

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]



Université d'Ottawa • University of Ottawa

**A SOCIO-RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LUKAN NARRATIVE OF THE LAST
SUPPER**

by

Ibitolu Oluseyi Jerome Megbelayin

**A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Theology, Saint Paul University, in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology and
Doctor of Theology**

Ottawa, Canada

December 20, 2001

© Ibitolu Oluseyi Jerome Megbelayin, Ottawa, Canada, 2002



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**385 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**385, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-76446-X

Canada

Acknowledgements:

As I come to the end of this project I realize that many people, too numerous to name here, have assisted me in one way or another; they all remain in my heart and memory. The following people, however, deserve special recognition:

First and foremost, my gratitude goes to God for giving me the strength and good health and for his providential care throughout my eleven-year sojourn in North America. I am grateful to my former bishop, Bishop A. O. Makozi, who sent me to North America for studies, to my longstanding friend, Archbishop John Olorunfemi Onaiyekan, the Instrument of my studies in North America, and to my bishop, Bishop Joseph Sunday Ajomo, for giving me all the support I ever needed without any reservation.

I thank my mother, Omofoye, who laboured hard for me to go to school and my brother, Aiyetan Megbelayin, who took over responsibility for my schooling following the untimely death of our dear mother. My appreciation goes to Rev. Louis Romi Fowoyo and Rev. Jerome Kokumo Bello, for taking care of my family while I was away in North America.

I am very fortunate to have such a serious scholar as Professor L. Gregory Bloomquist as my thesis director; I am grateful for his numerous suggestions, for the many hours he spent correcting, correcting and correcting my drafts; but above all, I thank him for his friendship. I thank Professor Frank Connolly-Weinert, who served as my private reader, for the many hours he spent reading my drafts and for the insightful conversations we had.

My sincere gratitude goes to “La Congrégation du St-Esprit”, Canada, for sponsoring my studies at Saint Paul University; I thank “la communauté spiritaine” at

Saint-Alexandre, Gatineau, Québec, for their hospitality, and in a special way, I express my appreciation to my friend Jean-Guy Gagnon, their Regional Superior at Gatineau, for his kindness and friendship.

I am grateful to Fr. Robert Chapman, the Pastor of St Philomena Parish where I lived throughout the writing of this dissertation. I thank him for his kindness and I appreciate the friendship of his parishioners.

I am honoured to have friends such as Cecil and Joan Cross family, Patrick and Helen Ezeamaka, Dr. Cole Ezeoke, Peter Farrell, Hale F. and Sandra E. Hemenway, Edward and Mary Johnson, Dr. Judith Ada Ifeagwu, Toni McGuire and her children (Sarah and Tim), James and Lottie Mitchell, Dr. Bill Tom Moore, Rev. Thaddeus Qbba, Jimi and Iyabo Ogundiran, Professor Joseph Femi Ojo, Francesca Rivere, Sr. Bernadette Sassone, D.W., Everell and Florence Thayer, and Deacon Charles Anthony Tobin: I thank them for their spiritual, moral and financial support, but above all, for their friendship. One friend, who did not live long enough to see all the fruits of his kindness to me, is Fr John H. Savage of Brooklyn, New York: God bless him.

DEDICATION:

To the memory of my parents, Megbelayin Arcenupin and Omofoye Elowogbami, my sister, Ibikemi Megbelayin, and my friend, Rev. John H. Savage of Brooklyn Diocese, New York.

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	The Anchor Bible (Commentary Series)
ABD	The Anchor Bible Dictionary
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
BCE	Before Common Era
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CE	Common Era
DSS	(Qumran) Dead Sea Scrolls
EDNT	Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament
EphArch	Ephemeris Archaeologica, 1890
ExpTim	Expository Times
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
Int	Interpretation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JR	Journal of Religion
JRS	Journal of Religious Studies
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSup	JSNT Supplementary Series
NovT	Novum Testamentum
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
NTS	New Testament Studies
Q	Qur'ān
RB	Revue Biblique
RBT	Review of Biblical Literature
RTP	Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSP	SBL Seminar Papers
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph

	Series
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
TJT	Toronto Journal of Theology
TS	Theological Studies
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Thesis Summary

A SOCIO-RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LUKAN NARRATIVE OF THE LAST SUPPER

In light of socio-rhetorical criticism, Luke's LS account emerges as rhetorical discourse both by its many Hellenistic rhetorical features and in terms of their underlying premise. Luke 22:7-38 (Western Text) clearly functions as a rhetorical discourse meant to alter the social expectations of Luke's community and produce corresponding changes in its conduct.

In Chapter One, we review the history of interpretation of the Lukan LS text and provide justification for the present study. We define the aim and present our research methodology. Here we suggest that Luke achieves his self-interest, as we have defined it, by constructing his LS as a rhetorical elaboration of theme. Treating Luke's LS as a rhetorical elaboration reveals that Luke 22:7-38 (Western Text) is a unified text. This textual unity helps to avoid disciplinary fragmentation of previous studies of this text, and to bring together different dimensions of the text for analysis. In this way, Jesus' instruction on true leadership (vv.25-28) assumes a central position in the rhetoric of Luke's supper text. This clearly contrasts with previous studies that have centralised the so-called "institution text" (vv. 19-20).

In Chapter Two, we define our textual unit as the Western Text (WT) and not the Alexandrian Text (AT) of Luke's LS. Here I show how Luke crafted his elaboration by looking at the narrative material, argumentation, and repetition. This analysis shows that Jesus is the main subject of the narrative text, and that the apostles are Jesus' rhetorical

audience, those for whom the elaboration is intended. I take this mode of argumentation as a clue that the Lukan LS text gives priority to the use of Graeco-Roman, social-cultural images of understanding rather than Judean images and modes of discussion. This leads me, in the examination of the subsequent textures, to privilege Graeco-Roman cultural meaning within the text rather than Judean modes of understanding.

Chapter Three shows that from the perspective of socio-rhetorical analysis there are four ways a text may use antecedent texts, oral or written, namely, recitation, reconfiguration, recontextualisation, and oral-scribal echo. Luke in composing his LS has reworked specific oral as well as written traditions available to him. Our analysis indicates that Luke 22:7-38 (WT) refers to Mark directly. But there are reconfigurations and recontextualisations of certain traditions that are not found in Mark, for instance, the *Didache* and John. Luke's agreement with 1 Cor, John, and the *Didache*, then, allows us to conclude that all four must have drawn on and reconfigured similar traditions. The rhetorical elaboration pattern within the LS narrative discourse in Luke 22:14-38 (WT) further suggests that Luke may have drawn on Greco-Roman textual traditions, e.g. rhetorical handbooks and exercises, novels and commentaries.

In Chapter Four we explore Luke's dependence on the cultural systems and social structure in his contemporary Mediterranean society. This analysis demonstrates that, in addition to his dependence on certain external texts, Luke is also dependent on certain cultural tradition and social institutions in his social environment.

This interaction with certain social codes and cultural scripts in the first-century Mediterranean leads me to conclude in Chapter Five that the language in the text can be social-culturally located as a first-century Mediterranean revolutionist response, with a

conversionist tendency, that seeks to reconstruct the old social order for the purposes of establishing a new social order, the kingdom of God, the kind of primitive “Christian” community Luke describes in the first chapters of Acts. I characterise this as a communitarian social response, for it sets out through its activities to construct the world on a communitarian basis. Jesus’ subversion of cultural meal habits is directed to the rhetorical audience constituted by his disciples and serves to reverse relationships and roles among them at meals, a mainstay of Judean purity system, and to indicate to them that the honoured one is the one who serves. The cultural function of Luke’s LS is, then, the creation of an inclusive community in which such a social response endures. This inclusivity suggests that in the new social order, God, not gentile kings, will be the patron, while Jesus will continue to broker God’s benefactions. When the apostles become rulers in the new dispensation they will begin to act as brokers of God’s benefactions and will thus socially and culturally mirror the actions of Jesus as broker.

The sixth chapter explores how this social and cultural program reflects sacred interests. Here my analysis leads me to suggest that Jesus’ sharing of his divine authority with the apostles and the potential positive transformative effect of Jesus’ petition to the deity on the apostles indicates that contact with Jesus himself leads to transformation. The meal Jesus promises his disciples will become for them a link to Jesus as they remember him at the breaking of bread, a communal meal that will transform members of the community (Luke 24: 30-32). The meal then assumes a higher, sacral-like value, as it becomes not a sacrificial rite but a sign of unity and cohesion. This unity and cohesion is further strengthened as the disciples are transformed into a fictive familial bond.

The concluding chapter combines exploration of the ideology of our chosen text with a résumé of the course of our investigation. Our exploration of ideological texture identifies the ideology of the implied author and shows just how this ideology shapes the narrative of the Lukan LS.

Socio-rhetorical analysis as we have engaged it here shows how a text's social-cultural environment helps to shape it. Socio-rhetorical analysis shows that a good knowledge of the social-cultural background of a text such as the NT is desirable for a better interpretation of it because of the fuller rhetorical and social considerations. Socio-rhetorical analysis also allows me to pose new questions to Luke's LS (WT), and to incorporate elements drawn from my own (Yoruba) culture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
I. Statement of the Question	1
II. History of Interpretation of the Lukan LS and the Present Study	3
A Text-critical Issues in Luke 22: 7-38	3
B Source-critical Issues in Luke 22: 7-38	5
C Formal Structure of Luke 22: 7-38	6
1. The Lukan LS as a Farewell Discourse	6
2. The Lukan LS as a Type-Scene	8
3. The Lukan LS as a Symposium	9
D Criticism of the Narrative of Luke 22: 7-38	11
E Redactional Studies of Luke 22:14-38	16
F Theological Exploration of Luke 22: 7-38	19
G Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Luke 22: 7-38	28
H Methodology	28
1. Innertexture	30
2. Intertexture	31
3. Social-Cultural Texture	31
4. Sacred Texture	32
5. Ideological Texture	33
III. Research Hypothesis	34
IV. Greek Text of Luke 22:1-38 and Translation	39
 CHAPTER TWO: INNERTEXTURE	 44
I. Introduction	44
II. Determining the Rhetorical Unit	44
III. The Text	46
A Repetitive Texture and Pattern in Luke 22:1-38	52
1. Repetition of Narrative Agents	53
2. Repetition of Main Topics	55
3. Repetition of Personal Pronouns	57
4. Summary	57
B Progressive Texture and Pattern	57
C Opening-Middle-Closing Texture and Pattern	59
D Narrational Texture and Pattern	61
1. Scene One (vv. 1-6)	65
2. Scene Two (vv. 7-13)	67
3. Scene Three (vv. 14-22)	69
4. Scene Four (vv. 23-34)	73
5. Scene Five (vv. 35-38)	79
6. Summary	82
E Argumentative Texture and Pattern	84

F	Thematic Elaboration-----	90
1.	Pattern of Elaboration in Luke 22: 7-38-----	94
2.	Analysis of the Pattern of Elaboration in Luke 22: 7-38-----	95
IV.	Summary-----	103
CHAPTER THREE: ORAL-SCRIBAL INTERTEXTURE-----		107
I.	Introduction-----	107
II.	Oral-Scribal Intertexture-----	109
A.	Recitation-----	110
1.	Luke 22: 1-2 cf. Mark 14:1-2-----	112
2.	Luke 22: 3-6 cf. Mark 14: 10-11-----	113
3.	Luke 22: 7-13 cf. Mark 14: 12-16-----	113
4.	Luke 22: 14 cf. Mark 14: 17-18-----	115
5.	Luke 22: 17-19a cf. Mark 14: 22-25-----	117
B.	Reconfiguration-----	120
C.	Recontextualisation-----	126
1.	Luke 22: 37 cf. Isa 53:12-----	128
2.	Luke 22: 21-22 cf. Mark 14: 18b, 22-----	129
3.	Luke 22: 24-27 cf. Mark 9: 34; 10: 42-45-----	130
D.	Oral-Scribal Echo-----	133
1.	Luke 22: 21 cf. Ps 41: 9; 55: 12, 13-----	133
2.	Luke 22: 31-34 cf. Job 1: 6-12-----	136
3.	Farewell Speech-----	138
III.	Summary-----	141
CHAPTER FOUR: SOCIAL AND CULTURAL INTERTEXTURE-----		144
I.	Introduction-----	144
II.	Social Intertexture-----	146
A.	Social Institutions-----	148
1.	The Household-----	148
2.	The Twelve Tribes of Israel-----	158
3.	Kingship Institutions-----	159
a.	God's Kingship-----	159
b.	Gentile Kingship-----	161
4.	The Temple-----	170
B.	Social Relationship-----	173
1.	Teacher-Discipleship Relationship-----	173
2.	Kinship-----	180
a.	Father-Son Relation: God as Jesus' Father-----	180
i.	Israelite Origin of the Title "Son of God"--	183
ii.	Egyptian Precedent-----	184
iii.	The Hellenistic World-----	186
iv.	NT: Resurrection as Son of God-----	188
b.	Brotherhood of the Apostles-----	189
3.	Patronage System-----	192

C.	Social Identity and Role-----	197
1.	Israelite Leaders-----	198
2.	Persons Preparing Meals and Fetching Water-----	199
3.	House Master-----	200
4.	Leader and Dinner Server-----	201
5.	Cock Crow-----	203
D.	Summary-----	203
III.	Cultural Intertexture-----	204
A.	References and Allusions-----	207
1.	Israelite Feast-----	208
2.	Meal Custom-----	208
B.	Echoes-----	213
1.	Son of Man and Satan-----	213
2.	Body Language-----	214
IV.	Summary-----	220
CHAPTER FIVE: SOCIAL-CULTURAL TEXTURE-----		222
I.	Introduction-----	222
II.	Social Rhetoric of Luke's LS-----	223
A	Meals and Table-Fellowship-----	235
B	Patron-Client System-----	239
C	Temple and the Household-----	246
D	Cultural Script of Honour-----	249
III.	Summary-----	259
IV.	Cultural Rhetoric of Luke's LS-----	260
V.	Summary-----	273
CHAPTER SIX: SACRED TEXTURE-----		276
I	The Deity-----	278
II	Holy Persons-----	279
A	Jesus as a Faithful Israelite-----	280
B	Titles of Jesus-----	281
1.	Jesus as Teacher-----	281
2.	Jesus as Son of Man-----	282
3.	Jesus as Son of God-----	284
4.	Jesus as Lord-----	288
III	Spirit Beings-----	291
IV.	Human Redemption-----	302
V.	Discipleship-----	305
VI.	The Apostles as Brothers-----	307
VII.	Religious Community-----	308
VIII.	Summary-----	310

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION-----**312**

BIBLIOGRAPHY-----**321**

I.	Primary Texts, Translations, and Philological Tools-----	321
II.	Reference Works-----	330
III.	Studies on Luke 22-----	334
IV.	Rhetorical Studies on Luke-Acts-----	340
V.	Other Studies on Luke-Acts-----	345
VI.	Other NT Studies: -----	363
VII.	Literary Analysis-----	369
VIII.	Rhetorical Analysis-----	374
IX.	Social-Cultural Anthropological Studies-----	392
X.	Other Methods-----	414
XI.	African Studies-----	425
XII.	Computer Software-----	426

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

I. Statement of the Question

The account of Jesus' last supper (LS) with his disciples before his death in the Third Gospel (Luke 22:7-38) has parallels in the canonical texts of Matthew (26: 20-30), in Mark (14: 17-26), and in John (13:1-17:26). Luke's LS recounts Jesus' final meal with the apostles (22:14-20), coupled with his parting words to them just before the authorities seized him (22:21-38). Although recent scholarly studies of Luke's LS account are many and varied, most concern themselves with standard theological, redactional, textual, tradition-historical or form-critical questions and methods.¹ Recently, however, Lukan

¹ Among the many studies on Luke's LS discourse we may mention the following: B. W. Bacon, "The Lukan Tradition of the Lord's Supper," *HTR* 5 (1912): 322-48; Andrew Brian McGowan, "Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel? The Institution Narratives and Their Early Interpretative Communities," *JBL* 118.1 (1999): 73-87; Bart D. Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts," *SBLSP*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991): 576-91; *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993): 197-211; Jonathan D. Brumberg Kraus, *Symposium Scenes in Luke's Gospel with Special Attention to the Last Supper*, PhD diss., Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee, 1991; P. H. Sellew, "The Last Supper Discourse in Luke 22:21-38," *Forum* 3 (1987): 70-95; I. J. du Plessis, "The Saving Significance of Jesus and His Death on the Cross in Luke's Gospel: Focusing on Luke 22:19b-20," *Neotestamentica* 28.2 (1994): 523-40; Robert William Canoy, *Perspectives on Eucharistic Theology: Luke as Paradigm for an Inclusive Invitation to Communion*, PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987; Dennis M. Sweetland, "The Lord's Supper and the Lukan Community," *BTB* 13 (Jan 1983): 23-27; Xavier Léon-Dufour, "'Faites ceci en mémoire de moi': Luc 22, 19- 1 Corinthiens 11, 25," *Christus* 24 (1977): 200-08; Philippe Rouillard, "From Human Meal to Christian Eucharist," *Worship* 53 (1979): 40-56; John Linskens, *Eucharist in St. Luke* (San Antonio, TX: Mexican American Culture Center, 1976); M. A. Smith, "The Lukan Last Supper Narrative," *Studia*

scholars have shown interest in the Lukan LS text as social, cultural and ideological discourse as well.²

Nevertheless, any efforts at bringing these dimensions together for analysis and interpretation are conspicuously lacking. In order to advance previous work on Luke's LS text while avoiding disciplinary fragmentation, we need a method of analysis that integrates various approaches to this text, both old and new, by showing how social and cultural norms find literary expression in Luke's LS.³

Evangelica 6.112 (TU 1973): 502-09; ; P. Benoît, "Le récit de la cène dans Lc XXII, 15-20," *Revue Biblique* XLVIII (1939): 357-93 and, "The Accounts of the Institution and What They Imply," in *The Eucharist in the New Testament: A Symposium*, eds. P. Benoît, Jean Delorme and J. Dupont, trans E. M. Steward (Baltimore/Dublin: Helicon Press, 1965): 71-83; Heinz Schürmann, *Le récit de la dernière cène Luc 22: 7-38*, trans. R. H. Hoizer, *Lumières Bibliques* (Le Puy/Lyon: Editions Xavier Mappus, 1966); Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans Norman Perrin (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1966); F. C. Burkitt, "St. Luke XXII 15,16: What is the General Meaning?" *JTS* 9 (1907-08): 569-72; "On Luke XXII 17-20," *JTS* 28 (1926-27): 178-81; and G. G. Monks, "The Lukan Account of the Last Supper," *JBL* 44 (1925): 228-60.

² See for instance, McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*, 1-26; Kraus, *Symposium Scenes in Luke's Gospel*; Jerome H. Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991): 361-87; and Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992): 402-403.

³ The beginning of such an approach may be observed in Willi Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

II. History of Interpretation of the Lukan LS and the Present Study

Scholarly study of Luke's LS since 1950 has been wide ranging, vigorous, and varied. The text, sources, form, typology, theology and authorial intent of this passage all have received substantial attention.⁴

A Text-critical Issues in Luke 22: 7-38

Disagreement among modern scholars over the original wording of the Lukan LS reflects the mixed testimony of the manuscript tradition itself, most notably over whether vv. 19b-20 are original or represent a later addition. Based on the work of Westcott and Hort in 1888, most Lukan scholars at first accepted the shorter version (Western text) as the original.⁵ But Joachim Jeremias' more recent arguments for the authenticity of the longer text⁶ (Alexandrian text) have led most Lukan scholars to favour including 19b-20 as

⁴ To the list of works in footnote 1 above we may add, Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985): 5-48; Marion Soards, *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987); Jerome Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988): 53-67; Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread: The Witness of the New Testament*, trans M. J. O'Connell (New York: Paulist, 1982): 15-179, 230—247; Eugene LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God: The Origin of the Eucharist According to Luke* (Chicago, IL: Archdiocese of Chicago Liturgy Training Publications, 1994).

⁵ See Henry Chadwick, "The Shorter Text of Luke xxii 15-20," *HTR* 50 (1957): 249. Among the scholars who disagreed with Westcott we may mention Herbert E. D. Blakiston and H. N. Bate. While Blakiston opines that Westcott's arguments are inadequate, Bate seeks a different "shorter text" (vv.15-18,21ff. without "no more" in v. 16). See Blakiston, "The Lukan Account," 548-555 and Bate, "The Shorter Text," 362-368.

⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 138-159.

belonging to the more original reading.⁷ Recently Bart D. Ehrman and Etienne Nodet have revived arguments for the Western text.⁸

All textual critics of the Lukan LS, however, agree on the uncertainty of the original text. The extensive manuscript evidence that supports the Alexandrian text still leaves us with the problem of explaining why the shorter text exists at all, and how to reconcile the view found in 22:19b-20 of Jesus' death as salvific ransom with Luke's inclination elsewhere to favour that of heroic, exemplary virtue.⁹ Be that as it may, we shall be using the Western text (WT) for this dissertation (see pp 46-52).¹⁰

⁷ Among scholars who prefer the longer text we may mention, Fitzmyer, Jeremias, LaVerdiere, Léon-Dufour, Marshall, Neyrey, Schürmann, Schweizer, and Senior. See further, F.G. Kenyon & C. E. Legg, "The Textual Data," in *The Ministry and the Sacraments*, ed. R. Dunkerley (London: SCM, 1937): 273-286 and Kobus Petzer, "Style and Text in the Lucan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:19b-20)," *NTS* (1991): 113-129, in support of the longer text.

⁸ Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread," 576-91 and *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 197-211; and Etienne Nodet, *The Origins of Christianity: An Exploration* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1998): 14-22.

⁹ See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on The Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971): 173-76.

¹⁰ Except where otherwise stated, our analysis refers to the Western Text (WT). Henceforth any reference to Luke 22:1-38 or any part thereof, for example 22: 14-22, excludes the contested text (19b-20).

B Source-critical Issues in Luke 22: 7-38

Source criticism of the Third Gospel is largely based on the Two-Source Hypothesis, namely, that the author of the Third Gospel used Mark and Q.¹¹ Any material that cannot be assigned to either of these two sources is thought to belong to the author's free composition or to a peculiar source,¹² named L (e.g. 7: 12-17; 10: 17-20, 38-42; 12:16-21; 15:11-35; 22: 15-18, 19b-20, 27, 31-33, 35-38).¹³ For those who consider the Alexandrian

¹¹ A minority of scholars argues that Luke, including the LS, is dependent on Mark and Matthew (Two-Gospel Hypothesis). The most recent proponents of this view are the members of the "Redaction Criticism and the Two Gospel Hypothesis Group" of the SBL. See *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, 82-120; *SBL 1993 Seminar Papers*, 303-333; *SBL 1994 Seminar Papers*, 516-573 and *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*, 636-687. See also Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2 vols. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989). I am persuaded by Raymond Brown's strong view that the Two-Source theory remains the best hypothesis for interdependence among the Synoptics; it remains highly implausible that Luke knew and used Matthew. See *The Death of the Messiah, From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1994): 40-46 and *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1994): 111-22. Though Darrell L. Bock is not dogmatic about the Two-Source theory, nonetheless he argues that the Two-Gospel hypothesis group is yet to justify their position. See Darrell L. Bock, "Response to David Dungan's section on Luke 22:1-46 in "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis," paper presented at SBL Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, 1995.

¹² See for example, Blakiston, "The Lucan Account," 549-552; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (New York: Doubleday, 1985): 1376, 1386-1387; Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words*, 97; Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, 105; Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 243; I. Howard Marshall, *Commentary on Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978): 785-827; and Arthur Vööbus, "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke," *NTS* 15 (1968-1969): 458. For an extensive exploration of sources on Luke 22, for example, see Soards, *The Special Material of Luke 22*. Soards concludes that Luke 22 is a fusion of Mark, oral and L sources.

¹³ See Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-LX* (New York: Doubleday, 1981): 83-84 for a listing of texts that he considers L. See further Kim

text more authentic, the Pauline tradition offers another possible reference for the Lukan LS (cf. 1 Cor 11:23-26). In either case, source criticism of the Lukan LS has rarely gone beyond canonical (NT and OT) material to include Graeco-Roman literature, language, and action prevalent in first-century Mediterranean culture. As we shall show, Luke's construction of the LS not only uses canonical sources, but also draws on other patterns from first-century Graeco-Roman culture at large.

C Formal Structure of Luke 22: 7-38

Although social context has been most significant in form-critical studies of the Lukan LS, there is still no consensus about the formal setting of this passage. Form-critically, some scholars argue for considering the Lukan LS to be a farewell discourse. Others maintain it represents a type-scene. Still others prefer to see it as a modified symposium. Each of these views has its merits, as well as limits.

1. The Lukan LS as a Farewell Discourse

In 1985 William Kurz went beyond the canonical boundaries of source criticism and compared the Lukan LS with both the Graeco-Roman Farewell address and the biblical Farewell address.¹⁴ While Kurz disagrees that Luke has imitated any particular farewell speech, he holds that Luke's LS blends elements of the discourses from both cultures, depends directly for some details on 1 Macc 2:49-70 (cf Acts 20:17-38) and 1 Kings 2:1-

Paffenroth's attempt to profile L in his *The Story of Jesus according to L* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), especially pages 27-65.

¹⁴ William Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses," *JBL* 104 (1985): 251-68.

10,¹⁵ and represents a counterpart to Paul's farewell address in Acts 20. Kurz also identifies two categories of function for the farewell address, namely *paraenetic* and *historiographical*.

Other scholars have similarly concluded that the Lukan LS narrative is a farewell meal. Donald Senior also believes that the meal (vv15-20) followed by a discourse (vv21-38) follows a farewell format,¹⁶ but limits Luke's usage to specific Jewish examples only, pointing to Acts 20:17-38 as another clear instance of similar Lukan composition.¹⁷ Even more recently, Peter K. Nelson has also argued for classifying Luke's LS as testamentary/farewell discourse;¹⁸ following a broad-based study of correspondence between the Lukan LS and contemporary testamentary literature in terms of both content

¹⁵ Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38," 264.

¹⁶ Donald C. P. Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* (Collègeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1989): 49-83.

¹⁷ Jacob's testament (Gen 48 & 49), Moses' testament (Deut 31-34) and Joshua's testament (Jos 23 & 24). See Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*, 54.

¹⁸ See Peter K. Nelson, "Testamentary Genre," in *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24-30*, ed. Pheme Perkins (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994): 97-119. Others who classify it as a farewell discourse include Robert J. Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature* (New York/ Mahwah: Paulist, 1985): 65; Fred B. Craddock, *Luke, Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1990): 257-260; LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God*, 125; Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 230; and Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 5-48.

and function, he concludes that 22:14-38 “may fairly be classified as a discourse designed on the model of the testamentary genre.”¹⁹

2. The Lukan LS as a Type-scene

Another approach to the formal nature of the Lukan LS is found in the work of Craig Thomas McMahan,²⁰ who analyses the Lukan meals as type-scenes, that is:

a basic situation, which recurs several times within a narrative. Each occurrence has a recognizably similar set of characteristics, sometimes highlighted by the repetition of key phrases, but this similarity permits--even requires if boredom is to be avoided--new variations in the development of the scene.²¹

This permits him to highlight the place of meals in Graeco-Roman literature and Old and New Testament literature. The Lukan meal scenes are superior to meals in the other Gospels because the Lukan meal scenes are frequent, specific, complex and intense, with the Lukan LS as the main meal in Luke with religious significance.²² In Graeco-Roman culture, he notes, the meal was a religious and social event and an important literary setting for social discussion.

¹⁹ Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 115. In his view this classification should not lose sight of the “points” at which Luke’s LS diverges from the testamentary genre as well.

²⁰ See McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*, 227-240.

²¹ McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*, 50.

²² McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*, 23-24.

Sociologically, the meal involves the binding of one person to another, while it religiously binds the human to the divine.²³ While this is also true in Israel's tradition, meals also represent exclusiveness for Jews who are not to eat with the nations because of the way meals traditionally symbolise ratification of Yahweh's covenant with his people (e.g. Ex 24:9-12).²⁴ The strength of McMahan's work lies in his broad study of literary traditions from Luke's time and culture. But his forced grouping of the Lukan meals casts doubt on his otherwise illuminating analysis.

3. The Lukan LS as a Symposium

Further exploration of the Graeco-Roman background to Luke's LS occurs among scholars who view certain Lukan meal scenes as Hellenistic symposia.²⁵ Recently, Jonathan D. Brumberg Kraus provided a comprehensive analysis of the Lukan LS itself as a symposium.²⁶ Kraus holds that Luke 22:1-38 represents "a conventional highly structured Graeco-Roman banquet, adapted to the particular Jewish meal customs of the Passover festival."²⁷ According to Kraus, Luke frames the LS as a symposium to show that Christian

²³ McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*, 8.

²⁴ For instance, "the **Haburah** meals of the Pharisees and in the table-fellowship at Qumran." See McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*, 12.

²⁵ E. Springs Steele, "Luke 11:37-54: A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" *JBL* 103 (1984): 379-394. For instance, Steele tested the symposium hypothesis and concluded that Luke 7:36-50, 11:37-54 and 14:1-24 can be understood "as modified examples of the Hellenistic *genus litterarium* of symposium" (390) [emphasis his].

²⁶ See Kraus, *Symposium Scenes*.

table fellowship is “rooted in Christian theory (Luke’s threefold periodization of salvation history).”²⁸

Despite its merits, Kraus’ argument remains doubtful and forced. As a symposium the Lukan LS lacks significant elements that one might expect to be made more explicit in a symposium text: who, for example, is the host, who are the guests, and who provoked Jesus to speak?

By these standards Luke’s LS emerges as less of a symposium and more of a surrogate family Passover meal.²⁹ And although Kraus hints at the connection between the

²⁷ Kraus, *Symposium Scenes*, 190.

²⁸ Kraus, *Symposium Scenes*, 197. He seems to be accepting Willibald Bösen’s view (*Das Mahlmotiv bei Lukas. Studien zum lukanischen Mahlverständnis unter besondere Berücksichtigung Lk 22:14-20*, diss. Universität des Saarlandes [Saarbrücken: Universität des Saarlandes, 1976], 82) that Lk 22:15-20 is an interpretation of two distinct literary units, namely, 22:15-18 and 22:19-20. This joining is in view of associating different stages of table fellowship with Jesus with the Lukan periodization of salvation history (see Kraus, 200, no. 11). Kraus thinks Conzelman’s (*Die Mitte der Zeit*, trans. *The Theology of St. Luke*) concept of Lukan periodisation of salvation history is different from Bösen’s (see Kraus, 228-230). Kraus’ structural analysis of Lk 22:1-38 appears to be based on Bösen’s two works (the second: *Jesusmahl, Eucharistisches Mahl, Endzeitmahl: ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Lukas* [Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1980]) on the Lukan Last Supper, more especially concerning the perceived correspondence between Jesus’ meals and the Lukan periodisation of salvation history. Bösen’s position can be summarised as follows: Luke has two sources for his version of the LS: Luke 22:19a is based on Mk 14:22, while Luke 22:19b-20 is based on 1 Cor 11:25. Thus, Luke’s story is a fusion of the Markan tradition and the Pauline. Furthermore, Luke 22:15-18 gives the account of the Passover, thereby suggesting that vv. 15-20 is a fusion of two meals, the Passover meal and the Eucharistic meal. His basic thesis is that there are three meals in Luke 22:1-38, namely, Jesus’ meal, the Eucharistic meal and the end-time meal, corresponding respectively to Jesus’ earthly ministry, the in-between period and the end-time (see Kraus, 200-207).

²⁹ See Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, 402.

form of this text and its broader ideological import, his focus on showing that Luke's LS is a symposium leads him to neglect the latter point. As a result, Kraus opens the door to wider issues, but leaves much work still to be done.

D Criticism of the Narrative of Luke 22: 7-38

Broadly, narrative criticism can be defined as focus on a type of literature that tells a story and how the story is told.³⁰ Thus according to Seymour Chatman, a narrative is double-sided, namely, story and discourse, that is, the content of the narrative (events, characters, settings and plot) and how the story is told, respectively.³¹ In a nutshell, narrative criticism focuses on "story-as-discoursed."³²

³⁰See Mark Allen Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991): 23.

³¹See Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978): 9. The "how" of narrative is what Powell calls, "the rhetoric of the narrative." See Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* 23. This definition agrees with Aristotle's understanding of Tragedy in his *Poetics*, see especially chapters 6 to 15. See, Jonathan Barnes, ed. *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984): 2320-27.

³²Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 3; cited in Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* 23. Robert W. Funk calls it Narrative Discourse, while recognising the "story-discourse dichotomy" that Chatman makes. See Robert W. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988): 2-3. Some define Narrative Discourse "as the conjunction of a story and a teller." See Guyora Binder & Robert Weisberg, "Narrative Criticism of Law," in *Literary Criticism of Law* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000): 209. In this thesis we use "narrative" and "narrative discourse" interchangeably. That means we treat Luke's LS as a narrative discourse, story-as-discoursed.

Narrative criticism of the Lukan LS has been done either within the framework of Luke-Acts³³ or within the framework of the Third Gospel.³⁴ Each appears to focus on a unique point. Tannehill aims to stand “on the borderline between character and plot, understanding character in terms of role, which is character in action and interaction within the unfolding plot.”³⁵ On the other hand, Heil’s attention is on the audience, that is, the implied reader,³⁶ “how the authorial audience or implied reader responds to the narrative of Luke-Acts in the sequence in which it is read.”³⁷ Kurz aims on “analysis of how the

³³See for instance, Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1: *The Gospel According to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986): 164-270; Luke T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1991): 1-24, 331-50; William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1993): 57-61; and John Paul Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach* (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1999): 165-98.

³⁴See for example, Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996): 175-225 and Jonathan Knight, *Luke's Gospel* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998): 136-40. We may include Joel B. Green, who attempts to correlate “culture-critical and narratological concerns” using discourse analysis. See Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997): 1, 748-76.

³⁵Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, vol. 1, 1. But see Tannehill’s approach in, *Luke*, 175-225.

³⁶Johnson is difficult to characterise, while his declared method is literary-critical, I get the impression he is doing some form of Redaction Criticism, See *Luke*, 1, 2.

³⁷Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 4.

narrative genre of Luke and Acts, as well as their canonical status as parts of the Bible. affect their interpretation.”³⁸

The focus of Kurz, then, is on the narrative character of Luke-Acts and on the narrators for the purpose of highlighting “the Lukan point of view on the event recounted, both as subsuming traditional materials and sources and as adding a distinctive voice to the harmony of the New Testament.”³⁹ In the end, although Kurz recognises Luke-Acts as a story, his approach is, in our view, better characterised as canonical criticism,⁴⁰ similar to Brevard S. Childs’s but different from that of James Barr.⁴¹ In so doing, Kurz allows himself to fall into certain pitfalls of canonical criticism that Mary C. Callaway has predicted: he overlooks historical factors that might have influenced the formation of the canon,⁴² flattens out the text to make it accessible to the reader, and “prefers harmonisation to dissonance and uncertainty.”⁴³

³⁸ See Kurz, *Reading Luke and Acts*, 5. Kurz does not say whether his reader is the real reader or the implied reader.

³⁹ Kurz, *Reading Luke and Acts*, 164.

⁴⁰ See Kurz, *Reading Luke and Acts*, 159-183.

⁴¹ See Mary C. Callaway, “Canonical Criticism,” in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993): 124-125. See further, Brevard S. Childs, *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984): 48-53 and James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) and *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987): 153-172 (here Sanders lays out similarities and differences between his approach and that of Childs).

⁴² See Bruce M. Metzger, “Historical and Theological Problems Concerning the Canon,” in *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origins, Development, and Significance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987): 251-288.

Heil in particular observes that the author of Luke-Acts assumes that his "audience possesses the social, cultural, historical, literary, rhetorical, and interpretative knowledge necessary to actualize the text's meaning and receive its communication."⁴⁴ In stating the prerequisites of Luke's audience Heil also implies that the social location of the implied author may be the same as that of the implied audience,⁴⁵ thus indirectly underscoring the cultural nature of Luke-Acts, a major presupposition of the approach we are using in this thesis.⁴⁶

While helpful, Heil overlooks the rhetoric of the story, how the story is told, that is, the discourse side of the narrative, by not paying attention to the narrator.⁴⁷ He also fails to recognise that a narrative is a rhetorical discourse, that is, literature for the purpose of persuading the audience, the implied as well as the real.

⁴³ See Callaway, "Canonical Criticism," 131-32; Kurz, "Harmonization of Lukan and other Canonical Perspectives...Complementary rather than Competition with the Canon," in *Reading Luke and Acts*, 162-166.

⁴⁴ Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 3.

⁴⁵ I say this because he cites Robbins' article on "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts" to support his claim. See Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 3, no 6. See Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome Neyrey, 305-32 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991).

⁴⁶ The cultural nature of Luke's LS is the concern of our chapter on social and cultural intertexture, that is, chapter four.

⁴⁷ See Chatman, "Discourse: Covert versus Overt Narrators," in *Story and Discourse*, 196-260 and Meir Sternberg, "Ideology of Narration and Narration of Ideology," in *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985): 84-128.

Although Kurz, Heil, and Tannehill treat Luke's writings as a narrative unity, only Heil makes a more conscious effort to show unity among Luke's meal scenes. The inner relationship he forges among the Lukan meals corroborates the conclusions of prior studies of Luke's LS that the cumulative effects of the Lukan meals are significant for a better understanding of the LS⁴⁸; he also provides a scholarly framework for my thesis that Luke's inclusiveness at the LS is evident if seen within the overall cumulative effects of his previous meal scenes.

Karris also provides a significant contribution by treating Luke's LS within the context of Luke's theme of food.⁴⁹ Karris' major point is that the Lukan Jesus "got himself crucified by the way he ate."⁵⁰ In any case, he agrees with Paul Minear that the centre of Luke's LS is not 22:19b-20, but in the dialogues between Jesus and the apostles (22:23-38).⁵¹ Although this observation is too general, it nonetheless opens the door for our more specific hypothesis that Jesus' teaching on leadership as service of others (vv. 24-27), is the central point of the Lukan LS.

⁴⁸See, for instance, Canoy, *Perspectives on Eucharistic Theology*, 172-187.

⁴⁹ See Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian*, 47-78.

⁵⁰ Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian*, 47.

⁵¹ See Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian*, 65, 67.

E Redactional Studies of Luke 22: 7-38

Most redaction critics still remain focused on discerning the theological import of a biblical author's editorial activities⁵² using canonical texts.⁵³ Nevertheless, although Jean-Marie Guillaume remains within traditional redaction criticism, he explores Luke's LS within the context of Luke's theme of commensality.⁵⁴ But as Guillaume remains within the confines of traditional redactional analysis, he is only able to forge a theological unity among Lukan meals. As John A. Darr has correctly observed, "redactional identification of a unique schema of salvation history, or other related themes...does not, in and of itself, constitute of the text's rhetoric."⁵⁵ Consequently, "little has been done to explain the rhetorical strategies" Luke has used for trying to persuade his audience.⁵⁶

⁵² See Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969); Neyrey, *Passion According to Luke*, 1; Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991): 169-70; Brown, *New Testament Christology*, 23-24. Christopher M. Tuckett has correctly observed that the author's concerns and ideas do not reside only in the changes he/she is perceived to have made to his/her sources but also when he/she leaves his/her sources intact. See Tuckett, *Luke* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996): 25-26.

⁵³ See Robbins' criticism of Raymond Brown and Joseph Fitzmyer in Vernon K. Robbins, "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, eds. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994): 181-82.

⁵⁴ See Jean-Marie Guillaume, « La scène de la commensalité, » in *Luc interprète des anciennes traditions sur la résurrection de Jésus* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1979): 129-159.

⁵⁵ John A. Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992): 49.

⁵⁶ See Darr, *On Character Building*, 50.

Jerome Neyrey makes the most significant move beyond traditional redaction critical study of the Lukan LS by integrating previous form-critical and redaction-critical studies of the text with a broader effort inquiring into its correspondence with the contemporary Jewish and Hellenistic farewell speech.⁵⁷ He gives four general features of a typical farewell speech that can be found in Luke's LS: (1) prediction of death, (2) predictions of attacks on the leader's disciples, (3) ideal behaviour urged, and (4) a commission. These features generally provide "one important interpretative clue: in farewell speeches the focus of attention tends to be on the disciples addressed rather than on the speaker."⁵⁸ Consequently, Neyrey correctly holds, in our view, that "Luke 22:14-38 tells us more about Luke's view of the apostles, their commission, and the succession of leaders in the church than about Jesus."⁵⁹ That is why, as we hope to show, the focus in Luke 22:7-38 is in fact on the disciples, for Jesus' teaching on inclusiveness and servant leadership is central to the narrative.

To support his contention that proper interpretation of the Lukan meals must seriously consider the ceremonial quality of a Mediterranean society, Neyrey has identified

⁵⁷ See Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*. Joel B. Green's redactional study covers only Luke 22:7-13. See Green, "Preparation for Passover (Luke 22:7-13): A Question of Redactional Technique," *NovT* XXIX, 4 (1987): 305-319. Other redactional studies include Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke (Die Mitte der Zeit = The Middle of Time)*, trans. Goeffrey Buswell (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1961): 199-202; Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, 785-827; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1385-1435; and C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990): 765-808.

⁵⁸ Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 7.

⁵⁹ Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 7-8.

four “maps” of roles for meals and table fellowship in the Graeco-Roman world, that is, prescribed persons, things, places, and times:

- a) Map of persons: only people of the same social status eat together. “Likes eat with Likes.” There is order in the sitting arrangement, for where one sits replicates one’s social role in the group. For instance, the right hand of the host is a place of honour (Luke 20:42, Acts 2:33). There is a presider.
- b) Map of things: food to eat and forbidden food. So not all food can be eaten.
- c) Map of places: meals are not eaten just anywhere. It must be in a place that can guarantee that proper diet is prepared in a proper way and served with proper utensils.
- d) Map of times: some meals are eaten at the right time. For instance, the Passover meal is eaten not every day or every week or month but once a year on a fixed calendar. Above all, meals are ceremonies with proper rules and regulations.⁶⁰

In his work on Luke’s LS, Neyrey has made three significant contributions: First, in form-critical terms, he confirms that scholarly view of the Lukan LS as a farewell discourse by showing the correspondence of this Lukan text with features of other typical Graeco-Roman and biblical farewell discourses. Second, he, like Heil, shows how Luke forged a strong interrelationship among Lukan meals, thereby exposing intertextual dependence.⁶¹ Third, Neyrey’s socio-anthropological insight into meal and table fellowship practice widens the relevant boundaries for interpreting the Lukan text. In these three ways, Neyrey has consciously begun to move beyond redactional criticism towards analysis that

⁶⁰ See Neyrey, “Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship,” 361-387.

⁶¹ In this, he agrees with Dennis Smith who treats the Lukan meals as a literary motif. See Dennis E. Smith, “Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke,” *JBL* 106.4 (1987): 613-38.

incorporates insights not only from textual studies but also from anthropology and sociology. In fact, he has paved the way for a socio-rhetorical analysis of the Lukan LS text.

F. Theological Exploration of Luke 22: 7-38

In reaction to what he calls “the rarity of synthetic presentations of Lukan theology,” Fitzmyer in 1981 provides a sketch of categories under which one might pursue Luke’s theology:⁶² (1) the Lukan kerygma (145-162); (2) the structure of the Lukan Gospel (162-164); (3) the Lukan geographical perspective (164-171); (4) the Lukan historical perspective (171-192); (5) the Lukan Christology (192-227); (6) the role of the Holy Spirit (227-231); (7) eschatology (231-235); (8) discipleship (235-257); and (9) overall portrait of Jesus in the Gospel (257-258). Of these nine categories, Fitzmyer explicitly indicates that Luke’s LS contributes to Luke’s theology in its kerygma (22:16,18,29,30), structure (22:22), historical perspective (22:3,22,35-37), Christology (22:19-20,22,33,37, 38), and discipleship (22:3,5,14,32). These five categories roughly correspond to what is traditionally called eschatology, salvation history, Christology, and ecclesiology. Fitzmyer’s own commentary on the Lukan LS, however, does not synthesise these categories.⁶³ Nevertheless, the theology of Luke’s LS has over the years been studied under these four categories.⁶⁴

⁶²See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-LX*, 143-258. See also François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Thirty Three Years of Research (1950-1983)*, trans. Ken McKinney (Aliison Park, PA: Pickwick Publication, 1987); and Earl Richard, “Luke- Writer, Theologian, Historian: Research and Orientation of the 1970’s,” *BTB* 13 (Jan 1983): 3-15.

⁶³See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1358-435. But see his attempt to do so in *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1989).

⁶⁴See for instance, Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 199-202; Willi Marxsen, *The Lord’s Supper as a Christological Problem*, trans. Lorenz Nieting

But more commonly, in the search for Luke's theology in the LS text the central focus has been on ecclesiology, the LS as a eucharist, its institution and eschatological import,⁶⁵ with little attention to its social and cultural implication.⁶⁶ Canoy, however, contributes significantly to our thesis by paying particular attention to the Lukan Jesus' inclusiveness at the LS.⁶⁷ Xavier Léon-Dufour and LaVerdiere represent general trends in theological exploration of Luke's LS.

Léon-Dufour seeks to re-examine the biblical foundation of the Eucharist.⁶⁸ In the light of this goal he takes a biblico-theological approach, which considers all the

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970); Jacob Jervell, "The Twelve on Israel's Thrones," in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975): 75-112; Dennis M. Sweetland, "The Lord's Supper and the Lukan Community," *BTB* 13 (Jan 1983): 23-27; Arthur A. Just, *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1993), especially 227-53; and Peter K. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24-30*, ed. PHEME PERKINS (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994).

⁶⁵ Other concerns are the date of the LS since the Synoptics disagree with the Johannine presentation and the origin of the Eucharist. See for example, Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1379-82; Enrico Mazza, *The Origin of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Ronald E. Lane (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1995); Nodet, *The Origins of Christianity*, 88-125; and Justin Taylor, "La fraction du pain en Luc-Actes," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999): 281-95.

⁶⁶ See for example, Paul S. Minear, "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology," *Worship* 44 (1970): 322-31; Canoy, *Perspectives on Eucharistic Theology*; Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 230-47; Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, 105-17; and LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God and The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1996): 79-111.

⁶⁷ See Canoy, *Perspectives on Eucharistic Theology*, 172-187.

⁶⁸ Léon-Dufour, *Sharing The Eucharistic Bread*.

biblical texts on the subject.⁶⁹ in order to “produce a ‘biblical theology’ of the eucharist and thereby offer dogmatic theologians a synthesis that will serve them as point of reference for the comprehensive interpretation they must provide on the basis of tradition.”⁷⁰ While he notes only four brief mentions of eucharistic practice in the Acts of the Apostles, he adds that there are two names for the eucharist: “the breaking of bread” and “the Lord’s Supper.”⁷¹ Concerning Jewish rites and the Christian Eucharist, Léon-Dufour holds that Luke or the tradition before him created a name for the Eucharist, namely the “breaking of bread.”⁷² In this way, Léon-Dufour acknowledges that the term “eucharist” does not exist in the NT; it is only a later characterisation.

Perhaps LaVerdiere has done more work on the “eucharist” in Luke’s writings than any other scholar, having devoted two books to it, one for the Third Gospel and the other for Acts.⁷³ Like Léon-Dufour, LaVerdiere seeks the origin of the Christian eucharist in the NT, but with particular focus on Luke’s writings. For him all the meals are eucharistic with Christological, ecclesiological and eschatological import. Be that as it may, like Léon-Dufour, he acknowledges also that the NT talks of “the breaking of bread” (Luke) and “the Lord’s supper” (Pauline), and not the “eucharist.” He goes further to show that the term

⁶⁹ Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 2.

⁷⁰ Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 6.

⁷¹ Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 15.

⁷² Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 23.

⁷³ See LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God and The Breaking of the Bread: The Development of the Eucharist according to Acts* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1998).

“institution” did not enter the picture until centuries after NT times.⁷⁴ In fact, according to him, “Discussion about the actual institution of the eucharist began between the ninth and eleventh centuries in the great controversies over the ‘real presence’ of Christ in the eucharist. In order to affirm the real presence, the church appealed to Jesus’ institution of the eucharist at the Last Supper.”⁷⁵ This, in our view, points to the political, ideological and rhetorical dimensions of the use of the term “institution” to characterise what Jesus did at the LS.

In the first place, the observation of both Léon-Dufour and LaVerdiere that the term “eucharist” is non-existent in the NT strongly suggests the possibility that “the breaking of the bread” in Acts does not deal with the eucharist but simply a statement of a meal. But the real question is whether Luke was writing only theology or was he concerned also with specific contemporary social problems of his Jesus-movement group? We hope to show that Luke’s LS is more concerned with specific contemporary social and political problems, such as inclusiveness and true leadership than with theological issues.

Secondly, the categories under which Luke’s theology is studied are, strictly speaking, not theology proper unless one has presupposed that Jesus is God.⁷⁶ Luke’s

⁷⁴ See LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God*, 3-5.

⁷⁵ LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God*, 4 and no. 8. This is not the place to discuss the various issues relating to the LS and the development of eucharistic doctrine. For attempts at such issues, see for example, A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord’s Supper in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1952) and “The Origins of the Eucharist,” *NTS* 1 (1954-55): 200-09; J. Reumann, “The Last and the Lord’s Supper,” *Lutheran Theological Seminary Bulletin* 62 (1982): 17-39 and *The Supper of the Lord: The New Testament, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*. See also Raymond E. Brown, *Biblical Exegesis and Church Doctrine* (New York/Ramsey: Paulist, 1981).

⁷⁶ I understand theology as human attempt to understand God. Exploration of the theology of a particular author or a particular text will be looking to see how the author or

Christology, for instance, may be understood as exploration of Luke's portrait of Jesus.⁷⁷ while ecclesiology is exploration of Luke's understanding of the group that emerged following Jesus' departure. Socially, Luke's kingdom-of-God language is a reference to the kingdom of Israel, understood to be under the rule of Israel's god (theocracy).⁷⁸ With a few exceptions,⁷⁹ explorations of Luke's theology as a whole or of the LS in particular hardly take seriously Luke's stated understanding of what he is doing, namely, to write a narrative (διήγησις) [Luke 1: 1] and not history (in the sense of events that occurred).⁸⁰

Put differently, theological exploration of biblical narratives,⁸¹ especially the doctrinal form, should take seriously the distinction between story and history.⁸² A

the text attempts to mediate god to the audience. See Antoinette Clark Wire, "Since God is One: Rhetoric as Theology and History in Paul's Romans," *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, eds. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994): 211 and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999): 175-76.

⁷⁷See For example C. M Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999): 133-37. But see Raymond Brown's overview of the meaning of Christology and the various approaches, Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1994): 3-15.

⁷⁸ We shall show that Israel of old had always understood itself to be under the rule of God, a concept that was not unique to Israel.

⁷⁹In this category we include the authors we have mentioned above under narrative criticism and Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," 133-37.

⁸⁰Although Fitzmyer notes the narrative character of Luke's writings, he still works in terms of the historical mode of analysis. See Joseph Fitzmyer, "The Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts," *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999): 165.

⁸¹As we have noted above narrative consists of a story and a discourse. The discourse part is the rhetoric of the story, how the story is told.

narrative, as we have noted above, is a story-as-discoursed; it is prescriptive and not descriptive, and as such one should recognise how the story is told, that is, its rhetoric.⁸³

As Wayne C. Booth aptly puts it, “the author cannot choose to avoid rhetoric: he can choose only the kind of rhetoric he will employ. He cannot choose whether or not to affect his readers’ evaluations by his choice of narrative manner; he can only choose whether to do it well or poorly.”⁸⁴

Furthermore, the rhetorical character of the biblical text also calls for a different hermeneutical approach. That is, because biblical narratives are intended to persuade their audience,⁸⁵ their rhetorical character also should be taken into consideration in theological interpretation.⁸⁶ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza’s observation on this issue is, in our view,

⁸²For a recent attempt in this direction, see James Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999): 345-61. Compare this to Aristotle’s distinction between historian and poet in *Poetics*, 9. 1-25 (1451^b) [Barnes, *Complete Works of Aristotle*, 2322-23].

⁸³We need to heed Stanley E. Porter’s observation that “rhetoric is not a single thing and neither can it be defined simply.” Stanley E. Porter, “Introduction: The Heidelberg Papers in Perspective,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993): 21.

⁸⁴Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1983): 149.

⁸⁵See George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984): 3; James J. Murphy, “Early Christianity as a ‘Persuasive Campaign’: Evidence from The Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of Paul,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993): 90-99; Darr, *On Character Building*, 53; and Amos Niven Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999).

⁸⁶See for instance, Wire, “Since God is One,” 210-27 and Lauri Thuren, “On Studying Ethical Argumentation and Persuasion in the New Testament,” in *Rhetoric and*

pertinent, namely, that “the subject in traditional understanding of theology is ‘faith.’ whereas in the rhetorical understanding of theology it is the interpreter.”⁸⁷ According to this rhetorical understanding of theology, the focus is not on divine revelation but rather on human mediation of that revelation, similar to prophetic role. In this way, theology is

the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993): 464-78.

⁸⁷Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic*, 176. But on the issue of possible contribution of rhetorical criticism of the biblical text to theology and historical reconstruction, see Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps, eds. *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); see especially the following contributions: Erika Mae Olbricht, “Acting on the Center: An Interview on Rhetoric and Hermeneutics with Thomas H. Olbricht in the Wake of *Hearing God’s Voice*,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 28-47; Thomas H. Olbricht, “Classical Rhetorical Criticism and Historical Reconstruction: A Critique,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 108-24; Dale Patrick and Allen Scult, “Rhetoric and Ideology: A Debate Within Biblical Scholarship Over the Import of Persuasion,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 63-83; Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps, “Introduction: The Malibu Conference and The Ongoing Debate,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 17-20; and Duane Frederick Watson, “The Contributions and Limitations of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Theory for Constructing the Rhetorical and Historical Situations of a Pauline Epistle,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 125-51. See also Martin Warner, ed., *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility* (London/New York: Routledge, 1990) and Pieter J. J. Botha, “Moral Possibility and Narrative Rhetoric,” *Neotestamentica* 28.2 (1994): 495-510.

human speech about the divine. and the biblical text is understood as human word about the divine.”⁸⁸

What is needed, then, is a rhetorical hermeneutics, that is, “the theoretical practice that results from the intersection between rhetorical pragmatism and the study of cultural rhetoric.”⁸⁹ This kind of hermeneutics “views *shared interpretative strategies not as the creative origin of texts but rather as historical sets of topics, arguments, tropes, ideologies, and so forth which determine how texts are established as meaningful through rhetorical exchange*” (emphasis in Robbins).⁹⁰ It is this kind of reading of the text of the Lukan LS, one that deliberately includes the ideological analysis of the text of the Lukan LS, that I am proposing through a socio-rhetorical analysis of the chosen text.⁹¹

⁸⁸ See Brown, “The Human Word of the Almighty God,” in *The Critical Meaning of the Bible* (New York/Ramsey: Paulist, 1981): 1-22. See also, Jean Levie, *Parole humaine et message de Dieu* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959); the English title: *The Bible: The Word of God in Words of Men*, trans. S. H. Treman (New York: P. J. Kennedy, 1962); cited in Brown, *The Critical Meaning of the Bible*, 21.

⁸⁹ Steven Mailoux, “Rhetorical Hermeneutics Revisited,” *Text and Performance Quarterly* 11 (1991): 233; cited in Robbins, “Socio-Rhetorical Hermeneutics and Commentary,” in *EPI TO AYTO: Essays in Honour of Petr Pokorny*, ed. J. Mrazek, R. Dvorakova, and S. Brodsky (Praha-Trebenice, Czech Republic: Mlyn Publishers, 1998): 285.

⁹⁰ Steven Mailloux, *Rhetorical Power* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1989): 15; cited in Robbins, “Socio-Rhetorical Hermeneutics and Commentary,” 285-86.

⁹¹ It is this lack of ideological concern in mainstream biblical as well as theological studies that is partly responsible for the plethora of Cultural and Feminist Criticisms in biblical studies. Examples of works in this direction are, Phyllis Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978); Schüssler Fiorenza, “The Ethics of Interpretation: De-Centering Biblical Scholarship,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 3-17; *Rhetoric and Ethic*; Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, ed., *Searching the Scriptures*, vol.1: *A Feminist Introduction* (New York: Crossroads, 1993) and *Searching the Scriptures*, vol.2: *A Feminist Commentary* (New York: Crossroads, 1994); Clarice J. Martin, “A Chamberlain’s Journey and the Challenge of Interpretation for Liberation,” *Semeia* 47 (1989): 105-35; Martin; Virginia Fabella and Mercy Amba Oduyoye, eds., *With Passion and Compassion: Third Women Doing Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988); Fernando F. Segovia and

The fact that this study also engages the Western text of the Lukan LS, one that no one has yet undertaken to any extent, is a further feature of its uniqueness. For whether or not the Western text is secondary, some people once read it as the primary text of the Lukan LS, as suggested by the fact of the physically extant Western text.⁹²

And clearly the Western text has a different emphasis. For instance, while Marie-Émile Boismard recently argues in favour of the Alexandrian text, he opines that if one accepts the Western text, it is certain that the text didn't have the account of institution of the eucharist. Boismard further cautions anyone who finds this opinion difficult to accept to remember that the Johannine LS also lacks an institution account.⁹³

Mary Ann Tolbert, eds., *Reading From This Place*, vol.1: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) and *Reading From This Place*, vol. 2: *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); Elizabeth A. Johnson, *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse* (New York: Crossroad, 1992); Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*, revised edition with Introduction, trans. and ed. Caridad Inda and John Eagleson (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988); Arthur F. McGovern, *Liberation Theology and Its Critics: Toward an Assessment* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1990); Peter Scott, *Theology, Ideology and Liberation: Towards a Liberative Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Stephen D. Moore, ed., *In Search of the Present: The Bible Through Cultural Studies*, SEMEIA 82 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1998).

⁹² Apart from *Codex Bezae*, the Western text is considered the original in William Whiston, *The Primitive New Testament Restor'd* (London, 1745) an English translation from *Codex Bezae* and *Codex Claromontanus* (D), a Greco-Latin manuscript containing only the Epistles of Paul; cited in Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origins, Development, and Significance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987): 268, 310; Brook F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, vol 1. (New York: Harper/London, Macmillan, 1881); and *New English Bible* (Cambridge: Oxford and Cambridge Universities Presses, 1970).

⁹³ Marie-Émile Boismard, *En quête du proto-Luc*, Études bibliques 37 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1997): 77.

G Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Luke 22: 7-38

While there is yet no rhetorical or socio-rhetorical analysis of the Lukan LS proper, rhetorical analysis of some portions of Luke-Acts have appeared.⁹⁴ These previous attempts at rhetorical analysis of portions of Luke's writings and the broader application of it to NT studies firmly validate further use of this method on other portions of Luke-Acts.

H Methodology

Our method of analysis is socio-rhetorical analysis. It is just such rhetorical analysis, understood in a fuller sense, that promises to complete the task that Jerome Neyrey has begun. Specifically, socio-rhetorical analysis expands upon the literary and stylistic

⁹⁴ See for instance, Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990): 50-52, 85-95; Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989): 69-141, 161-193; Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 39-72, 115-140; Ira J. Jolivet, "The Lukan Account of Paul's Conversion and Hermagorean Stasis Theory," in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 210-20; and Kota Yamada, "The Preface to Lukan Writings and Rhetorical Historiography," in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 154-72. For scholars, who characterise certain of their studies on Luke as socio-rhetorical or social rhetorical, see Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric* and Ben Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995); and L. Gregory Bloomquist, "Rhetorical Argumentation and the Culture of Apocalyptic: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Lk. 21," in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 173-209.

concerns of rhetorical analysis, going beyond them by including the social and cultural context within which speech takes place and the ideological reading that a text permits or nourishes. This mode of analysis and interpretation, then, seeks to integrate the ways people use language with the ways they live their lives in the world.⁹⁵

Vernon Robbins is the first to characterise his work as socio-rhetorical.⁹⁶ Socio-rhetorical criticism, which seeks to understand “language as a social product and tool,” is a multidisciplinary method which combines literary, rhetorical, social-scientific, and theological criticism into one integrated approach for analysis and interpretation of not just texts, but what its practitioners call “textures.” The word texture is here understood as a metaphor for the network of signification in a written text. According to Robbins, “the web of signification in a text produces a surface that looks different according to the different angles from which one approaches it.”⁹⁷ Relying on Stephen A. Tyler’s *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World*, Robbins further describes texture thus:

Writing and the texts produced by writing are, from the first, expressions of a metaphor of figuration as “weaving.” The word “text” itself derives from Latin *texture* (“to weave”) and we still speak of weaving or “stitching together...a discourse in which the “seams” are not obvious, or one that makes a “seamless web.” This weaving metaphor occurs in story after story as a symbol of order, and order itself is another weaving

⁹⁵ See Michael Warren, *Faith, Culture, and Worshipping Community: Shaping the Practice of the Local Church*. (New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1989): 1.

⁹⁶ See Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric*, 6; Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, xii, n. 8. See Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Second Edition (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992): xix.

⁹⁷ Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, xxvii.

metaphor, derived from Latin *ordo*, a technical term for the arrangement of threads in the warp and woof of a fabric. And, do we not still speak of the “fabric” of a tale, the “thread of discourse,” of words as the “clothing of thought,” of the “network” of ideas in a text, and of “spinning a yarn,” which others may “unravel.”⁹⁸

As such, this method regularly explores five such textures: innertexture, intertexture, social-cultural texture, sacred texture and ideological texture.⁹⁹

1. Innertexture

This first step in socio-rhetorical analysis is to identify patterns within the text at the syntactical, semantic, and rhetorical level. Analysis at this level is concerned with the words, clauses, phrases and sentences in the text. Robbins suggests five aspects of this texture:¹⁰⁰ Repetitive texture and pattern concerns the way in which the same words and phrases in the textual unit are used again and again. Progressive texture and pattern addresses the progression of words and phrases in the unit. Narrational texture and pattern examines the characters and their relationships in the narrative of the text. Opening-middle-

⁹⁸ Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, xxvii-xxviii; Stephen A. Tyler, *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987): 35.

⁹⁹ See Vernon Robbins, *Exploring the Textures of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetoric Interpretation* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1996): 3.

¹⁰⁰ Robbins, *Exploring*, 7. According to Kenneth Burke, “the repetitive, progressive, conventional and minor rhetorical forms of language” are basic rhetorical elements of language. See Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1931): 123-83; L. Gregory Bloomquist, “Methodological Criteria for Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Suggestion for the Expanded Use of Sociorhetorical Analysis,” in *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse* (St. Louis: Chalice, 1999): 185.

closing texture and pattern studies the delimitation of a discourse for analysis. Finally, argumentative texture and pattern explores the internal logic in the discourse: some of this argumentation is logical, while other may be qualitative.¹⁰¹

2. Intertexture

Another aspect of the internal dynamics of a text is its intertexture,¹⁰² namely, its relation to other texts and textures. This second step in socio-rhetorical analysis furthers our exploration of internal dynamics of a text by exploring possible relationship of the target texture to other textures. This is an investigation of the intersection of language and action in the Eastern Mediterranean literary forms present in the text. This step involves an extensive investigation not only of biblical and post-biblical Jewish literature, but also of other literary cultures evidenced in the target texture, e.g. Graeco-Roman literary culture and objects.

3. Social-cultural Texture

Both innertextural and intertextural analyses do not exhaust the inner dynamics of a text. In fact, internal dynamics of a text also are expressed in its social and cultural texture. The third step in a socio-rhetorical analysis, then, advances our exploration of the text's internal dynamics. This third step leads us to investigate the social-cultural implications of the language in a textual unit in order to determine the social-cultural function of the

¹⁰¹ Aesthetic texture and pattern, which Robbins includes as aspect of innertexture is more culturally conditioned, and should as such not be treated outside socio-cultural analysis. See Bloomquist, "Methodological Criteria for Apocalyptic Rhetoric," 186, no 21.

¹⁰² See Robbins, *Exploring*, 40-68 and *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (London/New York: Routledge, 1996): 96-143.

rhetoric in the text. Social-cultural intertextual investigation thus leads to an exploration of the social-cultural location of the language of the textual unit and the kind of culture it seeks to create for its reader. The social-cultural texture of a text “emerges in specific social topics,” “common social-cultural topics,” and “final cultural categories.”¹⁰³ Specific social topics in a text such as ours with a religious texture exhibit religious responses to the world in its discourse. Each kind of social response appears as a type of social rhetoric.

4. Sacred Texture

The biblical text as literature or story narrates, as do so many other texts of a religious nature, some human encounter with the divine. Analysing the sacred dynamics of a text is an attempt to locate the role of the divine in the text. Readers of the biblical text are “interested in locating the ways the text speaks about God or gods or talks about the realms of religious life.”¹⁰⁴ The sacred texture of a text includes aspects concerning deity, holy persons, and spirit beings in religious experience and reflection.¹⁰⁵ The sacred dynamics of a text are embedded deeply in the other textures of any sacred text. Consequently, “a major way to gain a fuller understanding of the meanings and meaning effects of sacred texture is through analysis and interpretation of other textures in the context of an understanding of its sacred texture.”¹⁰⁶ Therefore, a detailed study of the innertexture, intertexture, social-

¹⁰³ Robbins, *Exploring*, 71-75.

¹⁰⁴ Robbins, *Exploring*, 120.

¹⁰⁵ Robbins, *Exploring*, 120-31.

¹⁰⁶ Robbins, *Exploring*, 130.

cultural texture, with a further focus on the elements of sacred texture, should lead to an interpretation that is sensitive to more than the classical categories of theology. This should assist interpreters to open the text to a better understanding of the sacred texture of the particular text in question, but also of the present and the future of that text, something that is particularly pertinent to the next stage of socio-rhetorical analysis, ideological texture.

5. Ideological Texture

This analytical step presupposes that every story has an ideology or as Robbins puts it: "Every theology has a Politics."¹⁰⁷ In the case of biblical texts or sacred texture in other texts, this suggests that every sacred texture evidences the intersection of sacred texture and politics.

According to Robbins, ideological analysis focuses attention on the self-interest embedded in the text and in subsequent interpretations of it,¹⁰⁸ especially the biases, preferences, stereotypes and viewpoints in the text and in subsequent interpreters. The ideological texture of one's expectations, values and dispositions are a function of (1) one's social and cultural location; (2) one's relationship to groups, e.g. cliques, gangs, factions, corporate groups and religious traditions (e.g. Catholic tradition, Protestant tradition); and (3) modes of intellectual discourse (methods of analysis and interpretation, e.g. diachronic and synchronic).¹⁰⁹ Robbins underlines three ways of analysing the ideological texture of a

¹⁰⁷ Robbins, "The Magnificat," 194.

¹⁰⁸ Robbins has provided a much more detailed explanation of the characteristics and application of this approach in *Exploring and Tapestry*.

¹⁰⁹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 96-110.

text, namely, (a) analysis of the “social and cultural location of the implied author of the text”; (b) analysis of the “identity of power in the discourse”; and (c) analysis of the “ideology of the mode of intellectual discourse both in the text and in the interpretation of the text.”¹¹⁰

In my view, ideological texture should focus only on the self-interest embedded in the text, that is, the ideology of the implied author. In other words, analysis of ideological texture should focus on analysis of the “identity of power in the discourse.” In this way, analysis of ideological texture will show that the social and cultural rhetoric of the text, as well as its sacred texture, are a function of the ideology of the implied author.¹¹¹ In other words, analysis of ideological texture only needs to bring out the presupposition of the rhetoric of the text, which includes how the text mediates the sacred to the implied audience.

III. Research Hypothesis

It is our thesis that Luke has constructed his LS to change the attitude of his community in favour of his own view of the Jesus-movement group as an inclusive

¹¹⁰ Robbins, *Exploring*, 110-15.

¹¹¹ The social and cultural location of the implied author of the text is part of the concerns of social and cultural intertexture. I consider the mode of intellectual discourse not part of the ideological texture of the text. Every interpreter brings his/her ideology into analysis and interpretation of texts, and it is this ideology that determines the method one uses; nevertheless, the interpreter's ideology is not part of the ideology in the text being interpreted.

community,¹¹² where leadership is for the service of others, and to anchor this approach in the time of the earthly Jesus. Luke's Last Supper Narrative Discourse is a rhetorical elaboration, and it is Luke's strategy to try to persuade his community of the true meaning of service. Treating Luke's LS as a rhetorical elaboration permits us to see it as a discursive unit, that is, a particular kind of discursive unit that is rhetorically defined.¹¹³

¹¹² Here we follow Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey to distinguish Jesus movement and Jesus-movement group. Jesus movement refers to "that *set of opinions and beliefs*" which the earthly Jesus developed and diffused in order to bring about a social change in the first-century Israel (emphasis in the original). On the other hand, Jesus-movement group "includes those who espoused the opinions and beliefs" that Jesus articulated. Luke's group was one of such Jesus-movement groups that metamorphosed in the fourth century into what we now call Christianity. See Malina and Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988): xvii-xviii.

¹¹³ Our use of the term Narrative Discourse corresponds to Robert W. Funk's use of it, which also agrees with Seymour Chatman's understanding of Narrative, that is a "story-as-discoursed." Thus rhetorical elaboration is an aspect of "the how" portion of the narrative. On the other hand I use "discourse unit" in the manner of the method of Discourse Analysis. According to this understanding a narrative text may contain different discourse units (speech), while the whole story can be understood as a discourse. In this way, Luke 22: 1-6, Luke 22:7-13 or Luke 22: 7-38 can each be treated as a discourse unit; the whole of Luke-Acts can also be treated as a discourse. In this way we seek to underscore both the context and cohesiveness of Luke 22:7-38. For these characteristics of discourse analysis, see Jeffrey T. Reed, "Discourse Analysis," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (New York: Brill, 1997): 189-217 and "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 28-46; Eugene A. Nida, "The Role of Context in the Understanding of Discourse," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 20-27; and Robert E. Longacre, "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis Illustrated by Application to Mark's Gospel," in *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 140-68.

In light of socio-rhetorical criticism,¹¹⁴ Luke's LS account emerges as rhetorical discourse both by its many Hellenistic rhetorical features and in terms of their underlying premise.¹¹⁵ Luke 22:7-38 (WT) clearly functions as a rhetorical discourse meant to alter the social expectations of Luke's community and produce corresponding changes in its conduct.

The present work proceeds in seven chapters. After the present chapter, chapter two provides an initial insight (intrinsic analysis) into the innertexture of the Lukan LS with a view to determining its argumentation. This involves analysis of wordings and argumentative patterns and devices. We identify narrative textures and patterns including

¹¹⁴ We need to emphasise right away that Socio-rhetorical analysis is not a sociological and rhetorical analysis of texts, neither is it a literary and historical analysis. But rather it is "an interpretative analytics" that integrates insights from other methods of analysis. The "socio-" invites the interpreter to explore the world behind the text in order to open the text to the world before it, both the present and the future, while the "rhetorical" side draws attention of the interpreter to the text as a rhetorical discourse, that is, a story that seeks to persuade its audience for the purpose of creating culture. See Robbins, *Teacher*, xxiii; *Tapestry*, 11-12; and Response to "Vernon Robbins's Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: A Review." *JSNT* 70 (1998): 101. The primary goal of socio-rhetorical analysis is to uncover the kind of culture the text seeks to create. Thus analysis of the social rhetoric and cultural rhetoric is the heart and mind of this approach. In this thesis, chapter five then assumes a central position. In this way, the analyses of inner texture and intertexture are preparatory to analysis of social-cultural texture. While innertextural analysis reveals the inner nature of the text, intertextural analysis shows the textual traditions and social and cultural realities with which Luke is in dialogue. In particular, the cultural nature of the text begins to emerge in the analysis of social and cultural intertexture.

¹¹⁵ According to George Kennedy, New Testament books are rhetorical since their authors had a message to convey and sought to persuade their audience to believe it. See Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 3. Meir Sternberg agrees with this when he says: "the biblical storyteller is a persuader in that he wields discourse to shape response and manipulate attitude. Unlike most speakers, however, his persuasion is not only geared to an ideology but also designed to vindicate and inculcate it." See Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985): 482.

characters and thus combine literary and rhetorical techniques.¹¹⁶ Here we also advance socio-rhetorical criticism by determining the rhetorical nature of the Lukan LS as rhetorical elaboration.¹¹⁷ This analysis also enables us to delimit the textual unit for our investigation.¹¹⁸

In chapters three and four we analyse the intertexture of the Lukan LS in order to determine the other texts and textures interwoven into it. This involves analysis of references/allusions, recitations, echoes, reconfiguration and recontextualisations of data external to the chosen text. While in chapter three we identify and analyse the oral-scribal intertexture, chapter four concerns social and cultural intertextures of the chosen text. This intertextual analysis enables us to ascertain the nature and result of processes of configuration and reconfiguration, contextualisation and recontextualisation of phenomena in the world outside the Lukan LS.

Chapter five analyses the social-cultural texture of Luke's story of the LS by identifying the social-cultural topics as well as cultural categories in the chosen text. Here we shall explore the social-cultural location of the language of our textual unit, and the kind of culture it seeks to create for its reader. The overall objective of this chapter is to explore the social rhetoric as well as the cultural rhetoric of Luke's LS discourse.

¹¹⁶ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 3.

¹¹⁷ Robbins accepts Kennedy's critical view that he virtually failed to make use of "concepts and terminology of classical rhetoric as set out by Aristotle, Cicero or Quintilian" in his *Jesus the Teacher*. See Kennedy's review of *Jesus the Teacher: a Socio-Rhetorical*, in *Rhetorica* 4 (1, 1986): 67-72 and Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, xxx.

¹¹⁸ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 50-53.

Chapter six examines the sacred texture, namely, the role of the deity, spirit beings, and holy persons, in the Lukan LS text. This analysis shows how socio-rhetorical analysis is a major way for gaining a fuller understanding of the sacred aspects of Luke's text, which are embedded deeply in its other textures.¹¹⁹

Chapter seven forms our conclusion. Here we combine exploration of the ideology of our chosen text with a résumé of the course of our investigation. Our exploration of ideological texture identifies the ideology of the implied author and shows just how this ideology shapes the narrative of the Lukan LS.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 130.

¹²⁰ For the impact of the ideology narratives, see Sternberg, "Ideology of Narration and Narration of Ideology," 84-128.

IV. Luke 22: 1-38 and Translation¹²¹

	Greek	My translation ¹²²
1	Ἦγγιζεν δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα.	Now the feast of Unleavened bread which is called Passover was approaching.
2	καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν, ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν.	And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking just how they might destroy him. for they feared the people.
3	Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην, ὅντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα.	Then Satan entered into Judas called Iscariot, being a member of the twelve;
4	καὶ ἀπελθὼν συνελάλησεν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ στρατηγοῖς τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῶ αὐτόν.	And he went and conferred with the chief priests and temple officers just how he might hand him over to them.
5	καὶ ἐχάρησαν καὶ συνέθεντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι.	And they rejoiced and agreed to pay him money.
6	καὶ ἐξωμολόγησεν, καὶ ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν ἄτερ ὄχλου αὐτοῖς.	And he consented, and kept looking for an opportune time to hand him over to them apart from the crowd.
7	Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, [ἐν] ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.	Then came the day of the Unleavened bread on which the Passover lamb must be slaughtered;

¹²¹ I have italicised the disputed text, vv. 19b-20.

¹²² Except where otherwise stated all other biblical texts are from the Revised Standard Version (RSV). Thus where we compare Luke's text with another biblical text, both texts are from the RSV.

8	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην εἰπών, Πορευθέντες ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν.	And he sent Peter and John saying: "Go and prepare the Passover meal for us that we may eat it."
9	οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν;	And they said to him: "where do you want us to prepare it?"
10	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἴδου εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσῃ ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπορεύεται,	And he said to them: "Behold as you enter into the city a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him into the house which he enters;
11	καὶ ῥεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας, Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος, Ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω;	And tell the master of the house: "the teacher says to you: Where is the guest room where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples?"
12	κακεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε.	And that man will show you a large upper room that has been furnished; there prepare it.
13	ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.	So they departed and found it just as he had told them, and they prepared the Passover meal.
14	Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ.	And when the hour came, he sat at table, and his apostles with him.
15	καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν·	And he said to them, "How passionately have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer!"
16	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.	for I tell you, that I shall no longer eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

17	καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήρας εἶπεν, Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς·	And receiving a cup, giving thanks, he said, "Take this and divide it among yourselves:
18	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.	for I say to you I shall not drink from now from the produce of the wine until the kingdom of God comes."
19	καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήρας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.	Taking bread and giving thanks, he broke it and gave it to them saying, "This is my body, <i>which is being given for you; Do this in remembrance of me.</i> "
20	καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.	<i>And likewise the cup after dinner, saying, This cup, which is being shed for you, is the new covenant in my blood.</i>
21	πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης·	Nevertheless, behold the hand of the one handing me over is with me on the table:
22	ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται.	for indeed the son of man goes as it has been determined, nevertheless cursed be that man by whom he is handed over."
23	καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν.	And they began to argue among themselves who among them it might be who was going to do this.
24	Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων.	And there was a dispute among them concerning who among them would be the greatest.
25	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν ἐυεργέται καλοῦνται.	But he said to them, "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and those with power over them called themselves 'Benefactors.'

26	ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.	But you are not to (do) so. rather let the greater become like the younger and the leader like the one serving.
27	τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.	For who is the greater. the one sitting at table or the one serving? Is it not indeed the one sitting at table? But here I am in your midst as the one serving.
28	ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμεινηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου·	But you are the ones who have stood by me in my trials:
29	κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν,	And I assign you a kingdom, just my father assigned me.
30	ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.	in order that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.
31	Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον·	Simon. Simon, behold Satan demanded to sift you all like wheat:
32	ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπη ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σὺ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.	but I prayed for you, Peter, that your faith does not fail. And when you turn back, strengthen your brothers."
33	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Κύριε, μετὰ σοῦ ἔτοιμός εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι.	But he said to him, "Lord I am ready to go with you to both prison and death."

34	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρεῖς με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι.	But he said. "I say to you. Peter. a cock will not crow today until you deny three times that you know me."
35	Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλλαντίου καὶ πήρας καὶ ὑποδημάτων, μή τινος ὑστερήσατε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Οὐθενός.	And he said to them. "When I sent you out without a purse. traveler's bag. and sandals, you didn't lack any thing. did you?" And they said. "Nothing."
36	εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀλλὰ νῦν ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον ἀράτω, ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν.	And he said to them. "But now anyone who has a purse should take it and likewise a traveler's bag. and anyone who does not have them must sell his coat to buy a sword;
37	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.	for I say to you that what has been written must be fulfilled in me: 'He was reckoned with the lawless;' for in fact everything concerning me is at its end."
38	οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Κύριε, ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἰκανόν ἐστιν.	And they said, "Lord, behold here are two swords." But he said to them, "That is enough."

Chapter Two

INNERTEXTURE

I. Introduction

Socio-rhetorical study of the innertexture of Luke's LS calls for exploring its wording, argumentation, and other rhetorical devices such as characterisation and narrative flow of this passage as it stands. This requires analysing five kinds of textures and patterns common to rhetorical discourse, namely, repetitive texture, progressive texture, narrational texture, opening-middle-closing texture, and argumentative texture. In the process Luke's LS text emerges as a rhetorical elaboration.

II. Determining the Rhetorical Unit

From a rhetorical perspective our first step in this chapter is to define the rhetorical unit of our chosen text. According to George Kennedy, a rhetorical unit is any textual unit that expresses a complete argument; it can be an entire book such as the gospel of Luke, or a portion of it, like our chosen text. A rhetorical unit must have a discernible beginning and an ending; an *inclusio* is often a very clear indication of a rhetorical unit.¹

There has been no rhetorical delimitation of Luke's LS because there has been no rhetorical analysis of it. Most scholars who have studied it using other methods of analysis

¹ See Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 33-34.

and interpretation regard 22:14-38 as a textual unit.² Our analysis of opening-middle-closing texture demonstrates below (59) that 22:7-38 is a full rhetorical unit because it contains a complete argument. In fact, the introductory unit, vv. 7-13, forms an *inclusio* with the concluding unit, vv. 35-38. Our analysis of Luke's LS narrative discourse is, however, within the context of Luke 22:1-38; 22:1-6 introduces the passion narrative (Luke 22-23), while 22: 7-13 serves as an introduction to the LS proper.

The only issue for commentators is whether or not v. 14 should be part of the textual unit (vv. 14-38). For instance, Fitzmyer thinks it is only a transition verse.³ While P. H. Sellew thinks 22:14-38 contains two textual units, namely, vv 14-20 and vv 21-38, that is, a meal and a farewell discourse,⁴ Johnson thinks the two textual units are vv. 14-23 (the meal) and vv. 24-38 (the discourse).⁵ These scholars regard vv. 7-13 as preparation for the LS. Creed on the other hand treats vv. 7-38 as the LS. From a rhetorical perspective, v. 14 is not just a transition verse for it provides a setting and introduces the narrative agents (Jesus and the apostles). The expression "when the hour came," however, requires something before it in order for the reader to know what Luke means by "the hour." Luke's

² See for instance, I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter/Grand Rapids, MI: Paternoster/Eerdmans, 1978): 792-827; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1376-435; Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38," 251-68; Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 6-48; Luke T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1991): 337-50.

³ See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1376. Other positions are vv 15-20 (e.g. Bate and Benoît); vv 1-46 (SBL Two-Gospel Hypothesis Group); vv 1-38 (e.g. Kraus).

⁴ See Sellew, "The Last Supper Discourse in Luke 22:21-38." *Forum* 3 (1987): 70-95.

⁵ See Johnson, *Luke*, 336-349.

usage of “the hour” in the rest of his gospel, however, does not warrant ascribing any special character to its usage here.⁶ In our judgment v. 14 is transitional and requires vv. 7-13 to make sense.

III. The Text

As we have mentioned in our introductory chapter above, the original text of the Lukan LS remains in contention. This requires us to specify with which text we shall work.

The majority preference for the Long reading (the Alexandrian text) is based on the overwhelming manuscript evidence supporting it as argued essentially by Joachim Jeremias: “the decisive argument in favour of the Alexandrian text is its overwhelming attestation.”⁷ By relying solely on external evidence, Jeremias appears to pay little attention to Westcott and Hort’s caution that numerical strength must be judged with the factor of genealogy: “no available presumptions whatever as to text can be obtained from number alone, that is, from number not as yet interpreted by descent.” Westcott and Hort go on to say:

⁶ Outside the LS discourse Luke uses the “the hour” ten times (1:10; 2:38; 7:21; 10:21; 12:12,40; 13:31; 22: 53; 24:33) and “hour” four times (12:39,46; 22:59 & 23:44).

⁷ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 159. Majority acceptance of the Alexandrian text is partly consequent on P⁷⁵, the earliest (175/225) Lukan MS to contain the verses in question. See Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997): 274. The oldest is not necessarily the best guide to the original (so Brown, 97, 48). In our view, P⁷⁵ at best only confirms the existence of Alexandrian manuscripts containing the disputed text as of late second century or supports Westcott and Hort’s thesis that by the second century there had emerged at least three textual traditions, the Western, the Alexandrian, and a third: it does not prove the originality of the Alexandrian text. See Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek Languages* (New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1882; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988): 116; Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 224-26.

Apart from genealogy, the one MS becomes easily overborne by the nine; and it would be trusted against their united testimony only when upheld by strong internal evidence, and then manifestly at risk. But if it is found that the nine had a common original, they sink jointly to a numerical authority not greater than of the one.⁸

Although Jeremias notes that the Western text is probably original on stylistic and linguistic grounds, he opts for the Alexandrian text because he considers the LS “a liturgical text”:

On the basis of this evidence [stylistic and linguistic] there is high probability that Luke 22:19b-20 do not stem from Luke. Verses which do not stem from Luke—the conclusion appears unavoidable—cannot be part of the original text of Luke! This conclusion breaks down, however, as soon as it is realized that we are dealing in Luke 22:19-20 with a **liturgical text** (emphasis his).⁹

In the same fashion, Jeremias explained the existence of the Western text as arising from the need to protect this liturgical text from profanation: “The shortening took place in order to protect the Eucharist from profanation.”¹⁰ This represents a clear case of anachronism: a retrojection of later views (in this case liturgical practices) on the earlier context.

⁸ Westcott, *Introduction*, 43 & 44, see especially 39-66.

⁹ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 155. It should be noted that it is the strength of internal evidence (stylistic, linguistic, and transcriptional probability) which constrained Westcott and Hort to go out of their way to accept the Short Text as the more probably original. Because for them with “certain peculiar omissions excepted, the Western text is probably always corrupt as compared with the Non-Western text.” Westcott, *Introduction*, 194, cf. 121. For their full argument in favour of the Short reading, see their sections on “Exceptional Western Non-interpolation,” 175-177 and “Notes on Select Readings,” 63-64.

¹⁰ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 158. For Jeremias’ detailed discussion of this matter, see 138-159.

Paul F. Bradshaw notes this tendency in his quest for the origins of Christian liturgies.¹¹ The *Didache*, a late first-century or early second-century¹² document, does not seem to be aware of this special liturgical character of the eucharist. The *Didache* betrays no knowledge of the so-called “words of consecration” that later eucharistic practices have ascribed to the imagined *ipsissima verba Iesu* at the last supper:

1. Concerning the Eucharist, give thanks thus: 2. First, concerning the cup: “We thank you, our father, for the holy vine, David, your child, which you have made known to us through Jesus your child; to you be glory forever.” 3. Concerning the broken bread: “We thank you, our father, for the life and knowledge which you gave us through Jesus your child; to you be glory forever. 4. As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains and then brought together and made one, so let your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom, for yours is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever”¹³ [translation mine].

Full analysis and interpretation of this text is beyond the scope of this project,¹⁴ but it is safe to say that it does not identify the eucharist with Jesus; it only gives the words of thanksgiving (unfortunately we are never given the words of Jesus’ thanksgivings). Additionally, one must reckon with the probability that the command to repeat, both in

¹¹ See Paul F. Bradshaw, “The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship,” in *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992): 35-36.

¹² For this dating see, Kirsopp Lake, trans., *The Apostolic Fathers I* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912, 1985 reprint): 306-07; Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 386-87; *The New Testament and Other Early Christian Writings: A Reader* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998): 313; and Brown, *New Testament*, 837.

¹³ *The Didache* IX, 1-4.

¹⁴ For a recent, more extensive analysis of *The Didache* vis-à-vis Luke’s shorter text, see Justin Taylor, “La fraction du pain en Luc-Actes,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999): 281-95.

Luke and in Paul (but absent in Mark and Matthew), amounts to no more than a repetition of an act, namely, the breaking of bread, and not the words, as indeed appears to be the case in the Emmaus meal: "When he was at table with them, he took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them" (24:30).¹⁵ We therefore conclude that Jeremias' appeal to a special liturgical character of the eucharist is questionable.

Although Henry Chadwick¹⁶ takes exception to Jeremias' preference for the Alexandrian text, he concedes that Jeremias gave "the most lucid and fair statement of the facts available."¹⁷ He notes, however, that in spite of Jeremias' powerful argument for the Alexandrian text, Heinz Schürmann has also argued for the same text on different grounds, a contrast "so striking as to raise the question whether the arguments of these rival defenders of the Alexandrian text do not cancel one another out."¹⁸

More damaging to the originality of the Alexandrian text is the internal evidence supporting the originality of the Western text; a decision cannot be made solely on

¹⁵ Jeremias shares this interpretation of the command to repeat as referring to "the rite of breaking the bread, i.e. the right of grace at meal." *Eucharistic Words*, 250. Apropos, the Ibos of Nigeria have a similar rite, though, it involves not bread, but kola nuts: The first thing an Ibo person gives to an important visitor is kola to break; the visitor says a short prayer over the kola (it could be more than one kola nut, depending on how many people are present), breaks it, and hands it to the host for the purposes of distributing to all. It is only then any other food or drink may be offered. For the Ibos, "he who brings kola brings life."

¹⁶ Chadwick, "The Shorter Text," 249-258. Among the few who favoured the shorter text are F. C. Burkitt, John Martin Creed, Bart Ehrman, Arthur Vööbus, and Etienne Nodet. Justin Taylor is undecided.

¹⁷ Chadwick, "The Shorter Text," 249, no. 2.

¹⁸ Chadwick, "The Shorter Text," 250.

manuscript evidence.¹⁹ Besides Westcott and Hort's arguments from stylistic, linguistic, and transcriptional probability, we may add arguments from Luke's views (theology). The theology expressed in the disputed text (22:19b-20)—Jesus' death as a ransom—is foreign to Luke.²⁰ There are reasons to believe that Luke deliberately avoids giving this impression elsewhere in his writings. This can be seen from (a) his use of Isa 53 in Acts 8 and (b) redaction of Mark 10:45, 15:38,39 in Luke 22:37, 23:45, 47 respectively.²¹

Scholars often point to Acts 20:28 (the church of God which he has purchased with the blood of his son) as evidence that Luke does not totally reject the notion of Jesus' death as a ransom (redemption) for others.²² Luke 22:19b-20 is redemptive but not sacrificial, while Acts 20:28 is sacrificial but not redemptive. In other words, in Acts 20:28 God purportedly sacrificed (ritual sacrifice, not metaphorical sacrifice) his son to purchase the church.²³ I do not imply that ritual sacrifice and redemption are mutually exclusive, for religious sacrifice (sacrifice to a deity) has different purposes. For example, it can be

¹⁹ See Eldon Jay Epp, "Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (New York: Brill, 1997): 47.

²⁰ See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 199-203; "The Cup, the Bread," 576-91.

²¹ Acts 20:28 cannot be construed to mean that Luke, at least, understands Jesus' death as expiation. Hans Conzelmann agrees with this reading. See Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 201.

²² For instance, F. F. Bruce thinks it points to redemptive value of Jesus' death. See, Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990): 434.

²³ For an exploration of the difference between religious sacrifice and metaphorical sacrifice, see Bruce J. Malina, "Mediterranean Sacrifice: Dimensions of Domestic and Political Religion," *BTB* 26 no. 1 (1996): 26-44.

redemptive, or substitutionary, thanksgiving, communion, votive, preventive or for the purpose of owning something.²⁴ In Acts 20:28 God acquired a church with the blood of his son. Luke informs the reader that God owns the church for which God paid dearly, assuming his son was dear to him. God purchased the church with the blood of his son for God's benefit; it is not for the sake of the church, nor because the church needs to be redeemed. Acts 20:28 does not imply that Jesus died for anyone. We are left then with no Lukan text that expresses redemptive value of the death of Jesus outside the disputed text (Luke 22:19b-20). The redemptive notion expressed in Luke 22:19b-20, then, remains foreign to Luke, and as such may not have been part of the original text of Luke. One could, therefore, conclude that it is easier to explain the existence of the Alexandrian text as a result of interpolation by those concerned to introduce salvific effect to Luke's soteriology than to explain the existence of the Alexandrian text as a result of fear of profanation.²⁵

Yet, the very recent argument of Ulrich Schmid against Ehrman in favour of Alexandrian text,²⁶ in addition to Marie-Émile Boismard's earlier argument for the Alexandrian text,²⁷ indicates that the issue is not about to be resolved. It also shows that

²⁴ See J. Omosade Awolalu, *Yoruba Beliefs and Sacrificial Rites* (Burnt Mills, Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman, 1979): 138-160. See also Roland de Vaux's exploration of sacrifice in Israel in his *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, ed. David Noel Freedman, trans. John McHugh (Grand Raids: Eerdmans, 1997; original French edition, 1958): 415-456.

²⁵ For a detailed argument in favour of the Western text, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 197-211, 223-227.

²⁶ See Ulrich Schmid, "Eklektische Textkonstitution als Theologische Rekonstruktion zur Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesus bei Lukas (LK 22,15-20 und APG 20,28)," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999): 576-584.

²⁷ See Boismard, *En quête du proto-Luc*, 76-78.

arguments could be marshalled for both texts. In point of fact, Etienne Nodet very recently argued for the Western text.²⁸ Consequently, we are opting for the Western text, not so much because a more compelling argument has been offered for its originality, but rather as a hypothesis, that is, to see how it reads, for whether or not it is original, the fact remains that some have used it as if it were so. Thus this thesis would offer a first critical analysis of the Western Text (WT) of Luke's LS.

A Repetitive Texture and Pattern in Luke 22:1-38 (WT)

Repetitive texture and pattern reside in the occurrence of words and phrases in the text. Any word or phrase that occurs more than once in a text creates repetition. A clustering of repetitive data creates rhetorical topics.²⁹ By rhetorical topics, we mean "the places" where the rhetor looks for something to say about the subject.³⁰ This is what Aristotle calls *topoi* or *loci*. Aristotle distinguishes among three types of topics, namely, "common topics," "specific topics," and "strategic topics" (enthymemes).³¹ We attend to

²⁸ See Nodet, *The Origins of Christianity*, 14-22, no 43, 89, no. 85. And we may mention again Chadwick, Burkitt, Creed, and Arthur Vööbus among those who favour the shorter text.

²⁹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 8.

³⁰ See Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 20.

³¹ See Aristotle, *Rhet.* I.II.21-22; II.XIX-XXIV (*Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926]): 30-33; 264-335. See also Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 20-22.

three kinds of repetition: (1) repetition of narrative agents; (2) repetition of rhetorical topics; and (3) repetition of personal pronouns.

1. Repetition of Narrative Agents.

Table 1³² displays the narrative agents in our text, namely, the high priests, the scribes, the captains, Satan, Judas Iscariot, the people, the crowd, Peter, John, a man carrying a pitcher of water, the master of the house, the teacher/son of man/lord, the apostles/disciples, God/the father, the king of the Gentiles, and the twelve tribes. Of these agents, the scribes, the captains,³³ John, the man carrying a pitcher of water, the master of the house, the king of the Gentiles, and the twelve tribes, appear once each. Rhetorically, these do not require special attention since they are not repeated.

As the narrative progresses some agents assume new identities or new associations. The chief priests, who first pair with the scribes, later pair with the captains; there is, then, a coalition of three groups of people, namely, the chief priests, the scribes and the captains (henceforth, the authorities). The people become the crowd. Judas Iscariot becomes “the

³² All Tables are at the end of the chapter.

³³ Scholars are not certain to whom the term στρατηγός refers, a term Luke also uses in Acts 5:26. In Luke 22:52, Acts 4:1, and 5:24 he uses στρατηγός τοῦ ἱεροῦ, captain of the temple. The captain of the temple was historically a chief priest, second in rank only to the high priest. The captain of the temple was responsible for supervising temple sacrifices and commander of the temple guards, who were assisted by seven high officers also called captains of the temple. Does Luke mean the high officers or the temple guards, or officers of the temple? See Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991): 21 n. 110; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1375, 1451; Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation Into Economic and Social Conditions During the New Testament Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969): 165-66, 179-80; Bo Ivar Reicke, *The New Testament Era: The World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to A.D. 100*, trans from German by David E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968): 838; and Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 838.

one handing me over” and “that man.” The Satan remains Satan. The twelve become disciples, apostles, and those who are sent. Peter becomes Simon and back to Peter. The teacher becomes the son of man, and then the lord. God becomes “my father.” This indicates that only the Satan does not change. From the point of view of narratology the character of the Satan may be described as static while other characters that are mentioned more than once are dynamic.³⁴

Table I also indicates a cluster of two groups of people doing different things. On the one hand we have the authorities, Satan and Judas (Satan’s group); on the other hand we have Peter, John, the man carrying a pitcher of water, the master of the house and the teacher (teacher’s group) from vv 1-13. With an eye on the full text of the LS it can be seen that both groups are united by one purpose, namely, preparation. While there is preparation within Satan’s group to destroy Jesus, the teacher’s group is preparing to eat the Passover meal. Although the people are on the cluster of Satan’s group, they don’t belong to the group because they are against the destruction of Jesus (yet see 22: 47). The primary preoccupation of the Satan’s group is how to avoid the people, that is, just how to destroy Jesus away from the people. Thus the narrative agents in this introductory section of our text are in two opposing groups, with the people on their own. While the Satan’s group is shown to be actively planning against the teacher’s group, the latter has no counter plan.

Table I further reveals that from vv. 14-38 (WT) the cluster featuring the authorities, Judas, Satan, and the people has dwindled to only Judas (“the one handing me

³⁴ For possible character traits according to narrative critics, see Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism*, 54-55.

over” and “that man”) and Satan: the chief priests, the scribes, the captains and the people/crowd no longer feature. In the teacher’s group only Peter, the disciples and the teacher appear; John, the man carrying a pitcher of water and the master of the house disappear. The father becomes a member of the teacher’s group. Judas becomes “that man.” while the teacher becomes “the son of man.”

2. Repetition of Main Topics

Table 2 displays progressive and repetitive texture of major rhetorical topics. An attentive reading reveals expressions in which the following words are repeated: “Passover” six times; “hand over”/ “hand over to them” and “prepare”/ “prepare it,” “table” (at the table, at my table), “kingdom” (kingdom of God, a kingdom, my kingdom) occur four times each;³⁵ the words “eat” (to eat, not eat) and “fulfil,” “great” (the greatest, the leader), “serve” (serve or youngest) occur three times each; “unleavened bread,” “how,” “drink” (to drink or not to drink), “thanks” (after giving thanks, had given thanks), “purse,” “bag,” and “sword” appear twice each.

As table 2 further reveals, the introductory part (vv 1-13) of our text repeatedly features four main topics, namely, the approaching feast of Passover/unleavened bread, preparation to eat the Passover meal, how to destroy Jesus, and the plan to hand Jesus over. Verses 14-22 (WT) feature the topics of meal at table, Passover, fulfil, kingdom of God, thanksgiving, and hand over. This means of the four main topics that feature in the introductory section (vv.1-13) only two, namely, Passover meal and handover, feature in

³⁵ It should be instructive to note that the last occurrence of “table,” “eat,” “drink,” and “kingdom” are brought together in the same expression (so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom- v 30a). This suggests some relationship among them.

this portion, while three more topics (fulfil, kingdom of God, and thanksgiving) are added. Verses 23-38 reveal a repetitive texture that features six topics, namely, the greatest, serve table, assignment of a kingdom, meal at table in a kingdom, fulfil, and preparation for future trouble. Only the topics relating to meal, kingdom, and fulfil continue from vv. 14-22 (WT). And only the topic relating to meal features throughout the LS narrative. The topic of preparation, which features in the introductory section, appears in the third section; in the introductory section it is preparation for the Passover meal, in the concluding section it is preparation for troubled future. The narrative thus progresses within the framework of the theme of preparation. This table reveals a progression from four to six topics.

The pattern of repetition of major topics in the text creates six rhetorical units. In the first there is a repetitive texture that features the people/crowd, high priests, scribes, captains, how, and hand over. The second exhibits repetitive texture that features Passover, eat, prepare, and man. The third unit features table, eat, drink, kingdom, fulfil (or determined/comes), thanks, hand over, and man. The fourth exhibits repetitive texture that features table, greatest (leader or greater), serves, assign, and kingdom which culminates in a statement that features table, eat, drink, and kingdom. The fifth repeatedly features fulfil, while the sixth unit features repetition of Simon/Peter, purse, bag, and sword. While repetitive texture of a textual unit does not necessarily determine boundaries between small units of the text, it does offer a glimpse of the rhetorical progression in the discourse.³⁶

³⁶ Robbins, *Exploring*, 8.

3. Repetition of Personal Pronouns

Table 1 shows a limited use of personal names of the narrative agents. This limited use of personal names of the narrative agents results in an extensive use of personal pronouns. Table 4a displays progression and repetition of personal pronouns. There is hardly any verse without at least a personal pronoun. Table 4b displays a substitution of personal nominals for the personal pronouns, for a better accounting of distribution of the pronouns among the narrative agents. The tables show pronominal reference is made to Jesus, the apostles, and Peter thirty-nine, twenty-five, and nine times respectively. These substantial repetitions of pronominal reference shows that Jesus and the apostles are subject of central interest, while Peter as an individual is a subjects of major interest in Luke 22:1-38 (WT). Peter and John, Judas, and the authorities are of minor interest in the story of the LS.

4. Summary

As a summary, the repetitive patterns we have observed above provide an initial glance into the overall rhetorical movements in Luke's LS discourse. In other words, the repetitive patterns have only introduced us to the big picture of Luke's LS text that will provide the road map as we pursue the details of the discourse, for clustering of repetitive data "provides an overarching view of the texture of the language that invites the interpreter to move yet closer to details of the text."³⁷

B Progressive Texture and Pattern

Though repetition of words or phrases regularly underlines key rhetorical topics in a discourse, it may also create progression. By progression we mean movement forward.

³⁷ Robbins, *Exploring*, 8.

Thus “repetition itself is one of progression (movement), since movement from the first occurrence of a word to another occurrence is a forward movement.”³⁸ Focusing on progression within repetitions adds more dimensions to analysis in three ways: (1) it may lead to observations about progressive texture in the whole work; (2) it may also show phenomena that function as stepping stones to other phenomena in the textual unit; and (3), it may further show a sequence of subunits throughout a span of text.³⁹

Table 3 shows the progressive texture of main topics in Luke 22:1-38 (WT). There is a progression (movement) from “hand him over” to “hand me over” to “hand the Son of man over.” This progression identifies the “him” with the “me” and with “the son of man.” There is also a progression from “prepare to eat” to “table.” Another progression is from eating and drinking at the Passover table to eating and drinking in the kingdom of Jesus. A subset of this progression is a progression from the kingdom of God to Jesus’ kingdom. This progression suggests a further exploration of (1) a possible relation between table-fellowship in Jesus’ kingdom and table-fellowship in other kingdoms in the first-century Mediterranean world; (2) a possible connection between the kingdom of God and other kingdoms in the first-century Mediterranean world; and (3) the relation of the kingdom of Jesus and the kingdom of God.⁴⁰ This involves investigation of other texts external to the Lukan LS, a subject of intertextual analysis.

³⁸ Robbins, *Exploring*, 10.

³⁹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 10.

⁴⁰ “My kingdom,” “my table” are Lukan *hapax legomena*.

Another repetitive and progressive texture in the text is seen around the conjunction “and” and the verb “to say.” These are displayed in table 5. They come from the voice of the narrator. They both help to move the discourse forward. The repetition of “and” is a sign of the very repetitive syntax of the narrative, stringing together narrative statements without subordinating one to another.⁴¹ Table 5 shows also that the text contains more direct speech than indirect speech and that Jesus is allowed to say more than the apostles⁴²; the flow of speech is more from Jesus to the apostles. This indicates emphasis is on the apostles, the subject of central interest in Luke 22:1-38 (WT).

C Opening-Middle-Closing Texture and Pattern

Determining a rhetorical unit is an attempt to determine a textual unit that contains a complete argument; this sets the outer limits of a discursive unit. On the other hand, opening-middle-closing texture and pattern is concerned with determining the beginning, middle, and closing of a rhetorical unit.⁴³ Repetitive, progressive, and narrative patterns

⁴¹ See David Lodge, *The Art of Fiction* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1993): 90.

⁴² By direct speech we mean when a character is speaking, for instance, vv. 8b-12 is direct speech by Jesus. On the other hand, indirect speech is when the narrator is speaking (commenting), for instance, vv 1-8a is indirect speech.

⁴³ For Aristotle, according to David Lodge, “a beginning is what requires nothing to precede it, an end is what requires nothing to follow it, and a middle needs something both before and after it.” Lodge, *Art of Fiction*, 216. Lodge does not provide his source, which is *Poetics* 7.1450b. 26-31 (Jonathan Barnes, ed. *The Complete Works of Aristotle* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984]): 2321-22.

create the opening-middle-closing of a unit.⁴⁴ Determining the beginning of a textual unit is not as difficult as determining the end of the beginning⁴⁵; nor is it easy to determine the beginning of the end of a unit, and scholars may not agree on the middle of a textual unit.⁴⁶

Verses 7-13 concern preparation for the Passover meal and serve as the introductory unit to the LS narrative discourse. It is a self-contained unit; it does not require anything either before or after it to make a complete sense to the reader. The beginning of the LS discourse, however, requires it. The reader does not know what “the hour” means or why Jesus reclines at table with his apostles, or who the apostles are without vv. 7-13. In other words, given that v.14 is not intelligible without vv. 7-13, vv. 7-13, must form the first scene of the LS narrative discourse. Verses 7-13 then decisively set the opening of the narrative discourse as they introduce the LS narrative discourse proper.

The last statement in v. 38, “it is enough” (ἰκανόν ἐστίν.) indicates an ending to the narrative discourse. Although there is a transition to another scene, v. 38 has the character of the ending of the eating scene; it hardly requires anything to follow it. Nothing more follows at the eating context. In point of fact, v. 39 clearly establishes the ending of the LS discourse at v. 38 as it provides another narrative setting, the most important element of which is a change of place: “And coming out he [Jesus] went, as was his custom, to the Mount of Olives; and the disciples followed him.”

⁴⁴ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 50 and *Exploring*, 19.

⁴⁵ See Lodge, *Fiction*, 3-8.

⁴⁶ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 19.

The opening scene suggests Jesus and his disciples are preparing in a festive mood. But at end of the discourse, they will leave the table in sorrow since their leader will soon suffer and die. If the opening scene signals a joyful celebration, the closing scene suggests imminent agony and sorrow. Thus the implied author uses the narrator to lead the audience through the LS discourse along a trajectory that moves from joy to sorrow. This trajectory forms the middle of the narrative unit.

D Narrational Texture and Pattern

Narrational texture and pattern concerns narrative agents and their relationships in the narration of the text. In other words, narrational texture and pattern reside in the voices and actions in the text. The voice or action can be that of the narrator, a narrative agent or a written text (like the OT). In all, it is the narrator who gives voice and action to other characters. The narrator's choice between direct speech and indirect speech is a rhetorical device, for direct speech conveys a stronger sense of the presence of the speaker than indirect speech. It is the narrator who gives narrational texture and pattern to the narrative. Sometimes a pattern emerges in the alternation of direct speech and indirect speech. A narrational pattern may occur also in the repetition of a particular speech type (e.g. a phrase like, he said, they said). Analysis of narrative pattern of a discourse allows a closer look at its subunits or scenes.

Contemporary narrative criticism distinguishes at least three facets of the narrator, namely, the real author, the implied author, and the narrator.⁴⁷ The real author stands outside the narrative text, while the implied author is the author discernible in the narrative text. The narrator is the one who tells the story. Sometimes the implied author and narrator are hard to distinguish (e.g. in Luke's Gospel).

As a narrative Luke's LS presupposes a narratee, the one to whom the narrator narrates his story.⁴⁸ A story has a teller and a hearer. This invites the preface to Luke's two-volume work (Luke 1:1-4) into the innertexture of the LS for three reasons. First, in the preface Luke addresses his two-volume narrative to one Theophilus (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1).⁴⁹ That means Luke is the narrator while Theophilus is the narratee in Luke's

⁴⁷ For this distinction, see Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983): 70-73 and Robert W. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988): 29-34.

⁴⁸ See Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* 19, 25-27 and Funk, *Poetics*, 27-38.

⁴⁹ As is well known, the identity of Theophilus remains one of the unresolved issues in Lukan studies. The majority of scholars think that Theophilus was a person of significant social consequence to whom Luke dedicated his two-volume work, may be, to ensure publication. The age-old suggestion that the name Θεόφιλος can be understood as a designation for the beloved of God remains dubious. See Brown, *New Testament*, 227, no. 5. Additionally Fitzmyer has shown that Theophilus was a proper name in use as early as the third century BC. See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 299-300. See also, Johnson, *Luke*, 28. Whatever the identity of Theophilus, Luke unambiguously names him the addressee not only of the Third Gospel but of Acts as well. See Kota Yamada, "The Preface to Lukan Writings and Rhetorical Historiography," in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 154-72. Thus, the implied reader and the narratee of the LS portion of Luke-Acts are Theophilus, just as Luke is both the implied author and the narrator of the story.

writings.⁵⁰ Secondly, in the preface to Luke-Acts Luke depicts his literary purpose, namely, to write an orderly account for Theophilus in order that Theophilus may know the truth concerning the things Theophilus has been informed. Luke's use of *καθεξῆς* may be taken as narrative order rather than chronological order vis-à-vis Luke's intention to write a narrative account (*διήγησις*).⁵¹ Luke's use of *καθεξῆς* in Acts 11:4 in relation to Peter's recounting of his experience with Cornelius (Acts 11:5-17) lends credence to this view. Thirdly, Luke the narrator underscores his own *ethos* (credibility) since he has investigated everything accurately from the beginning (1:4).

Rhetorically, Luke's reference to his *ethos* is an appeal to the *pathos* (desired response) of Theophilus in order to persuade him, as it is also what Fitzmyer calls a "rhetorical protestation about completeness."⁵² Additionally, Luke's reference to the eyewitnesses and ministers of the word "from the beginning" is an appeal to ancient authority for the purpose of persuading the implied audience.⁵³ His description of his

⁵⁰ See Funk, *Poetics*, 34-35.

⁵¹ See Yamada, "The Preface to Lukan Writings," 166-68 and Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 292, 298-99. For explanation on the different senses of "order" from the point of view of narratology, see Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* 36-38.

⁵² Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 297.

⁵³ The implied audience/reader of Luke-Acts is the person to whom the narrator addresses his story as different from the narratee. This corresponds to what John Paul Heil calls authorial audience. See Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 2-3. The implied audience/reader of Luke-Acts corresponds to Luke's elusive community. Although Luke addresses his work to Theophilus, scholars think Luke envisages a larger audience, for instance, a community. For attempts to identify Luke's community, see Luke T. Johnson, "On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay," *SBL Seminar Papers*, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979): 87-100; Philip Francis

predecessors acts as a signal to the implied audience that Luke may not agree totally with earlier narratives and anticipates Luke's reconfiguration and recontextualisation of received traditions as he narrates his story in his writings in general and in the LS in particular.⁵⁴ As it affects the LS we shall show this when we analyse the oral-scribal intertexture in chapter three.

Another appeal to the *pathos* of the implied audience shows up when Luke asserts that the earlier narratives and the one he undertakes concern "the things which have been accomplished among us, just as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke 1:1-2). These "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning" probably include the apostles as Luke indicates elsewhere. For instance, in Luke 24:48 the Lukan Jesus tells the apostles, "you are witnesses of these things"; in Acts 1:8 Jesus commissioned the apostles to be his "witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the ends of the earth." Also in Acts 2:21 Peter declares that, "only one of the men who have accompanied us during all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us must become with us a witness to his resurrection." This witnessing role of the apostles may explain Luke's preference for "the apostles" at the LS (22:14) in lieu of Mark's "the twelve" (14:17).

Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987): 24-45; and Kurz, *Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*, 12-16.

⁵⁴ Luke's desire to write a narrative in spite of his knowledge of earlier narratives suggests he does not agree totally with earlier accounts.

This rather brief analysis of Luke's preface⁵⁵ seeks to show that the narratee of Luke's LS is Theophilus, the addressee of his two-volume work. Our analysis then permits us to conclude that Luke's preface, both rhetorically and narratologically,⁵⁶ forms part of the innertexture of LS narrative,⁵⁷ and will thus enlighten our analysis of Luke 22:1-38 (WT).

Based on repetitive and progressive texture (see Table 6) we have divided Luke 22:1-38 (WT) into five scenes: Scene one (vv.1-6), scene two (vv 7-13), scene three (vv 14-22), scene four (vv 23-34), and scene five (vv 35-38). All but one of these, namely, the first (vv. 1-6), alternate direct speech with indirect speech.

1. Scene one (22: 1-6)

The first scene contains indirect speech only; it is a narrational introduction to Luke's passion narrative (Luke 22-23). It thus provides the setting for the Passion events. The narrator introduces some of the principal characters, namely, the chief priests, the scribes, the temple captains, Judas Iscariot (henceforth, Judas), Satan, and Jesus. Furthermore, the narrator informs the hearer that the authorities have determined to destroy Jesus. The only problem of the authorities is "the how" because they are afraid of the people. In this they found the support of the Satan, who "entered" Judas Iscariot, one of the

⁵⁵ For recent explorations of Luke's preface, see Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) and Yamada, "The Preface to Lukan Writings."

⁵⁶ For the close relationship between rhetoric and narratology, see Dennis L. Stamps, "Rhetorical and Narratological Criticism," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (New York: Brill, 1997): 219-39.

⁵⁷ The LS narrative is, as a matter of fact, part of the innertexture of Luke-Acts.

twelve, in order to hand over Jesus to his would-be destroyers. The narratee knows how opposition to Jesus has been growing among the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders (see 9:22; 19:47; 20:1,19,46). In fact in 20:19 “the chief priests and the scribes tried to lay hands on him at that very hour, but they feared the people.” But this time they find the Satan’s support as he readily provides the “how” by entering into Judas, one of the twelve for the purpose of handing over Jesus to them. The designation of Judas as “one of the twelve” is meant to heighten the determination to destroy Jesus; it also underlines the point that the destruction of Jesus will not occur without an insider collaboration.

There are two further reasons for the appearance of the Satan at this point, in addition to the narrative characters already introduced. One, it bears on the *ethos* of Judas as the narrator seeks to protect the character (integrity) of Judas. Two, it appeals to the *pathos* of the narratee, for the narrator seeks to put the narratee on notice that the Satan is responsible for Judas’ decision to hand Jesus over to those determined to destroy him: Judas is thus not to blame. The introduction of the Satan into the story adds a cosmic dimension to the plot to destroy Jesus, for it indicates that the conflict is not just between the authorities and Jesus, but also between the Satan and God in Jesus. We shall pursue this cosmic dimension further in our chapter on sacred texture.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ Commentators have seen a connection between this verse and 4:13 where the devil “departed from him until an opportune time.” See for example, Brown, *New Testament*, 255; Johnson, *Luke*, 75; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1989): 161; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 174; and Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 16, 28, 156-57. At the temptation scene the devil was alone in trying to destroy Jesus, but by now the devil has found formidable allies among Jesus’ opponents, namely the authorities. There can be no more opportune time to attack one’s enemy than when one has allies in the leaders who are determined to destroy him. So, the narrator draws a connection between Jesus’ enemies and Satan. This indicates that for the narrator, even though “the devil departed from him until an opportune time”, Satan continues to work through human agents. See Elaine Pagels, *The Origin of Satan* (New York: Vintage, 1995): 89-90. With “he consented, and began to look for an opportune time to hand him over apart from the crowd,” the narratee is put in suspense and invited to wait and see how events unfold. This temporary suspense is intended to hold the

In v. 6 the narrator shifts from the people to the crowd. This shift from people to crowd does not indicate a different group, just as the change from disciples to apostles does not (vv. 11, 14). Luke the narrator often shifts terms within the same scene but means the same group (cf. Luke 3:7, 10, 15, 18, 21; 6:17, 19; 7:24, 29; 8:42, 45, 47; 9:11, 12, 13, 16, 23:4, 13; 23:27, 48).⁵⁹

One of the questions the narrator raises in the mind of the audience is whether or not Jesus will know about the plot to destroy him before it materialises: will Jesus be taken unawares? In this scene the narrator does not give voice to any of the narrative agents. In other words, there is no direct speech. All the audience knows about the characters comes from the narrator. As such, the audience is invited to trust the narrator. The repetition of “hand him over to them” and “a part from the crowd” signals the end of the unit.

2. Scene two (22: 7-13)

The second unit begins by repeating “unleavened bread” with which the first unit begins. This moves the narrative forward, for, having settled “the how” (vv. 2, 4), the narrative moves to another narrative event, namely, preparation for the Passover feast. This scene alternates direct speech with indirect speech (narration), and this also moves the narrative forward. While scene one introduces the Passion narrative in general, this scene introduces the LS narrative portion of the passion narrative.

interest of the narratee as it raises questions in the mind of the narratee, and delays answers. See David Lodge, “Suspense,” in *The Art of Fiction* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1993): 13-16.

⁵⁹ See Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 143.

The main narrative event here is preparation for the Passover meal. The scene features a dialogue between Jesus and two of his disciples, Peter and John. Thus Peter and John are introduced into the narrative. The Lukan Jesus takes the initiative to tell Peter and John to go prepare for the Passover meal (cf. Mark where unnamed disciples remind Jesus of the need to prepare the Passover). Previously Luke has paired the two with James in Luke 8:52, where Jesus raises the daughter of Jairus and in Luke 9:28, the scene of the transfiguration. This pairing of Peter and John indicates the leadership role of the two disciples in Luke and foreshadows their pairing together later in Acts (3:1,3,11; 4:13,19; and 8:14).⁶⁰ Also by naming Peter and John, Luke may be implying that the two are also leaders who serve, a theme Jesus will address later in the narrative, 22:23-30.

The first part of verse 13, “and as they went they found it just as he had told them” underscores the import of this unit: rhetorically this touches on the *ethos* (character, credibility) of Jesus. In other words, the narrator indicates Jesus’ foreknowledge of events. Thus thematically the unit begins and ends with the same rhetorical topic, namely the *ethos* of Jesus, for they are meant to show Jesus as one who is in charge of the events that are about to happen; he is not taken unawares. In this way, the narrator begins to prepare the narratee for the foretelling of the betrayal in v. 21. So the thrust of this scene is to

⁶⁰ Luke, in his second list of the apostles (Acts 1:13), has John next to Peter, whereas in his first list, Luke 6:14-16, John is listed fourth. And in other synoptic lists, James is shown to come before John. So Luke’s pairing of Peter and John, and his listing in Acts 1 suggests that John begins to occupy the second place in the time of the earthly Jesus.

underscore Jesus' foreknowledge of coming events,⁶¹ within the context of preparation for the Passover meal.

This scene introduces an instance of irony. From scene one the audience already knows that the authorities have concluded to destroy Jesus. But the narrator presents Jesus here behaving as if he has no knowledge of the plot. This situational irony seeks to heighten the sympathy of the audience for Jesus, even as it keeps the audience in suspense in order to sustain its interest.

3. Scene three (22: 14-22) [WT]

Luke the narrator begins this scene by introducing a different set of characters, namely, he (Jesus) and the apostles and by changing the time frame: while scene two concludes by informing the narratee that the Passover meal has been prepared, scene three begins "when the hour came." The significance of the new character set is that the narrator introduces Jesus as the principal character while the apostles are subordinates (cf. the Markan οἱ δώδεκα (the Twelve) with οἱ ἀπόστολοι (the ones sent)). Luke may be emphasising the nature of the future mission of these who will be sent.⁶² Although the

⁶¹ See Joel B. Green, "Preparation for Passover (Luke 22:7-13: A Question of Redactional Technique)," *NovT* 29, no. 4 (1987): 314, 318.

⁶² In any case "the apostles" is a more inclusive term than Mark's "the Twelve". For instance there can be more than twelve apostles, but "the Twelve" cannot be more than twelve. Even Luke entertains a larger number than the twelve apostles (see Acts 14: 14), in spite of his attempt to limit the number of apostles to twelve (Acts 1:15-26) and the suggestion that the two terms ("the twelve" and "the apostles") are coterminous in Luke-Acts. See John P. Meier, "The Circle of the Twelve: Did It Exist During Jesus' Public Ministry?" *JBL* 116.4 (1997): 641-42. His almost none use of "the twelve" in Acts (only once, 6:2) vis-à-vis his abundant use of "the apostles" shows Luke's preference for the latter.

meal preparation has been made for Jesus to eat the Passover meal with his “disciples.”

Luke now narrows Jesus’ table-companions to the circle of “the apostles.”⁶³ Jesus reclining at table introduces one major event of the narrative, namely, a meal is about to begin.

In this scene direct speech and narrational discourse (indirect speech) alternate. The narrational portion describes Jesus’ actions. Jesus makes a speech: he tells the apostles how greatly he has desired to eat the Passover meal with them before he suffers, because he shall no longer eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. This temporal delay or suspense raises a question in the mind of the apostles as to when it will be fulfilled. Jesus indicates that the Passover meal from which he now abstains he shall eat in the kingdom of God. Jesus connects the meal they are about to eat to the kingdom of God and thus suggests that the Passover meal that he and they will eat will find fulfilment in the kingdom of God.⁶⁴

⁶³ There is nothing in “where I may eat the Passover with my disciples” to suggest that a larger group than the apostles is intended. After all, the apostles too, are disciples.

⁶⁴ Luke’s use of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke-Acts sheds light on his use of it in the LS. The phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs two times in the LS text (vv. 16, 18), while it occurs thirty six times outside the LS discourse, thirty times in the gospel (4:43; 6:20; 7:28; 8:1,10; 9:2,11,27,60,62; 10:9,11; 11:20; 13:18,20,28,29; 14:15; 16:16; 17:20,21; 18:16,17,24,25,29; 19:11; 21:31; and 23:51) and six in the Acts (1:3; 8:12; 14:22; 19:8; 28:23&31). Like Mark, Luke does not employ the form ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (the kingdom of heaven, literally, the kingdom of the heavens). Matthew’s use of it may be due to the Israelite nature of Matthew’s community, where one avoids calling God’s name. It is thus an alternative to ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Fitzmyer is thus correct to say there is no difference in the basic usage of both forms. See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 155. Luke, however, never explains what he means by ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. At least four renderings are possible: “God’s kingdom,” “God’s kingship,” “the reign of God,” or “the ruling activity of God.” All are possible translations of a possible Aramaic (a language that Jesus most probably spoke), while “God’s kingdom” is a literal translation of the Greek. See Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989): 4. “God’s kingdom” and “the ruling activities of God” are

Expectation of dining in the kingdom is indicated in Luke's writings. For example, in Luke 14: 15 when one of those at table with Jesus heard what Jesus said retorted, "Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God!" Jesus here signals that there indeed shall be "dining" in the kingdom. The lingering question in the mind of the apostles is how soon the Passover meal will find fulfilment in the kingdom of God. "Before I suffer" characterises his death as "suffering" and not as "dying." In this way the stress is not on dying but on suffering. The announcement of his imminent suffering continues the gradual process of revealing Jesus' knowledge of a plot to destroy him.

Nothing up till now suggests that the meal will not go ahead.⁶⁵ Lukan scholars continue to debate whether or not Jesus ate at the LS (cf. "And as they were eating, he said" (Matt 26:21a); "And as they were at table eating, Jesus said" (Mark 14:18a); "And during supper" (John 13:2b). With the longer reading there appears to be a supper proper ("And

more concrete, while "God's kingship" and "the reign of God" are more abstract. Luke seems to have used it in both senses. For instance, a spatial sense may be intended in Luke 7:28; 9:27; 10:11; 14:15; 17:20; 22:16, 18, while a more spiritual sense may be implied in Luke 4:43; 8:1; 9:2. See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 155-56. Nevertheless, there is no indication that Luke's usage of the term "kingdom of God" in his two-volume work differs from its usage in the OT, that is, God's ruling activities on earth through the human agency of God's anointed. The preaching of the kingdom of God is the centrepiece of the Lukan Jesus' mission. This implies that the kingdom of God provides the framework within which Jesus carries out his resistance to the dominant gentile culture; this we shall show when we discuss the cultural rhetoric of Luke's LS in chapter four.

⁶⁵ Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 793. See also Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1382.

likewise the cup after supper”) [Luke 22:20a], but with the shorter text, we must not only ask whether Jesus ate, but also whether any of his table-companions ate! ⁶⁶

Next is a narration of Jesus’ action (“he took the cup, and having given thanks he said: Take this and divide it among you...until the kingdom of God comes”). Jesus introduces another event, namely, drinking, and connects it to the kingdom of God as he had done above with the bread.

And as above with the bread, Jesus now says he will abstain from drink until the kingdom of God comes. The narrator has already informed the narratee of a future messianic banquet in Luke 13: 29 (“And they will come from east and west, and from north and south, and will sit at table in the kingdom of God”). In this way the double reference to the kingdom of God underscores the eschatological dimension of the Passover meal, suggesting a reference to a messianic banquet. Luke thus indicates a connection between the fulfilment of the Passover meal in the kingdom of God and the coming of the kingdom of God when Jesus will eat and drink.

A narration of another Jesus’ action follows: he took bread and having given thanks, he broke it and gave to the apostles. Direct speech indicates that he identifies the broken bread with himself: This is my body.⁶⁷ Unlike with the cup, he does not ask them to divide

⁶⁶ In our view, because of the imminence of his death, Jesus is now only concerned with getting his parting word to his disciples than with eating the meal, and as such, neither Jesus nor the apostles ate. Jesus wants to do what he has to do before his final moment. The meal can be deferred, as indeed, Jesus has done, but his last instructions cannot.

⁶⁷ David Daube thinks that “because the disciples are not shocked at the crudity of the idea of a piece of bread standing for a human being would seem that the disciples were likely to have been familiar with a ritual in which a piece of bread did indeed stand for a person, namely, the messiah. They would have understood Jesus to be associating himself with a messianic symbol, which was eaten as part of a Passover meal... ‘This is my body’ (in Aramaic he could have said, ‘This is me’) would have conveyed a message of self-

the broken bread among themselves. The narrator does not say whether or not the apostles divide the cup among themselves or divide the broken bread among themselves. The Lukan Jesus serves the apostles at table in preparation for his teaching on leadership as service of others.

This scene concludes with Jesus predicting that one of his table-companions will hand him over: "behold the hand of the one handing me over is with me on the table." He adds that there is nothing he can do about his impending death because it has been so determined.⁶⁸ This is a restatement of vv. 2-6 where the authorities have determined to destroy him and Judas is looking for an opportune time to hand him over to them. This signals the end of the unit and also reveals that Jesus is aware of the determination of the authorities to destroy him and Judas' complicity with them. In this way, the narrator indicates to the narratee that Jesus is in charge of events. Again, this protects Jesus' credibility. The foretelling of the one who will hand Jesus over concludes the process begun in scene two of leading the audience to know that Jesus is fully aware of the plot to destroy him. In the end, this scene is a monologue, intermixed with the narrator's voice, for only Jesus talks and acts.

4. Scene four (22: 23-34)

The first part of this scene (vv. 23-24) is all narrational, while the second portion (vv. 25-30) is completely monological, for only Jesus speaks. The narrator informs the reader of the apostles' immediate reaction to Jesus' speech. According to the narrator the

revelation." See Bleicher Deborah Carmichael, "Daube on the Eucharist and the Passover Seder," *JSNT* 42 (1991): 45-45, especially 55.

⁶⁸ "The son of man must leave" is a metaphor for death; thus Jesus predicts his death.

apostles desire to know who among them would hand him over. They also want to know who among them seems to be the greatest. By recounting (indirect speech) these two events, the narrator invites the hearer to take his word for it. But as summarised events they form both a conclusion to the meal portion of the narrative, as well as a swift transition to the next focused event, the instruction on leadership as *διακονία* of others. According to Robert W. Funk, "recounting is characteristic of introductions and conclusions, which tend to be iterative or generalized, and also of transitions, where a series of intervening events is compressed into a summary in order to come swiftly to the next focused event."⁶⁹

Their dispute about greatness indicates that the apostles understand Jesus to be predicting his imminent death. Jesus begins his speech by informing them he would suffer and concludes it by informing them it has been determined he must leave (die). So their dispute about greatness is a dispute about the one to succeed Jesus as leader of the group. This is virtually a repetition of Luke 9:44-46 where a dispute about greatness reportedly broke out among the apostles following Jesus' predicting he would be handed over to men. In this way the apostles are drawing a connection between a possible handing over of Jesus to men and a successor, which casts doubt on the narrator's assertion that the apostles do not understand what Jesus says (9:45).

The narrator does not allow the apostles to speak for themselves. Their narrated reactions are not directed to Jesus: they wonder and dispute among themselves. As with the cup the narrator characteristically does not tell the audience how Jesus comes to know about their wondering and dispute, nor do the apostles seek a rationale for Jesus' actions.

⁶⁹ Funk, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 156.

This is the manner in which the implied author wants the narrator to present these events to the audience, and it is part of the plot of the narrative discourse. So, the apostles react only to what Jesus says, namely, prediction of his impending death and that one of them would hand him over.

Thus the apostles are concerned about two things: the fact that it is one of them who will hand over their master and who Jesus' successor will be and thus what their own future holds. Their dispute about greatness suggests they do not understand Jesus' actions. This misunderstanding is in conflict with Jesus' understanding of greatness, and thus requires resolution, hence the *raison d'être* of the next narrative event, the lesson on leadership as service; the next focused event is a logical follow-up to the conflict.⁷⁰

The dispute about greatness then provides a context for Jesus to give a teaching on leadership as service, again following the pattern at 9:44–48. Jesus responds by picking up from the last narrative statement concerning the apostles (the greatest) just as they had picked up from his last narrative statement about handing over. He ignores their desire to know who would betray him.⁷¹ This contrasts with other LS accounts, where Jesus

⁷⁰ At the foot washing the Johannine Jesus explicitly states that the disciples do not know what he has done to them. His washing their feet is an example for them to follow (John 13:12–16). Not a few scholars have recognised similarities between the Lukan LS and the Johannine LS discourse, for instance, as a farewell discourse and a presentation of Jesus' action at the supper scene as a παράδειγμα for apostles/disciples to follow.

⁷¹ By narrative statement we mean a sentence with a single main verb. A narrative statement can be action statement or status statement. See Funk, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 42 #25.

reportedly points out the one who will hand him over.⁷² This is a sign that the rhetoric of Luke's LS narrative differs from the other LS narratives.⁷³

In this context Jesus again teaches, but this time he does so with a lesson on leadership as service. He uses inductive argumentation in the form of two analogies from the contrary: (1) the attitude of the kings and leaders of the Gentiles, and (2) the relationship between the one who sits at table and the one who serves at table. The ones sent out are not to be like the gentile kings and leaders; rather, the leaders must serve instead of being served because he (Jesus) has served them. In this way, the implied author draws their attention back to Jesus' action at table. Jesus associates leadership with service (*διακονία*) while he discourages leadership that lords it over the led as is the case with gentile kings (v.25). Although Jesus' remarks here are didactic, they are also a reprimand, since the remarks cast doubt on the knowledge of the apostles.

Jesus acknowledges the loyalty and faithfulness of the apostles and promises them a kingdom; they will eat and drink at his table in his kingdom, and be judges of the twelve tribes of Israel (vv.29-30).⁷⁴ The number of thrones on which the apostles will sit and

⁷² See William F. Albright, C. S. Mann, *Matthew: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1971): 321 and F. C. Fensham, "Judas' Hand in the Bowl and Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1964/65): 259-61.

⁷³ In other words how Luke tells his story of the LS differs from other versions of it. In John we know it is Judas the son of Simon Iscariot. Though Mark and Matthew do not reveal the name to the reader as John does, nonetheless they indicate that Jesus' table-companions know the one who will hand him over.

⁷⁴ For a detailed analysis of the content of 22: 29-30, see Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 205-230. See also Jacob Jervell, "The Twelve on Israel's Throne: Luke's Understanding of the Apostolate," in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975): 75-112.

judge is open-ended (cf. Matthew's twelve thrones). It is possible the open-endedness of the Lukan thrones is intended to anticipate the election of Matthias in Acts. Additionally, as we shall show presently, the narrator may be putting his audience in suspense concerning the fate of Judas, the one who would hand over Jesus. With the promise of a kingdom, the implied author intends to cushion the negative effect of Jesus' remarks on the apostles. The use of the conjunction *δέ* in v. 28 contrasts the statement here with the narrative statements in vv 25-27. In other words, Jesus is saying, although the apostles fail to understand the true meaning of leadership, still they qualify to serve on the thrones of Israel because of their loyalty. In this way the implied author presents Jesus as one who not only blames but recognises and rewards loyalty as well,⁷⁵ and as a compassionate person. Jesus assigns the apostles a kingdom in order that they may dine with him in his kingdom (vv. 29-30a). Rhetorically, verse 30b ("and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel") is both a restatement of v.29 and amplification of it for the purpose of specifying the limit of their jurisdiction. That is, although the number of thrones is not indicated, the kingship of the apostles will be over the house of Israel (the twelve tribes of Israel).

Here the narrator introduces an irony into the narrative: Jesus still recognises the loyalty of the apostles even though he knows they will all desert him when his future trial comes. Even more striking is that the Lukan Jesus does not name his betrayer (cf. Matthew and John). It is reasonable to presume that still Judas is part of the group being addressed, which would suggest that he also will share in the kingdom Jesus is assigning to the

⁷⁵ Assignment of a kingdom to the apostles in order that they may dine with Jesus in his kingdom can be construed as a reward for their loyalty. See Nelson, "Luke 22:28-30: Perseverance and Reward," in *Leadership and Discipleship*, 173-232.

apostles, that he also will eat and drink in Jesus' kingdom, and that he also will be judge over the twelve tribes. This inclusion of Judas raises in the mind of the audience the issue of the force or consequence of Jesus' remark about the one who will hand him over--woe to that man by whom he, the son of man, is betrayed. In any case, non-exclusion of Judas from the promised reward for the apostles is intended to show Jesus as an inclusive person. In this way, the narrator also presents Jesus as a forgiving person, thereby anticipating Luke 23:34 where Jesus prays for his enemies: "Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do" (cf. Stephen in Acts 7:60).

As we have noted earlier, in verses 25-30 only Jesus speaks. The concluding portion of the scene (vv. 31-34), however, features a dialogue between Jesus and Peter. Although Jesus begins by addressing the whole group, he quickly narrows it down to Peter. Jesus predicts a future attack on the apostles: their faith will fail for Satan has demanded to sift them. Peter will deny him, but Jesus quickly assures Peter that he has prayed for him so that his faith may not fail, and he directs Peter to strengthen his brothers when he has turned back. Luke sometimes uses the verb ἐπιστρέφω (turn, turn back) to mean conversion, a change in religious orientation (Luke 1:16, 17; Acts 3:19; 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18, 20; 28:27). In any case, Peter thinks he is faithful and loyal enough not to deny Jesus, but Jesus assures him he will deny him sooner than he could imagine. The focus of Jesus' prayer on Peter leaves the other apostles at the mercy of the Satan.

In scene one the audience already knows that the Satan entered Judas for the purpose of handing him over to his enemies. Jesus now reveals to his apostles that the Satan is going to cause them to deny him. So the Satan is responsible for the failures of the apostles, including Judas. The Satan is thus portrayed as a flat character, for his traits are

consistent and predictable (he tempts Judas, and now the apostles). On the other hand, Jesus and the apostles are portrayed as round characters⁷⁶: Jesus curses Judas and rebukes the apostles, but he also rewards them: the apostles can be status conscious (v. 24), and they can be arrogant (v. 33) or also loyal (v. 28). This revelation about the Satan's demand heightens Jesus' impending fate even as it suggests Luke's desire to absolve the apostles of any failure, for it portrays Jesus being deserted and alone in his hour of need and support. The foretelling of denial of the apostles, again, strengthens Jesus' *ethos*, because it shows again that Jesus is aware of coming events. But by insisting that the Satan will have his way, the narrator also portrays Jesus as powerless before the Satan. Thus although the narrator presents Jesus as an omniscient character, Jesus can do very little to change the course of events.

5. Scene five (22: 35-38)

The last scene (vv.35-38) features the only dialogue between Jesus and the apostles as a group. Verse 35 continues the dialogue from scene four, but this time it is a dialogue between Jesus and the apostles.

This last scene forms an *inclusio* with vv. 7-13, the scene that introduces the LS narrative proper. Thematically, both are concerned with preparation: in vv. 7-13 the preparation is for the Passover meal, while in this scene the preparation is for mission after the departure of Jesus.⁷⁷ There is also a narrative connection between the two scenes, as

⁷⁶ For these character traits, see Edward Morgan Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1927): 103-18; cited in Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* 55.

⁷⁷ Verses 35-38, especially v. 36 and v. 38, remain notoriously difficult to interpret. Here only v. 36 is our concern. The issues involved in v. 36 revolve around the character of the emphatic "but now" (*ἀλλὰ νῦν*): does it contrast the peaceful time of the previous

one scene introduces the narrative, while the other concludes it. There is a change of locale after the last narrative statement in v. 13 (“and they prepared the Passover meal”), just as there is a change of locale with the last narrative statement in v. 38 (“that is enough”). Both these narrative statements prepare the audience for a change of locale. In both scenes the narrator presents Jesus in dialogue: in vv. 7-13 the dialogue is with Peter and John, while in vv. 35-38 the dialogue is with the apostles.

The two scenes touch also on Jesus’ *ethos* as the narrator shows that Jesus is reliable. In vv. 7-13 only Peter and John “found it just as he had told them.” Here all the apostles confirm that they lack “nothing,” which is another way of saying they found it as he told them. Their new commission, however, differs from their previous commission. In the former commission they did not need to take care of their needs; this time, however, they have to be ready to fend for themselves. Verse 37 is a citation of ancient authority to underscore further Jesus’ *ethos*. The repetition of “fulfil,” a Lukan theme, in this verse indicates that Jesus’ foreknowledge of events is a key rhetorical topic of the discourse.

Verses 35-36 refer to 9:1-6 (the mission of the Twelve) and to 10:1-12 (the mission of the seventy/seventy-two).⁷⁸ Verse 36 begins with an emphatic note: But now. It has the

mission of the apostles referred to in v. 35 and the passion of Jesus, soon to begin as P. S. Minear opines? See P. S. Minear, “A Note on Luke xxii. 36,” *NovT* 7 (1964): 128-134. Or is it a contrast between the time of Jesus and the time of the church, as Conzelmann contends? See Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 81, 103, no 1, 186. Marshall thinks it is “a call to be ready for hardship and self-sacrifice.” See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 824, 825. Fitzmyer has taken the position that the “but now” cannot be limited to the immediate passion of Jesus, but includes the mission of the apostles in Acts. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1430 & 1431. In our opinion the instruction refers more appropriately to the mission of the apostles after the departure of Jesus, when they may have to fend for themselves because they can no longer rely on people’s hospitality. The contrast the Lukan Jesus draws between the short mission of the apostles during his ministry and “the now” is to inform the apostles they will, like him, face persecution after his departure.

⁷⁸ This is the issue of which of the two previous missions, the mission of the Twelve or the mission of seventy (two)? Again, Quesnell holds it refers to the mission of

effect of referring to another historical moment. The “but now,” ἀλλὰ νῦν signals a transition to another historical moment, and anticipates a changed situation in the future now at hand. The apostles are to take a purse, a bag if they have one. But anyone who does not have them has to sell his mantle to buy a sword. Thus Fitzmyer is correct to note that the introduction of the “swords” signals the difference in the periods of Jesus and the period of the church, which is marked by persecution.⁷⁹ So this is an important change of time in the Lukan narrative. Jesus must be “reckoned with transgressors” (v. 37) in fulfilment of scripture (cf. Isa 53: 12). The apostles immediately show Jesus their two swords; this prompts Jesus to say to them: that is enough, that is, two swords are enough.⁸⁰

the seventy (-two) in support of his argument that more than the apostles were present at the Lukan LS. See Quesnell, “Women at Luke’s Supper.” Fitzmyer on the other hand argues that the mission of the seventy (-two), which is unique to Luke, is the creation of Luke, arising from his use of sources (Mark and Q). Thus Luke seeks to correct this in 22:35-36. In other words, there was only one mission, namely, the mission of the twelve. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 842-43, 1430. For Marshall, either the twelve took part in the mission of the seventy (-two) or the mission charge to the seventy (-two) was originally charged to the twelve. See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 824. From a rhetorical perspective, Luke could simply be inventing this example in accord with Aristotle’s view that in a rhetorical speech one could invent example. See *Rhet.* II.XIX.27.3 (Freese, 272, 273).

⁷⁹ See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1432.

⁸⁰ Scholars are not agreed on what to make of the last narrative statement in the mouth of Jesus: “that is enough”(v. 38b). In my view, much of the difficulty results not from the text itself, but from scholars’ own sensibilities about what they think Jesus can encourage or not encourage. This is why some scholars argue that the apostles misunderstand Jesus’ instructions. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1430-1431, 1433 and Johnson, *Luke*, 347. Otherwise, the response of the apostles is a logical response to Jesus’ advice in verse 36 that anyone who does not have a purse and a traveler’s bag should sell his coat to buy a sword. The discussion of the appropriateness or otherwise of a man wearing a sword in Shabbat 6.4 (Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 186) suggests that men wear swords on other days of the week. That means it is not unusual that the apostles in our chosen text could produce two swords on the spot. What else does the Lukan Jesus want the apostles to do with swords if not for fighting as evident in verse 49? It should be noted, however, that Luke does not explicitly identify the person who strikes the high priest’s

6. Summary

The above analysis of the narrative texture of Luke 22: 1-38 (WT) reveals the following narrative patterns: First, the principal character, Jesus, has more to say because the focus is on the apostles. Second, the last statement of a speaker in a scene moves the discourse forward as it forms the basis for response: Jesus directs Peter and John to go and prepare the Passover meal; they ask to know where to prepare it and Jesus directs them to the place of the meal; the apostles respond to Jesus' prediction of the one who will hand him over; Jesus in turn responds to their dispute over the greatest of them; next Peter responds to Jesus' prediction that he, Peter, will personally deny him; and the apostles respond to Jesus' question concerning their last mission. Third, the voice of the narrator helps to move the discourse forward, when he reports a speech. Fourth, throughout the narrative, the implied author permits Jesus to speak for himself (direct discourse), but does not allow the chief priests, the scribes, Judas, and Satan to also speak for themselves. The narrator simply makes assertions about these other characters. This is because the implied author considers Jesus a reliable character. And it is for the same reason that the implied author allows Jesus to make assertion about gentile kings. In this way, the narrator seeks to provide standards that will guide the audience to proper understanding of the narrative. Proper understanding here corresponds to the implied author's point of view.⁸¹ Although Jesus has more to say, still, the narrative is a dialogue as the following dialogical pattern emerges:

servant (v. 50; cf. v. 49) with an apostle, and the question is, "shall we strike with a sword," and not "shall we strike with the sword" (emphasis mine).

⁸¹ On the effects of implied author's points of view on narrator and the implied audience, see Sternberg, "Viewpoints and Interpretation," in *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 129-152, and Lodge, "Point of View," in *The Art of Fiction*, 25-29.

1. Jesus speaks (v. 8)
 Peter and John respond (v.9)
 Jesus responds (vv.10-12)
2. Jesus speaks and acts with an opening tone (vv. 15-22) [WT]
 the apostles respond (vv. 23-24)
3. Jesus speaks (25-32)
 Peter responds (v. 33)
4. Jesus speaks (vv. 34-35a)
 the apostles respond (v. 35b)
5. Jesus speaks (vv. 36-37)
 the apostles respond (v. 38a)
6. Jesus speaks with a closing tone (v. 38b).

In conclusion, Luke presents the story of the LS as a dialogue between Jesus and his apostles. The Israelite Passover is the historical setting for the LS. The implied author shows Jesus as a reliable character and allows Jesus to reveal his own character through his actions and words. Only the narrator and Jesus make assertions about other characters. For instance, in addition to the narrator's assertions about the chief priests, the scribes, Judas and Satan, he also makes assertions about the apostles. Although the narrator asserts that the apostles are status conscious, he relies on Jesus to show that they are loyal. In this way, the implied author indicates that the narrator and Jesus are reliable, and thus invites the audience to trust them. The introduction of the plot to destroy Jesus in vv. 1-6 seeks to place the LS within the larger context of the passion narrative (Luke 22-23), while Luke 22: 7-38 (WT) acts as transition to the passion narrative.

The above analysis then presents the narrative texture of Luke's LS. Rhetorically we need to go beyond this literary analysis, for both the narrator and the narratee are rhetorical tools created by implied author.⁸² The narrator is in the text to narrate the story in accord with the goal of the implied author. We have seen above what the narrator does rhetorically

⁸² See Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* 27.

with the narratee. For instance, the narrator presents himself as a credible storyteller, and presents Jesus as a very credible character. Thus as the narrator tells the story, and because of the way he tells it, the implied audience accepts him as a reliable guide to the story.⁸³ For this reason, readers can easily re-enact the rhetoric of the narrator rather than show the nature of that rhetoric. In order therefore to avoid the risk of being seduced by both the implied author and the narrator we need a rhetorical analysis of the whole activity of the implied author. This calls for a rhetorical analysis of the argumentation itself in the narration and in the speech the narrator attributes to the characters.⁸⁴ This leads to analysis of argumentative texture of our chosen text.

E Argumentative Texture and Pattern

Our analysis of narrational texture above reveals the narrational nature of Luke 22: 1-38 (WT). But an important feature of narration is the arguments, the motor by which the plot advances. Thus argumentative texture and pattern concern the internal reasoning of a narrative discourse. The presence of rationales indicates that a text has a rich deductive argumentative texture: the presence of story and narration itself represents inductive argumentation. A narrative discourse regularly exhibits a mixture of two kinds of rhetorical progression: logical progression and qualitative progression. We have logical reasoning when the discourse presents assertions and supports them with reasons. On the other hand, qualitative reasoning occurs when the quality of the images and descriptions encourages the

⁸³ See R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983): 17; Robbins, *Tapestry*, 55.

⁸⁴ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 58-64.

reader to accept the portrayal as true and real.⁸⁵ The more noticeable form of argumentative texture is logical or syllogistic reasoning, which generates logical progression.⁸⁶ The presence of **because, for, since** or **if...then** (γάρ, ὅτι) is a very good indicator of a rationale. The presence of **in order that** or **so that** (ἵνα) may also indicate rationale.

The first scene (vv. 1-6) contains a rationale for why the authorities are looking for just how they may destroy Jesus: **because** they are afraid of the people. The possession of Judas by the Satan, on the other hand, does not logically follow from the statement about the fear of the authorities.

In the second scene (vv. 7-13) we have a logical progression since Jesus gives reason for sending Peter and John to prepare the Passover meal: go prepare the Passover **so that** we may eat it. The logical progression provided by Jesus' story to the apostles of the man who would meet them makes for further progression.

The third scene (vv. 14-22) [WT] is a fusion of logical and qualitative progressions. Verse 14 features both logical and qualitative progression moving the implied audience from 7-13 onwards. After Peter and John have prepared the Passover meal (v. 13) the implied audience expects Jesus to recline at the table with his disciples (not with the apostles) to eat the meal: "The teacher says to you, where is the guest room, where I am to eat the Passover with my disciples?" But instead, the narrator tells his audience that Jesus

⁸⁵ See Robbins *Exploring*, 21 and *Jesus the Teacher*, 9-10.

⁸⁶ See Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1931): 124; Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 9-12 and *Tapestry*, 59.

reclines with the apostles **because** Jesus greatly desires to eat the Passover with the apostles before he suffers. Deductively, Jesus adds that the reason he so desires is **because** he will no longer do so until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God (vv. 15-16). Subsequently, Jesus gives a cup to the apostles to share because he will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes (vv. 17-18).

The action of Jesus, that is, the breaking of the bread (v. 19a), that follows is not a logical requirement to his speech in v. 18. Meanwhile, the narrative progression has highlighted eating and drinking in the kingdom of God as a special topic of the discourse. Jesus gives broken bread to the apostles while identifying it with his body, but giving no rationale, whereas he gives a reason (v. 18) for giving them a cup to share among themselves. The reason why Jesus gives a broken bread to his apostles and identifies it with his body will become clear in the elaboration that follows (vv. 23-38). Jesus announces to the apostles that he will be handed over by one of them **because** it has been so determined; there is, however, no logical requirement that Jesus foretells his handing over. But this foretelling of the handing over heightens the nearness of his death and thus suggests, rather than gives reasons, why he is abstaining from the Passover meal.

Verses 23-24 exhibit a qualitative progression rather than a logical progression. The apostles' desire to know who among them will hand him over is certainly not a logical requirement from the information Jesus has just provided. In addition, the implied audience does not expect them to start disputing which of them was going to succeed Jesus as leader. While the placement of this dispute may not make sense to the implied audience, nonetheless, the narrator uses it to provide a fuller characterisation of the apostles that are eating this final meal with Jesus.

Verses 25-30 feature contrary and example as argument for a different style of leadership. Strikingly, no logical, deductive argument is given until v. 27. Jesus does indicate why those who are eating with him are not to lord it over their subjects and allow themselves be called benefactors in v. 30. Even though they are seated at table like leaders being served, they must serve because he, their leader, has served them. Although this does not deductively provide rationale for Jesus' action at table, one can conclude from his qualitative argumentation that he has served them there because he wants to give them an example to follow.

In v. 30 Jesus gives a reason for the assertion he makes in v. 29. He assigns the apostles a kingdom **in order** that they may eat and drink at his table in his kingdom. Although the implied audience may be inclined to think that the assignment of a kingdom is because of the loyalty of the apostles, Jesus does not say so deductively. The second narrative statement in v. 30 (and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel) is not part of the rationale for the assignment of a kingdom to the apostles. *Καθήσεσθε* is a future indicative and not a subjunctive present like *ἔσθητε*. In other words, *ἵνα* covers only the first of the two narrative statements in this verse.

Verses 31-34 exhibit also a logical progression. Prediction of future trouble for the disciples is not a logical follow-up to the previous statement, but Jesus gives reason for praying specifically for Peter: so that Peter's faith may not fail. The rhetorical repetition of Simon makes him the focus of attention here and it is intended to get his attention even though the first assertion concerns the whole group: the Satan has demanded to have you (*ὑμᾶς*). This repetition has the rhetorical effect of personalising the assertion, and it

provides the context for a personal dialogue between Peter and Jesus, which permits Peter to defend his honour and loyalty to Jesus. The conclusion reveals that the narrator takes Jesus back to the dispute about greatness. Jesus gives a command to Peter: when you turn back, strengthen your brothers.⁸⁷ The strengthening role Jesus gives Peter may be in anticipation of Peter's leadership function in Acts. Here Jesus tactically names Peter as leader and the one to serve the others.

The final deductive, logical argumentation occurs in v. 37 where Jesus provides rationale for warning the apostles of troubled future. When Jesus sent out the group without purse, bag or sandals they lacked nothing. But they must now take all these because "what has been written must be fulfilled in" him. The second rationale ("for in fact everything concerning me is at its end") heightens the nearness of Jesus' departure.

Summary

The foregoing has been an attempt to analyse the argumentative nature of Luke's LS. This has helped to open up its argumentation. It is our finding that Luke's LS discourse is argumentative as it provides reasons for certain assertions.

Narrational discourse then assumes argumentative texture as it gives reasons for narrative events through the discursive unit. In our text, the authorities are seeking "just how" to destroy Jesus **because** they are afraid of the people. Jesus passionately desires to eat the Passover meal with his apostles before he suffers, **because** he will not eat it any longer until it is fulfilled in God's kingdom. Jesus gives a cup to the apostles **because** he shall not drink wine until God's kingdom comes. The hand of the one who will hand Jesus

⁸⁷ Cf. John 21:15-17, "feed my lambs...feed my sheep... feed my sheep").

over is with him on table. **because** it has been so determined. The apostles must serve. **because** he has served. He appoints the apostles a kingdom, **because** he wants them to dine with him in his kingdom. He prays for Peter **because** he wants Peter's faith to not fail.⁸⁸

This analysis has shown that the inner nature of the Lukan LS is argumentative. In other words, the LS discourse is designed to persuade its reader/hearer. Argumentative texture, according to Robbins, gives reasons for events to happen as they do. In some instances, the reasons are so explicit that a reader perceives them to be logical. In other instances, the reasons are implicit, part of the innate qualities of people, circumstances, and images that persuade people to accept their plausibility. In the context of both logically explicit and qualitatively innate reasons, unexpected things may happen in the story that the reader develops a willingness to accept as a natural outcome of the assertions and activities in the discourse.⁸⁹

Our analysis of argumentative texture of the Lukan LS further reveals that the discourse progresses in a manner similar to a rhetorical elaboration of themes supported by rationales.⁹⁰ There are discernible patterns of elaboration embedded in Luke 22: 1-38 (WT), namely, Luke 22: 14-38 (WT), which reveal the rhetorical function of parts as the discourse progresses.

⁸⁸ Robbins, *Exploring*, 29.

⁸⁹ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 29.

⁹⁰ See Burton L. Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia in the Hellenistic School," in *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, ed. Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989): 31-67.

The pattern of elaboration in our text creates this scenario: (1) The narrator describes the setting. (2) Jesus the principal character addresses the apostles in words and actions, concluding with two topics (the foretelling of his betrayal and the necessity of his imminent death), which generate internal argument among the apostles; Jesus' first speech is a monologue. (3) There follows the first dialogue proper of the textual unit, the argument among the apostles, which is in response to the two topics with which Jesus ends his speech. (4) In response to their dispute Jesus begins to elaborate the topics, concluding with a topic (prediction of their denial and possible enemy attack), which affects them all; but Jesus quickly narrows it down to Peter. This results in a dialogue between Jesus and Peter. (5) Dialogue ensues between Jesus and Peter as Peter suggests that he should be regarded as more faithful than others. (6) Jesus responds insisting Peter will deny him sooner than later. Jesus concludes his third speech by shifting attention to the apostles as he promises them reward (a place in his kingdom where they will eat and drink, and be judges) for their faithfulness. This generates the context for the only dialogue between Jesus and the apostles. (7) Dialogue ensues between Jesus and the apostles in form of question and answer;⁹¹ Jesus predicts future trouble for them after his death and says he must suffer and die soon. This concludes the discourse.

F Thematic Elaboration

Thematic elaboration concerns an elaboration of a thesis or a theme through argumentation in order to reveal the meanings and meaning-effects of the

⁹¹ The dialogue between Jesus and the apostles raises the issue of exactly how many people are present at the Lukan LS. Jesus' statement here may seem to apply to more than the twelve.

thesis or theme.⁹² Ancient rhetoricians contemporary with the NT offer ample examples of what constitutes a complete rhetorical argument (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, *Progymnasmata Hermogenes*, and *Progymnasmata Theon*). For instance, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 2.18.28-19.30 shows that a complete argument consists of a proposition to be elaborated, a rationale that supports the proposition, argumentation that confirms the rationale, the embellishment, and the résumé.⁹³

The following is an example from *ad Herennium*

2.18.28-2.19.30:

The most complete and perfect argument, then, is that which is comprised of five parts: the Proposition, the Reason, the Proof of the Reason, the Embellishment, and the Resume. Through the Proposition we set forth summarily what we intend to prove. The Reason, by means of a brief explanation subjoined, sets forth the causal basis for the Proposition, establishing the truth of what we are urging. The Proof of the Reason corroborates, by means of additional arguments, the briefly presented Reason. Embellishment we use in order to adorn and enrich the argument, after the Proof has been established. The Resume is a brief conclusion, drawing together the parts of the argument. Hence, to make the most complete use of these five parts, we shall develop an argument as follows:

Proposition

"We shall show that Ulysses had a motive in killing Ajax.

Rationale

"Indeed he wished to rid himself of his bitterest enemy, from whom, with good cause, he feared extreme danger to himself.

Confirmation of the Rationale

"He saw that, with Ajax alive, his own life would be unsafe; he hoped by the death of Ajax to secure his own safety; it was his habit to plan an enemy's destruction by whatsoever wrongful means, when he could not by rightful, as the undeserved death of Palamedes bears witness. Thus the fear of danger encouraged him to slay the man from whom he dreaded vengeance, and, in addition, the habit of wrong-doing robbed him of his scruples at undertaking the evil deed.

⁹² See Robbins, *Exploring*, 52.

⁹³ See Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 51-56; Robbins, *Exploring*, 53-54.

Embellishment

"Now not only do all men have a motive even in their least peccadilloes, but certainly they are attracted by some sure reward when they enter upon crimes which are by far the most heinous. If the hope of gaining money has led many a man to wrong-doing, if from greed for power not a few have tainted themselves with crime, if numerous men have trafficked for a paltry profit with arrant deceit, who will find it strange that Ulysses, when under stress of acute terror, did not refrain from crime? A hero most brave, most upright, most implacable against his foes, harassed by a wrong, roused to anger—him the frightened, malevolent, guilt—conscious, guileful man wished to destroy; the treacherous man did not wish his bitter enemy to stay alive. To whom, pray, will this seem strange? For when we see wild beasts rush eagerly and resolutely to attack one another, we must not think it incredible that this creature, too—a wild, cruel, inhuman spirit—set out passionately to destroy his enemy; especially since in beasts we see no reasoning, good or bad, while he, we know, always had designs, ever so many, and ever so base.

Resume

If then, I have promised to give the motive which impelled Ulysses to enter upon the crime, and if I have shown that the reckoning of a bitter enmity and the fear of danger were the factors, it must unquestionably be acknowledged that he had a motive for his crime." (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 2.18.28-19.30).⁹⁴

This elaboration demonstrates that a complete argument would normally contain a rationale that supports the theme, and an argument that confirms the rationale. For instance, the confirmation of the rationale contains "an appeal to the undeserved death of Palamedes." This appeal is an argument from example as well as an argument from authoritative witness from the past. Embedded in the embellishment is an analogy of wild beasts in order to unfold the issue further and argue for the truth of the initial theme and rationale.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Cicero, *Ad Herennium* (trans. H. Caplan [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954]): 107-109; cited in Robbins, *Exploring*, 53-54.

⁹⁵ Summary of Robbins', *Exploring*, 54.

Besides giving rationales for assertions, Luke 22: 7-38 (WT) also contains. (a) argument from the contrary, (b) argument from analogy, (c) argument from example, and (d) argument from ancient authority. It is our thesis that Luke 22:7-38 (WT) contains a thematic elaboration with (vv. 14-38) [WT] as the elaboration proper similar to the above example from *ad Herennium*.⁹⁶ In this way, vv. 7-14 serves as introduction to the elaboration, which is consistent with the narrative nature of the LS. Although the pattern of elaboration in this Lukan text may not be as clear-cut as the above example, Luke's LS offers a thematic elaboration in its own right, for it contains essential topics for elaboration. That Luke's LS does not resemble any known thematic elaboration should not be a surprise, for Luke is known to use his sources in a creative manner. As Burton Mack rightly reminds us, professional ideal does not require wooden adherence to some established order for the smaller units of the speech, "but to craft an original composition in keeping with sound rhetorical principles."⁹⁷ What we have in Luke's LS is what Thomas Louis Brodie calls "inventive imitation" of the kind of thematic elaboration in *ad Herennium*.⁹⁸

Mack further reminds us that the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, *Progymnasmata* of *Hermogenes* and of *Theon* are classroom exercises and as such "one would not expect to

⁹⁶ We understand 22:7-38 to be Luke's narrative of the LS, with vv.1-6 as introduction to the passion narrative (Luke 22-23). So our analysis of vv. 7-38 is within the context of vv. 1-38, with vv. 1-6 as a significant preceding co-text of the LS proper.

⁹⁷ Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia in the Hellenistic School," 63.

⁹⁸ Brodie defines "inventive imitation" as "the process that combines the basic elements of imitation and creativity." Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984): 21.

find in literary works blocks of material that followed the pattern so simply and transparently.”⁹⁹ In fact, *ad Herennium* envisages a situation where one may not use all the argumentative topics (2.19. 30). Thus one would find a variety of ways of using the pattern. Luke may indeed be making a creative use of a pattern of elaboration with which he was familiar.¹⁰⁰

1. Pattern of Thematic Elaboration in Luke 22:7-38 (WT)

1. Introduction (vv. 7-14): This unit introduces the elaboration. It provides the setting, Passover setting, the characters (the Teacher, the apostles), and the event (Passover meal).
2. The initial theme with rationale (vv. 15-16).
3. Amplified restatement of the theme with rationale (vv. 17-22) [WT].
4. Statements of the question (vv. 23-24). This unit has the rhetorical function of *Quaestio*. The apostles raise two questions for resolution, namely, the identity of who among them would hand over Jesus and who among them is the greatest.
5. Argument from contrary (vv. 25-26). This unit features a citation of gentile leadership as an example of what leadership is not.
6. Argument from analogy and examples (vv. 27-30): analogy of server at dinner and two examples on how the apostles should behave: the example of Jesus as one who

⁹⁹ Mack, “Elaboration of the Chreia,” 64.

¹⁰⁰ See Thomas Louis Brodie’s comments on Luke’s rhetorical style in his “Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts.”

serves and the example of assignment of a kingdom to the apostles in imitation of his father.

7. Argument from *pathos* (vv. 31-34). This unit appeals to Peter's emotions, which leads to a dialogue between Jesus and Peter.
8. Argument from *pathos* (vv. 35-36). Jesus appeals to the emotions of the apostles. It also contains argument from contrary: in contrast to their experience of hospitality when he sent them on mission, now situation is changing such that they may have to fend for themselves.
9. Argument from ancient authority (v. 37).
10. Conclusion (v. 38). The rhetorical function of verse 38 is conclusion, which shows the apostles displaying their emotions.

2. Analysis of the pattern in Luke 22: 7-38 above

The pattern of elaboration above does not follow traditional pattern of elaboration. For instance, there is an introduction (vv. 7-14) in the above pattern with a rhetorical function, namely, narratio. Besides providing the setting and the introduction of the characters, we find the introduction of the main character as the Teacher with prophetic knowledge; his prophetic knowledge is stated in the fact that Peter and John found things as he has told them, which underscores the authority of the Teacher. This is a statement of the *ethos* of the Teacher in form of narration. This statement of the *ethos* of Jesus is consistent with one of the three kinds of proof a rhetorical speech should furnish, namely, the moral character (*ethos*) of the speaker; the speaker must be worthy of confidence.¹⁰¹ The

¹⁰¹ See Aristotle, *Rhet.* I. II. 3 (Freese, 16-17).

statement of the narrator. “so they departed and found it just as he has told them” (v. 13), is a rhetorical statement of the *ethos* of Jesus. Because of the authority of Jesus, it is he, and not the narrator, who will elaborate the theme.

The import of this introductory unit, then, is the introduction of Jesus as the Teacher with prophetic knowledge, that is, an appeal to his *ethos* (moral character). The form of the statement of the *ethos* of Jesus agrees with Aristotle’s recommendation that it is better to have another person present the *ethos* of the speaker.¹⁰² in the sense that it is the narrator who asserts that Peter and John “found it as he has told them” (22: 13). The introduction also contains a reference to the theme of eating. The narrator introduces it as a Passover lamb that must be killed, while Jesus underlines the significance of the meal when he directs two of his disciples to go prepare for it. The directive presupposes his statement of great desire to eat the meal with his apostles (v. 15). Put differently, because of his passionate desire to eat the Passover meal with his apostles before his death, Jesus does not need his disciples to remind him of the need to prepare, as is the case in Mark (14: 12) and Matthew (26: 17).

Following the statement of the *ethos* (moral character) of Jesus in form of narration, we have a statement of the theme (vv.15-16). The theme for elaboration is the meal, that is, on the final, desired eating before the death of Jesus. Put differently, the theme for elaboration has to do with Jesus’ emotion-laden statement regarding his desire to do what he has to do with his apostles before his imminent death. The eating will not happen because of his imminent death, which he calls suffering, not death. It will be shown that

¹⁰² See Aristotle, *Rhet.* III. XVII.16 (Freese, 460-461).

this suffering will lead to death only in vv. 21-22. In giving rationale for why he passionately wishes to eat the Passover meal with his apostles, Jesus announces his death as suffering. In this unit we have also a restatement of the setting, namely, a Passover setting that emphasises the Passover character of the occasion.

Verses 17-22 (WT) restate the theme in vv. 15-16 with its rationale. Verse 18 repeats, “I shall not (drinking is part of eating) until... kingdom of God” of v. 16. “As it has been determined” also repeats the idea of Jesus’ desire to eat the Passover with his apostles. “The son of man goes as it has been determined” not only repeats the idea of Jesus’ suffering, it also signals that the suffering will lead to death, for to “leave” in this context is a metaphor for death (cf. Acts 1:25; John 14:2,3, 12, 28; 16:7, 28). A restatement of the theme by way of expansion is a powerful rhetorical device for reminding the audience of the issue under discussion, especially in oral presentation. What follows is elaboration of the theme in order to bring out its meaning effects.

In vv. 23-24 the apostles raise two questions, namely, the identity of the one who among them will hand over Jesus and the greatest among them. The apostles direct the questions to themselves and not to Jesus, which suggests that the apostles are not challenging the honour of Jesus. But since Jesus is the only one with answers to those questions his honour is indirectly challenged. The dispute over leadership is, indirectly, a challenge to Jesus’ honour as well, since it is the responsibility of the departing leader to appoint a successor.

Nevertheless, Jesus’ action underscores the rhetorical effect of the two questions. On the one hand, he is silent on the question of the identity of the one who will hand him over. This silence signals to the apostles that the identity of the one doing the handing over

is not important; this has the immediate effect of discouraging the apostles from vilifying or characterising one of their number as the villain of the group. In v. 22 Jesus has already indicated he is not a victim, a notion that is further strengthened by the citation of ancient authority in verse 37 to the effect that his departure is in fulfilment of scripture. Where there is no victim, there can be no villain. In the end by ignoring the question about the identity of the one who will hand him over, Jesus gives the apostles no warrant to exclude any from their group. Jesus' silence is intended to advance his inclusiveness.

On the other hand, Jesus picks on the issue of leadership as a stepping-stone to the rhetorical elaboration. The meaning of the departure of Jesus for the apostles is stated in v. 24 as the apostles dispute over the issue of the greatest among them. By this dispute the apostles indicate that the death of Jesus means one of them has to take his place as leader of the group. It also implies that their very future is at stake. Jesus' response addresses these two concerns of the apostles in two parts. The first part concerns leadership. By using analogy and contrary Jesus shows what true leadership is. The conduct of the apostles as leaders must be contrary to that of gentile kings who lord it over their subjects. But using the analogy of the diner and the dinner server Jesus gives himself as example of leader to follow. The attention Jesus gives to the issue of leadership centralises it, while his silence on the identity of the one who will hand him over points to his inclusive tendency.

Verse 24 permits the elaboration that ensues, and thereby acts as the rationale for the elaboration. Thus by a careful and deliberate use of both silence and speech, inclusiveness and leadership are centralised in Luke's LS text. This permits us to see verses 23 and 24 as statements of the rhetorical situation for the composition of the LS. In other words, we see in verses 23 and 24 a two-fold statement of the exigency to which Luke's LS

can be construed as a fitting response, that is, the rhetorical problem.¹⁰³ the social-political issues that require resolution. This observation further supports our thesis that the central issues in Luke's LS discourse (WT) are inclusive table fellowship and servant leadership.

Verses 25 and 26 present argument from the contrary by citing gentile leadership as an example of the kind of leaders the apostles should not be. This is followed by two examples of how the apostles should behave: the example of Jesus as one who serves (v. 27) and the example of Jesus in assigning a kingdom to the apostles in imitation of his father (vv. 28-29). Verse 27 can be construed as an enthymeme, one of the two logical proofs that Aristotle recommends for rhetorical speech.¹⁰⁴ In verse 27 the missing premise is the conclusion: The one sitting at table is the greatest (major premise). But here I am in your midst as the one serving (minor premise as contrary). The missing conclusion that Jesus expects the apostles to draw is: you also should serve.

Verse 30 provides the rationale for verse 29. The rationale is a restatement of the hoped-for meal in the kingdom stated in verses 16 and 18. This restatement brings the

¹⁰³ See Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," in *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999): 110, 115. It is worth noting here that scholars are agreed on what constitutes the rhetorical situation as distinct from the historical situation. While Kennedy identifies the rhetorical situation with the historical situation (the *Sitz im Leben*), Jan Botha distinguishes the two. See Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 34 and Botha, *Subject to Whose Authority?* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1994): 149, plus 140-150 for a detailed exploration of the issue. For a first attempt at definition of rhetorical situation, see Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.

¹⁰⁴ See Aristotle, *Rhet.* I.II.13 (Freese, 25). The other logical proof is example, which Aristotle calls rhetorical induction, while he calls enthymeme rhetorical syllogism in which one premise is not stated, but which the audience can figure out (*Rhet.* I.II.8 [Freese, 8-19]).

eating and drinking of verses 16 and 18 together, and it assures the apostles of dining in the kingdom of Jesus. Jesus does not provide any rationale for the kingdom his Father assigns him. Be that as it may, here we see Jesus using the two kinds of deliberative rhetoric that Aristotle has identified, namely, hortatory (exhorting) and dissuasive, “for he who exhorts recommends a course of action as better, and he who dissuades advises against it as worse.”¹⁰⁵ That is, vv. 25-26 is dissuasive, while vv. 28-29 is exhortatory.

The elaboration proceeds by focusing attention on the emotions (*pathos*) of both Peter as an individual (vv. 31-34) and the apostles as a group (vv. 35-36). Both appeals use dialogue, that is, dialogue between Jesus and Peter, and dialogue between Jesus and the apostles as a group. The foretelling of Peter’s denial is a challenge to Peter’s honour, and Peter’s protestation suggests that Jesus succeeds in arousing Peter’s feelings.

In verses 35-36 Jesus refers the apostles back to a previous mission experience for the purpose of showing that the apostles are beginning a new historical moment,¹⁰⁶ and they indicate that the apostles are indeed entering a troubled future after his departure. This is rhetorically an argument from contrary: their former mission experience of hospitality can no longer be guaranteed. It is, as well, an appeal to the *pathos* (emotions) of the apostles (vv. 35-36). The emotional reaction of the apostles in verse 38 indicates that Jesus succeeds in arousing their feelings. Appealing to the emotions (*pathos*) of his audience at the tail end

¹⁰⁵ Aristotle, *Rhet.* I.II.3-5 (Freese, 34-35).

¹⁰⁶ As we have observed above (no 78) Luke may be inventing this example in a manner consistent with Aristotle on the two kinds of example, namely, what has happened in the past and inventing example (*Rhet.* II.XIX. 27.3 [Freese, 272-273]).

of the rhetorical speech is for the purpose of giving a continuing effect on the audience.

This is how traditional rhetorical speech ends.¹⁰⁷

Verse 37 is a citation of ancient authority (scripture) that repeats an idea in the initial theme and its restatement; it also repeats the same idea in v. 22. This restatement strongly confirms the initial theme. It also serves as a résumé of the parts of the argument, as well as a reminder to the audience of the initial theme. Verse 38, which shows the physical reaction of the apostles to Jesus' statement in verses 36 and 37, concludes the speech. As such, the concluding verse functions to indicate that Jesus the rhetorician succeeds in persuading his audience. Jesus' last narrative statement, namely, "that is enough," shows that the Lukan LS (WT) has more to do with servant leadership than with the death of Jesus, that is, servant leadership is in fact the point of what Jesus elaborates here.

In summary, the above analysis shows that Jesus ably uses significant argumentative topics of ancient rhetorical speech for his rhetorical elaboration: ethos, pathos, contrary, analogy, rhetorical induction (example), and rhetorical deduction (*enthymeme*). Luke allows Jesus and not the narrator to elaborate the theme, thereby presenting Jesus as a master rhetorician. This image of a master rhetorician coheres with image of teachers in the first-century Mediterranean world, where grammar school education would normally include exercises in rhetorical composition as found in rhetorical

¹⁰⁷ See Burton L. Mack, "The Anointing of Jesus: Elaboration within a Chreia," in *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989): 103.

handbooks such as the *progymnasmata*.¹⁰⁸ There are two exhortations from Jesus' action, namely, as the one who serves and his assignment of a kingdom to the apostles in imitation of his father. This legitimises his authority, while denying the authority of gentile kings, since he does things like his father. As such verses 25-30 act as a rhetorical statement of the authority of Jesus.

The kind of rhetoric we find as per the foregoing elaboration is clearly deliberative rhetoric: it is neither judicial (forensic) nor epideictic,¹⁰⁹ because the advice of Jesus to the audience in our text concerns future actions. So the end of the rhetorical speech at the LS is "the expedient or harmful, for he who exhorts recommends a course of action as better, and he who dissuades advises against it as harmful."¹¹⁰ The expedient here is the honourable. Our analysis shows that Jesus uses both rhetorical deduction (*enthymeme*) and rhetorical induction (examples) as proofs. The examples used are derived from the past as advised by Aristotle.¹¹¹

Furthermore, as a deliberative rhetoric, the Lukan Jesus appeals to his audience to be as inclusive as he is and to be leaders who serve others as he has been; this is the honourable thing to do. In the end Luke presents the *ethos* (moral character) of Jesus as

¹⁰⁸ See Hock and O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 1.

¹⁰⁹ Aristotle distinguishes three kinds of Rhetoric: the deliberative is either hortatory or dissuasive from future action; the forensic (judicial) is either accusatory or defensive (law court is the setting); and the epideictic is for praise or blame (see *Rhet.* I. II.3-III.6).

¹¹⁰ See Aristotle, *Rhet.* I.II.5 (Freese, 34-35).

¹¹¹ See Aristotle, *Rhet.* III.XVII.5 (Freese, 453). Aristotle distinguishes two kinds of examples, namely, in what has happened and in inventing examples oneself (*Rhet.* II.XIX. 27.3 [Freese, 272-273]).

persuasive enough for the course of action he has recommended for his audience. This explains why, unlike standard rhetorical elaboration, the discourse begins with a demonstration of the *ethos* of Jesus. Treating Luke's LS as a rhetorical elaboration of a theme strengthens our thesis that the Lukan text has inclusiveness and servant leadership as the primary focus.

IV. Summary

The above analysis of the inner nature of Luke's LS reveals that it is narrational, for it contains narrative material, namely, events, characters and settings. Luke 22:7-38 (WT) is thus a "story-as-discoursed." This narrative text is also argumentative, for it gives rationales for certain assertions for the purpose of persuading its audience. Furthermore, Luke's LS also emerges as a rhetorical elaboration of themes. The repetitive texture of the main characters shows that Jesus is the main subject of the narrative text, but its narration focuses on the apostles, since Jesus the main character has more to say to the apostles. Its rhetorical elaboration, however, presents it as an activity of persuasion. In this way, the focus shifts more on the audience rather than on the speaker, for it is the audience that the speaker intends to persuade.¹¹² The rhetorical elaboration shows the inner relationship between the theme of eating in vv. 15-22 (WT) and the narrative statements in vv 24-38. In other words, vv. 24-38 helps to expatiate on the theme of eating which presents the setting for Jesus to give his parting word on inclusiveness and servant leadership. Because of his

¹¹² See Binder and Weisberg, *Literary Criticisms of Law*, 23.

fast-approaching death Jesus has time only to give his apostles his parting instructions, which become the central event in the Lukan LS discourse.¹¹³

Rhetorically speaking, then, Luke 22: 7-38 (WT) presents Jesus as an example (*paradeigma*) of a leader who serves.¹¹⁴ The repetition of certain words and phrases (such as “the greatest,” “is fulfilled,” “at the table,” and “the kingdom of God”) helps to highlight key topics of the discourse. This passage features a mixed *chreia* (vv. 15-22) [WT], that is, a combination of a sayings *chreia* and action *chreia*.¹¹⁵

It is our claim, then, that an even better way to understand Luke’s LS is to see it as rhetorical elaboration. In other words, Luke’s LS shows external elaboration by adding related units to supplement, complement, or extend the thought and action in the primary unit, namely vv. 15-22 (WT). Elaboration seeks to explicate thoughts or actions that are otherwise obscure, thereby drawing fuller attention to the textual unit that contains them. Rhetorically, this is done by way of rationale and a combination of example, analogy, contrary, and recourse to ancient authority.

¹¹³ Some earlier studies of this text have tended to treat vv. 24-38 as if an appendage to the meal portion of the LS. See for instance, Evans, *Saint Luke*, 781 and Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 336-349.

¹¹⁴ Cf. K. G. Kuhn, “Die Abendmahlsworte,” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 75 (1950): 40. According to Mack, it is very important to understand that “the raw data of rhetorical persuasion consisted of examples, analogies, and fables, and that an example of any kind counted as a proof in a pattern of argumentation, not merely as an illustration in an illuminating instruction.” Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 40.

¹¹⁵ A *chreia* is “a brief statement or action aptly attributed to a specific person or something analogous to a person.” See Robbins, *Exploring*, 41; Mack, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 11; Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O’Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol. 1, *The Progymnasmata* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986): 83, 89.

Elaboration may occur in different significant settings, such as a controversy or a meal. Burton Mack and Willi Braun have shown that Luke is no stranger to rhetorical elaboration within a meal setting.¹¹⁶ Mack's study of Luke 7:36-50 provides this pattern of elaboration:

Luke 7:36-50 (Jesus at dinner in a Pharisee's home):

Setting: vv. 36-38

Challenge/Question: v. 39

Introduction: v. 40

Analogy: vv. 41-43

Example: vv. 44-46

Rationale and Contrary: v. 47

Conclusion: v. 48

Judgment: v. 50.

Braun's study of Luke 14:1-24 provides this pattern of elaboration:

Luke 14:1-24 (Jesus at a dinner in a Pharisee's home):

Setting: vv. 1-2

Challenge and Question: v. 3

Introduction: v. 4a

Action: v. 4

Rationale: v. 5

¹¹⁶ See Burton L. Mack, "The Anointing of Jesus: Elaboration within a Chreia," in *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989): 100-04 and Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric*, 162-76.

Amplification of action: v. 6

Analogy: vv. 7a,c-10, 12-14

Judgment and contrary: v. 11

Example: vv. 16-24

Conclusion: v. 24.

A close reading of Luke 5:27-39 and Luke 19:1-27 may reveal they too are rhetorical elaborations within meal setting. Further analysis of these examples from Luke's writings will, I believe, strengthen our claim that Luke has composed his LS narrative discourse (WT) in a manner similar to rhetorical elaboration.

We must then take this mode of argumentation as a clue that the Lukan LS text gives priority to the use of Graeco-Roman, social-cultural images of understanding rather than Israelite images and modes of discussion. For my study, this means, in the examination of the subsequent textures, we shall have to privilege Graeco-Roman cultural meaning within the text rather than Israelite modes of understanding.

Table 1
Progression of Narrative Agents

[illegible]

Table 3

[illegible]

Table 4a
Repetition of Personal Pronouns

Verbs	3rd Per Pl Nom	3rd Per Pl Acc	1st Per Pl Nom	3rd Per Pl Dat	3rd Per Pl Acc	1st Per Pl Acc	2nd Per	3rd Per Gen	Indefinite	1st Per Sg Dat
1	they			him						
2	they			him						
3	they			him						
4	they			him						
5	they			him						
6	they			him						
7	they			him						
8	they			him						
9	they			him						
10	they			him						
11	they			him						
12	they			him						
13	they			him						
14	they			him						
15	they			him						
16	they			him						
17	they			him						
18	they			him						
19	they			him						
20	they			him						
21	they			him						
22	they			him						
23	they			him						
24	they			him						
25	they			him						
26	they			him						
27	they			him						
28	they			him						
29	they			him						
30	they			him						
31	they			him						
32	they			him						
33	they			him						
34	they			him						
35	they			him						
36	they			him						
37	they			him						
38	they			him						

Table 4b
 Substitution of Personal Names for Personal Pronouns

Verse	2nd Per Pl Noun	3rd Per Sg Noun	1st Per Sg Noun	2nd Per Sg Det	3rd Per Pl Det	1st Per Pl Det	2nd Per	3rd Per Sg	Indefinite	1st Per Sg Det
2	the chief priests			Jesus						
4	the chief priests	Judas		Jesus	the chief priests					
5	the chief priests	Judas		Jesus	the chief priests					
6		Judas		Jesus	the chief priests					
8		Jesus				for us				
9	Peter and John			Jesus						
10		Jesus		the father myn	Peter and John					
11		the father myn	I (Jesus)							
12							you (howsoever)			
13	Peter and John	Jesus			Peter and John		you (the apostles)			
14	Peter and John	Jesus		him (Jesus)				us (Jesus)		
15		Jesus	I (Jesus)		the apostles		you (the apostles)			
16			I (Jesus)				you (the apostles)			
17		Jesus					howsoever			
18			I (Jesus)				you (the apostles)			
19		Jesus			the apostles					
21								one	me (Jesus)	
22		Jesus							me (Jesus)	
23	the apostles				themselves					
24					them (the apostles)					
25		Jesus			them (the apostles)					
26	those				them					
27							you (the apostles)			
28							you (the apostles)			
29			I (Jesus)				you (the apostles)		one	me (Jesus)
30							you (the apostles)			me (Jesus)
31							you (the apostles)			
32			I (Jesus)				you (Peter)			
33	Peter		I (Peter)	Jesus			you (Peter)			
34	Jesus		I (Jesus)				you (Jesus)			
35		Jesus	I (Jesus)		the apostles		you (Peter)			me (Jesus)
36	the apostles	Jesus		the apostles			you (the apostles)			
37		he	I (Jesus)				you (the apostles)		anyone	me (Jesus)
38	the apostles	Jesus			the apostles			anyone	me (Jesus)	

Table 5
Progression of "And" and "Say"

Verses					
2	and				
	and				
4	and				
	and				
5	and				
	and				
6	and				
	and				
8	and				
	and	saying		(to them)	
9	and	they said	to him		
10	and	he said		to them	
11	and	say	(to him)		
		says			to you
13	and				
	and				
14	and				
	and				
15	and	he said		to them	
16		I tell			you
17	and	he said		(to them)	
18		I tell			you
19	and				
	and	saying		(to them)	
23	and				
24					
25		he said		to them	
	and				
26	and				
29	and				
30	and				
	and				
32					
33	and				
34		he said	to him		
	and	I say			to you
35	and	he said		to them	
	and	they said	(to him)		
36	and	he said		to them	
	and				
	and				
37		I say			to you
	and				
38	and	they said	(to him)		
		he said		to them	

Chapter Three

ORAL-SCRIBAL INTERTEXTURE

I Introduction

The publication of *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* has brought the attention of NT scholars to the arena of intertextual studies.¹ This work underscores the fact that texts stand in relation to other texts, and words also stand in relation to other words. This suggests that analysis and interpretation of any text may require an exploration of its intertextures.

At the same time that literary critics are exploring the relationship of texts, social anthropological as well as semiotic insights are revealing that language and texts are a function of society. Therefore, language in any text participates in the language of a particular society; it is a reusing or recycling of societal language. This suggests that language in any text and among texts has fuller meaning only within their social-cultural context. Interpreters then must pay attention not only to textual and literary connection but also to social roles and cultural scripts embedded in a text.

Social-cultural intertextual investigation, however, also calls for an exploration of the social and cultural location of the language of the textual unit and the kind of culture it

¹ Sipke Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel* (Kampen: Kok, 1989). For a more recent focus on Intertextuality, see also Robert F. Stoops, ed. *Semeia 80: The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).

seeks to create for its reader. A society's culture is made up of whatever one must know or believe in order to behave in a manner acceptable to members of the society. In this way culture can be said to reside in the hearts and minds of people. Human "culture is the life of a people," including their arts, beliefs, traditions, and language. Thus religion, ideology, art, and common sense, are all an integral part of cultural systems.²

In contradistinction to literary critics' attention to the relationship of texts alone or to the social-scientific analysis of society or culture alone, socio-rhetorical critics attend to both areas and to social and cultural intertexture in their analysis. Socio-rhetorical critics are interested in the intertextures of texts, for socio-rhetorical criticism is interested in the textures of texts. In practice this may not be an exclusive distinction, for some literary critics understand intertextual analysis to involve more than seeking echoes or allusions or citing of previous texts. For instance, Richard B. Hays, Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes understand intertextuality as the study of the semiotic matrix within which a text's acts of signification occurs.³

² For further exploration of our use of "culture" here, see Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973) and *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1983). See also John Paul II, "Discourse to the Representatives of the World of Culture at the Catholic University of Santiago, Chile (3 April 1987)," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis (AAS)* 80 (1988): 15; Peter N. Stearns, Donald R. Schwartz, *World History: Traditions and New Directions* (New York: Addison-Wesley, 1989): 3; Rhys H. Williams, "Religion as Political Resource: Culture or Ideology," *The Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 35.4 (Dec 1996): 372; and The General Secretariat of the Synod of Bishops, *Synod of Bishops Special Assembly for America: Encounter with the Living Christ: The Way to Conversion, Communion and Solidarity in America: Instrumentum Laboris* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997): 7.

³ See Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989): 15, summarising Kristeva and Barthes: Julia Kristeva, *La*

This chapter and chapter four present a further exploration of the internal dynamics of Luke's LS text by analysing its intertexture using socio-rhetorical analysis.⁴ In this chapter, we engage in an extensive investigation not only of oral-scribal intertexture in the form of biblical and post-biblical Israelite literature, but also of other literary cultures evidenced in the target texture, e.g. Graeco-Roman literary culture and objects, involving analysis of references/allusions, recitations, echoes, and reconfiguration of data external to the chosen text. On the other hand, chapter four will identify and analyse two other kinds of intertexture: (a) cultural intertexture and (b) social intertexture.⁵ This intertextual analysis enables us to ascertain the nature and result of processes of configuration and reconfiguration, contextualisation and recontextualisation of phenomena in the world outside the Lukan LS.

II Oral-scribal Intertexture

Here we explore Luke's rhetorical use of any external text in composing his LS. Luke 22:1-38 (WT) used other texts in four ways: (i) recitation; (ii) reconfiguration; (iii) recontextualisation; and (iv) oral-scribal echo.

révolution du langage poétique (Paris: Seuil, 1974); and Roland Barthes, "Theory of the Text," in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981): 31-47.

⁴ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 102.

⁵ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 40-68; *Tapestry*, 96-120.

A Recitation

Recitation is the use of speech or narrative from oral or written tradition, in the exact words in which the person has received the speech or narrative or in different words.⁶ For instance, Luke 4:1-13 (the temptation scene) contains three ways Luke recites texts from the OT. First, Luke 4:4 contains exact words ("One does not live by bread alone") from Deut 8:3 (LXX). Second, Luke 4:8 contains (it is written, 'worship the Lord your God, and serve him only') a recitation of Deut 6:13 in different words. Third, in Luke 4:10-11 Luke quotes Psalm 91: 11-12, while omitting some words from it. The following table displays these texts from Luke, Deuteronomy, and the Psalm.

Luke Luke 4:4 And Jesus answered him, "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'"	Deuteronomy and Psalm Deut 8:3 And he humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna, which you did not know, nor did your fathers know: that he might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but that man lives by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of the LORD.
Luke 4:8 And Jesus answered him, "It is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve.'"	Deut 6:13 You shall fear the LORD your God; you shall serve him, and swear by his name (recitation in different words in bold).
Luke 4:10 for it is written, 'He will give his angels charge of you, to guard you,' 11 and 'On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone.'"	Psalm 91:11 For he will give his angels charge of you to guard you in all your ways. 12 On their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone (the omitted words are in bold).

⁶ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 41.

Recitation was the first exercise teachers would have taught students when they composed *chreiai* (brief statements or actions aptly attributed to a specific person).⁷ Recitation in a rhetorical culture does not have to be verbatim, for a writer in a rhetorical culture views an antecedent oral-scribal text as a performance and a new performance can rework the previous text as is congenial to the writer. This kind of recitation Vernon Robbins terms recitation composition, by which he means "a writing that presupposes that sources and new compositions are performances in particular contexts."⁸ In this way internal variations among performances of the same text may be due to different argumentative, persuasive or ideological needs. All the cases of scribal recitations in the LS are Luke's recitation of Mark.⁹

The first Lukan recitation of Mark occurs in Luke 22:1-13, which recites Mark 14:1-16, with the omission of vv 3-9 (the story of the anointing at Bethany). Luke 22:1-2 corresponds to Mark 14:1-2, Luke 22:3-6 to Mark 14:10-11, and Luke 22:7-13 to Mark 14:12-16. Let us compare them section-by-section.

⁷ See Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 94-95; Vernon K. Robbins, "Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, ed. Camille Focant (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993): 120 and *Tapestry*, 103.

⁸ Vernon K. Robbins, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels," in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991): 167.

⁹ We accept Mark's priority based on the Two-Source Theory, which remains the best hypothesis for the interdependence among the Synoptic Gospels.

1. Luke 22:1-2, cf. Mark 14:1-2

Luke 22:1-2 Now the feast of Unleavened Bread drew near, which is called the Passover. And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking how to put him to death; for they feared the people.	Mark 14:1-2 It was now two days before the Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread. And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking how to arrest him by stealth, and kill him; 2 for they said, "Not during the feast, lest there be a tumult of the people."
---	---

The verbatim recitation is in bold. Luke recites the rest of this Markan narrative in his own (Luke's) words. Mark seems to separate the two feasts. Luke does not identify the two in 2:41. Exodus (12:17-20; 23:15; 34:18) shows that the Israelites continued to eat the unleavened bread of the Passover for seven days after the Passover. Technically, this seven-day period became "the feast of Unleavened Bread," and with time, all the seven or eight days became known as "Passover" (Deut 16:1-4; Ezek 45:21-25).¹⁰ Although Josephus, like Mark, still distinguished the two, like Luke in 22:1.7, he sometimes identified the two.¹¹ Another difference between Luke and Mark is that Luke changes Mark's specific dating to a more general one. Luke identifies the feast of Unleavened Bread with the Passover.¹² He corrects Mark's rather wordy description of the plan of the chief priests and the scribes to destroy Jesus. This correction changes Mark's direct speech to an indirect one. Thus in Mark the implied author permits the authorities to speak for themselves while the implied

¹⁰ See Josephus, *Antiq.* 14.2.1; 17.9.3 (William Whiston, trans. *The Works of Josephus* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987]): 366-367, 465; cited in Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 440.

¹¹ See Josephus, *Antiq.* 3.10.5 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 96); *Antiq.* 17.9.3 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 465); *Wars* 2.14.3; 5.3.1 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 616, 701); all cited in Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 439-40.

¹² For a history of the fusion of the two feasts, see de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 484-93.

author in Luke allows the narrator to make an assertion about them. But despite the noted differences in wording and narrative touch Luke 22:1-2 is still a recitation of Mark 14:1-2.

2. Luke 22:3-6, cf. Mark 14:10-11

Luke 22:3-6:

Then Satan entered into Judas called Iscariot, who was of the number of the twelve; he went away and conferred with the chief priests and officers how he might betray him to them. And they were glad, and engaged to give him money. So he agreed, and sought an opportunity to betray him to them in the absence of the multitude.

Mark 14:10-11:

Then Judas Iscariot, who was one of the twelve, went to the chief priests in order to betray him to them. And when they heard it they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought an opportunity to betray him.

The very important difference between Luke and Mark here is the Lukan Satan, who entered Judas. For Luke, Satan was responsible for the action of Judas, while for Mark Judas was responsible for his action against Jesus. This indicates a fundamental difference between Luke and Mark. While Judas' understanding of the concern of the authorities to carry out their plan away from the people is only implicit in Mark, it is explicitly stated in Luke, that is, Judas will hand Jesus over in the absence of the crowd.

3. Luke 22:7-13, cf. Mark 14:16

Luke 22:7-13

Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, on which the passover lamb had to be sacrificed. So Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, "Go and prepare the passover for us, that we may eat it." They said to him, "Where will you have us prepare it?" He said to them, "Behold, when you have entered the city, a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him into the

Mark 14:12-16

And on the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the passover lamb, his disciples said to him, "Where will you have us go and prepare for you to eat the passover?" And he sent two of his disciples, and said to them, "Go into the city, and a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him, and wherever he enters, say to the householder, 'The

house which he enters, and tell the householder. 'The Teacher says to you, Where is the guest room, where I am to eat the passover with my disciples?' And he will show you a large upper room furnished; there make ready." And they went, and found it as he had told them; and they prepared the passover.	Teacher says, Where is my guest room, where I am to eat the passover with my disciples?' And he will show you a large upper room furnished and ready; there prepare for us." And the disciples set out and went to the city, and found it as he had told them; and they prepared the passover.
---	--

There are noticeable differences here between Mark and Luke. First, in Mark it is the disciples who demand to know where the Passover would take place and the two disciples Jesus sends to prepare are unnamed. In Luke it is Jesus who takes the initiative and the two disciples are Peter and John. Second, Luke also changes the Markan order of events, namely, that it is Jesus and not the disciples who initiate the preparation for the Passover meal. This shows the Lukan Jesus is in charge of events; he does not need a reminder. Third, Mark 14:13 indicates that the feast of unleavened bread lasts more than a day, and the preparation for the feast occurred on the first day of the feast. In Luke by contrast, the reader is given the impression that the feast is a one-day affair, and the preparation occurred on the day of the feast. Additionally, while Mark states the sacrifice of the Passover lamb as a custom, Luke makes it a necessity (ἡ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα). For Luke then, the sacrifice of the Passover lamb on the feast of unleavened bread is a customary obligation that must be carried out. These characteristics of the feast found in the LS find textual support in Israelite biblical literature (see Exod. 12:13; 23:10-19; 34:18-26; Lev. 23:4-8; Ezek 45:21-24; Ezra 6:19-22) and Israelite post-biblical literature.¹³

¹³ See Josephus, *Wars*, 6.9.3 and Pesahim section of the *Talmud*. See also Herzl Theodor Gaster, *Passover: Its History and Traditions* (New York: Henry Schuman, 1949;

Above I noted Luke's omission of Mark's story of the anointing of Jesus at Bethany. This omission may be due to a similar story found earlier in Luke 7:36-50. It may be that Luke has not only reconfigured Mark 14:3-9, but has also recontextualised it. Mark's anointing at Bethany has parallels in Matt 26:6-13 and John 12:1-8. John's form of the story shares an important element with Luke's form, namely, the anointing of Jesus' feet, and not his head as Mark would have it. This may indicate evidence of a contact between the Lukan and Johannine traditions.¹⁴ The story itself in its Markan form portrays Jesus as someone who cares little about the poor; he condones wastefulness for the sake of his burial, a view that is incompatible with the Lukan Jesus, who identifies with the poor.

4. Luke 22:14, cf. Mark 14:17-18

Luke 22:14

("And when the hour came, he sat at table, and the apostles with him.")

Mark 14:17-18a

("And when it was evening he came with the twelve. And as they were at table eating. "

Again, Luke recites Mark 14:17-18a in 22:14 with some modifications. The most important change Luke makes is having "the apostles" in place of Mark's "the twelve." This is a shift from disciples (v. 11) to apostles (v. 14). As with the shift from people (v. 2)

Reprint. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1984) and Baruch M. Bokser, "Unleavened Bread and Passover, Feast of," *ABD*, vol.6, ed. Noel David Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 755-65.

¹⁴ For discussion on this, see Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 684-92; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John I-XII* (New York: Doubleday, 1966): 449-52; T. W. Bevan, "The Four Anointing," *ExpTim* 39 (28 1927): 137-39; and M.-J. Lagrange, "Jésus a-t-il été oint plusieurs fois et par plusieurs femmes?" *RB* 21 (1912): 504-32.

to crowd (v. 6), the shift here does not indicate different groups. A careful exploration of Luke's usage of the titles "the apostles" and "the Twelve" reveals that the two terms are coterminous. For instance, in Luke 6:13 and 9:1, Luke clearly equates "the apostles" with "the twelve."¹⁵ This is also the case in Acts 6:1-6.¹⁶

Mark describes the functions of the twelve Jesus has chosen as, "to be with him, and to be sent out to preach and have authority to cast out demons" (Mark 3:14-15). On the other hand, the Lukan Jesus called twelve of his followers and named them apostles (Luke 6:13). By naming the twelve "apostles" the Lukan Jesus indicates their function.¹⁷ The twelve that Jesus calls are functionally apostles (those who are sent). This suggests that Luke uses the title "apostles" when he wants to underscore the function of the twelve. Luke, in using the title in 22:14, seeks to draw attention to their role, and to prepare the reader for Acts 1:1-26 where Luke explicitly defines their role as ἐπισκοπή (function), διακονία (service, ministry), and ἀποστολή (mission) [Acts 1: 17, 20, 25].

Additionally, we have argued above that "the eyewitnesses and ministers" that Luke talks about in his preface include the apostles. This means that for Luke the apostles at the LS are there to be witnesses to Jesus' action and word. This is very important for Luke

¹⁵ For a careful analysis of Luke 6:12-16, see Fitzmyer, *Luke I-LX*, 613-20. See also John P. Meier, "The Circle of the Twelve: Did It Exist During Jesus' Public Ministry?" *JBL* 116.4 (1997): 641-42.

¹⁶ See the use of "the twelve" in Luke 8:1; 9:1,12; 18:31; 22:3,47; Acts 6:2; "the apostles" in Luke 6:13; 9:10; 11:49; 17:5; 22:14; 24:10; but 29 times in the Acts between 1:2 and 16:4.

¹⁷ See Hans Dieter Betz, "Apostle," *ABD*, vol. 1, ed. Noel David Freedman, (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 309.

rhetorically since his narrative is based on what the apostles as eyewitnesses have transmitted. He must show their presence at the events that make up the story in order to persuade Theophilus of the certainty of “the things that have been accomplished among us”(1:1).

5. Luke 22:17-19a, cf. Mark 14:22-25

Another Lukan recitation of Mark is Luke 22:17-19a, which recites Mark 14:22-25:¹⁸

Luke 22:17-19a

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body."

Mark 14:22-25

And as they were eating, he took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them, and said, "Take; this is my body." And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

It may be argued if this is not more properly categorised as reconfiguration: we think it is a fusion of recitation and reconfiguration. The recitation features additions and omissions of certain words and phrases. In place of Mark's report of the action of the twelve "they all drank of it," Luke provides Jesus' saying "This is my body" along with enthymematic elaboration signifying that what Jesus says is more important for Luke than what the apostles do. Luke also omits the whole of Mark 14: 24 ("This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many"), an omission that is in line with Luke's resistance

¹⁸ But structurally Luke here reconfigures Mark; this can be seen from the Lukan cup-bread order.

to the notion of Jesus' death as a ransom for many. For Luke Jesus dies a righteous martyr's death (see Luke 23: 47).¹⁹ Luke's "until the kingdom of God comes" anticipates vv. 29-30, where Jesus promises dining in the kingdom as part of the apostles' reward for faithfulness. For Mark's blessing over the bread (Mark 14: 22), Luke has thanksgiving, which agrees perfectly well with the thanksgiving over the cup (v. 17). Luke 22: 18 recites Mark 14:25 as a rationale for giving the cup to the apostles.

In the foregoing we have explored Luke's use of previous texts, either in exact words or in Luke's own words. Luke's recitation of Mark, even in a modified form, confirms Luke's connection with literary tradition about Jesus as he has intimated to the narratee Theophilus in the preface. Luke's intention to write an orderly account is exemplified when he changes the Markan order of events (Luke 22:7-13 // Mark 14:12-16).

Luke's recitation of Mark may have been influenced by a rhetorical culture of recitation composition, which we mentioned at the beginning of this section. For instance, the agreements and differences among three accounts by Plutarch of Alexander's refusal to run in the footrace at Olympia show some correlation with the similarities and differences we have noted between Luke 22:1-19a, 22 and Mark 14:10-25.²⁰

¹⁹ See also Bart D. Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread," 576-91 and *A Historical Introduction*, 109, 110.

²⁰ Robbins has shown that certain differences among the Synoptics are consistent with rhetorical culture of which Plutarch's three accounts of Alexander's refusal to run at the Olympia are examples. See, Robbins, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels," in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991): 149-155.

Moralia 179D: Being nimble and swiftfooted, when he was appealed to by his father to run at the Olympic footrace, he said: "indeed, if I were to have kings as competitors."²¹	Alexander 4:10 In contrast, when those around him inquired whether he would be willing to compete in the Olympic footrace, for he was swift-footed, he said: "if I were to have kings as competitors."²²	Moralia 331B: Since he was the swiftest of foot of the young men of his age, and his comrades urged him to enter at Olympia, he asked if kings were competing. And when they replied in the negative, he said that the contest was unfair in which a victory would be over commoners, but a defeat would be a defeat would be the defeat of a king.²³
---	---	--

The differences in the three recitations are obvious. For instance, they do not agree on who appealed to Alexander to run at the Olympic footrace. In *Moralia* 179D it was his father, but in *Alexander* 4:10 it was "those around him," while in *Moralia* 331B it was his comrades. Again while both *Moralia* 179D and *Alexander* 4:10 quote Alexander's response, *Moralia* 331B narrates his response by way of question and answer. In spite of these differences, it is doubtless that the three versions are about the same event, namely that when some person/persons appealed to Alexander to run at the Olympia he said he

²¹ Plutarch, *Moralia*, vol. 3 (ed. F. C. Babbitt [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968]): 55; cited in Robbins, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act," 149-150.

²² Plutarch, *Lives*, vol. 7: *Alexander* 666D (ed. Bernadotte Perrin [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919]): 232-233; cited in Robbins, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act," 149-150.

²³ Plutarch, *Moralia*, vol. 4 (ed. F. C. Babbitt [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968]): 407-409; cited in Robbins, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act," 149-150.

would only do so if kings were also competitors. Also, they witness to Alexander's running ability. A similar scenario emerges in our comparison of Luke 22:1-19a, 22 and Mark 14:10-25.²⁴ It is thus possible that Luke's recitations of Mark has been influenced by a rhetorical culture where a recitation of an antecedent story, both oral and written, is understood as another performance. As well Luke's literary activity here is similar to Qumran literary compositional activities, which Geza Vermes appropriately characterised as "scribal creative freedom."²⁵

B Reconfiguration

Reconfiguration concerns the restructuring of a previous event or antecedent tradition. Both recitation and recontextualisation may be part of the reconfiguration of the antecedent event or tradition. Reconfiguration is an instance of a rhetorical imitation of other texts or similar situation. The ability to reconfigure a previous situation in composition is a mark of the creativity of the rhetor. A good example of reconfiguration is Luke 4:1-2, which restructures the context of Exod 34:28 and that of 1 Kgs 19:18.

Luke 4:1-2	Exodus 34:28	1 Kings 19:8
And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit for forty days in the wilderness, tempted by the	And he was there with the LORD forty days and forty nights; he neither ate bread nor drank water. And he wrote upon the tables the	And he arose, and ate and drank, and went in the strength of that food forty days and forty nights to Horeb the mount of God.

²⁴ For an exploration of a possible correspondence between recitation composition and Synoptic variations, see Robbins, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels," 142-68.

²⁵ See Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997): 23.

devil. And he ate nothing in those days; and when they were ended, he was hungry.	words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments.
---	---

Luke reconfigures the context in which Moses receives the Law, while evoking the image of Elijah's flight to the wilderness.²⁶ Similarly, we can detect in Luke's birth narratives (Luke 1-2) a reconfiguration of different OT traditions of the birth stories and prayers, for instance the birth of Isaac in Genesis and Hannah's prayer of thanksgiving in 1 Sam 2:1-10.²⁷ This Lukan tendency of reconfiguring different traditions into one tradition is also evident in his LS text.

It is our thesis that in composing his LS Luke reconfigures Mark's LS by incorporating other traditions. This accounts for certain of the dissimilarities between Luke's LS and Mark's LS. Luke's restructuring of Mark's LS is apparent in Luke 22:14-38 (WT); the most obvious of this reconfiguration is the discourse that follows the meal portion of the LS. The meal portion (Luke 22:14-22) [WT] also contains a restructuring of Mark 14:17-26. In Mark, the order of events is: meal begins; Jesus foretells his betrayal; Jesus blesses and breaks bread; Jesus gives thanksgiving over a cup; and a closing song follows. In Luke, on the other hand, the order is: a speech by Jesus, cup, bread, and the foretelling of the betrayal. For Luke then the foretelling of the betrayal happens after and not during the meal as Mark has it. In this, Luke agrees with John (13:17-20). The meaning

²⁶ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 107.

²⁷ For a detailed analysis of Luke's use of OT traditions in his birth stories, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (New York: Doubleday, 1993).

effect of this reordering is that in Luke, unlike in Mark, it is certain that Judas is with the group through the meal scene.

Perhaps the more noticeable restructuring is the order of the bread and the cup. Luke's cup-bread order differs from the Markan bread-cup order. Possibly Luke is reconfiguring a different tradition than Mark's. The *Didache*, a second century document, has the Lukan order.²⁸ Paul also may be aware of this order (1 Cor 10: 16). With the *Didache* and 1 Cor 10:16 Luke appears to be reconfiguring an oral tradition concerning the cup-bread order while verbally reciting Mark. The parallel between Luke and the *Didache* concerning the cup-bread order indicates both Luke and the *Didache* probably drew on a common or similar source. The following table shows how Luke, Paul, and the *Didache* agree against Mark.

Luke 22:17-19a	1 Cor 10	Mark 14:22-25	Didache 9:1-4
And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." 19 And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave	The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?	And as they were eating, he took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them, and said, "Take; this is my body." 23 And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. 24 And he said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which	Concerning the Eucharist, give thanks thus: 2. First, concerning the cup: We thank you our father, for the holy vine, David, your child, which you have made known to us through Jesus your child; to you be glory forever. 3. Concerning the broken bread: We thank you our father, for the life and knowledge which you gave us through Jesus your child; to you be glory forever. 4. As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains and then brought together and made one, so let your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom, for yours is the

²⁸ See *The Didache*, IX.

it to them. saying, "This is my body."	is poured out for many. 25 Truly, I say to you. I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."	glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.
--	---	--

As the above table shows the text from Paul and the *Didache* agree with Luke's not only in the cup-bread order, but in the kind of prayer pronounced over the elements of cup and bread as well, namely, a prayer of thanksgiving. This differs from Mark, who has bread-cup order and a blessing over the bread and thanksgiving over the cup. Furthermore, Luke, the *Didache*, and 1 Cor. 10 parallel the Israelite *Kiddush*, which features cup-bread blessing before the meal. Enrico Mazza believes the *Kiddush* is the source of *Didache* 9.²⁹ The above scenario, then, suggests that Luke reconfigures Mark 14:22-25 (we accept Markan priority) by incorporating the tradition found in 1 Cor. 10 and the *Didache*.

In the discourse following the meal portion (Luke 22:24-38), Luke continues his restructuring of Mark. This portion of Luke's LS combines both recitation and recontextualisation in reconfiguring Mark. The context of Luke 22:24-27 clearly differs from the context of Mark 9: 33-36, 46-48. Also Luke 22:31-32 (prediction of denial) belongs to a different context than Mark 14:27-31; in Luke it is still at the dining room, whereas in Mark it is at the Mount of Olives. Luke also evokes a tradition that he shares with Matthew (22: 28-30; Matt 19:28). Luke in 22:35-38 evokes the context of Isa 53. Here

²⁹ See Mazza, *The Origin of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans Ronald E. Lane (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1995): 43.

we have another evidence of a mixture of recitation and recontextualisation. The following table shows a graphic comparison of the structures of Luke's LS and Mark's. This table shows clearly that Luke departs from Mark's configuration of the LS.

Luke	Mark:
1. Speech from Jesus	1. Meal
2. Thanksgiving over cup	2. Foretelling of handover
3. Thanksgiving and breaking of bread	3. Blessing and breaking of bread
4. Foretelling of handover	4. Thanksgiving over cup
5. Dispute about greatness	5. Closing song.
6. Reward for the apostles	
7. Prediction of denial	
8. Prediction of future trouble.	

John's version of the LS lacks what traditional commentators call "the institution text." Yet a closer look at the Johannine account of the LS reveals that it shares some affinities in structure, concept, and themes with Luke's LS. The most significant of these is a farewell speech after Jesus' last meal with his followers in both Luke and John, though in a more developed form in John. This agrees with the view of Julius Schniewind that a common tradition between Luke and John is often found "in fuller, more satisfactory form in John than in Luke."³⁰

An attentive comparison of the two accounts also reveals thematic agreements between them. For instance, in both accounts the Satan reportedly enters Judas for the purpose of handing over Jesus to those who seek to destroy him (Luke 22:3-6; John 13:2).

³⁰ Julius Schniewind, *Die Parallelerikopen bei Lukas und Johannes* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1958): 63-64, cited in Moody D. Smith, *John Among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth-Century Research*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992): 90.

27). In this way, both blame the action of Judas on the evil one. Also Jesus in both accounts uses his action at table to instruct his apostles on leadership as service of others (Luke 22:24-27; John 13:13-16);³¹ in Luke it is service at table, while it is foot washing in John. Both present Jesus as assuring the apostles of a place in his kingdom (Luke 22:28-30; John 14:1-3); in Luke it is the reward of the apostles' faithfulness, while in John it is to settle their troubled heart. In both cases the promise is meant to reassure the apostles/disciples that they will not be separated from Jesus in spite of his departure.³² Luke also shares with John the foretelling of the betrayer only after the meal (Luke 22:21-22; John 13: 21).

Furthermore, they both portray Jesus as fully in charge of the events at the LS. They both underline the nearness of Jesus' departure, though more explicit in John than in Luke (Luke 22:35-38; John 14:25-31). The "but now" of Luke has a similar meaning-effect as John's "I will no longer talk much with you." Luke's "it is enough" brings closure to the discourse in the same way that John's "Rise, let us go hence" brings the LS to a close.³³ Both Luke and John (Luke 22:35-38; John 14:25-31) indicate that Jesus departs the LS to struggle with the prince of this world; Luke makes this as explicit as John in 22:53. The following table shows the thematic and structural agreement between Luke and John.

Luke	John
1. Satan enters Judas (22:3)	1. Devil enters Judas (13:2, 27)
2. Meal time (22: 17-19a)	2. Meal time (13:2-3)
3. Foretelling of handover (22: 21-22)	3. Foretelling of handover

³¹ See Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John XII-XXI*, AB 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1970): 557.

³² See Brown, *John XII-XXI*, 557.

³³ See Brown, *John XII-XXI*, 656.

4. Leadership as service (22:24-27)	4. Leadership as service (13:13-16)
5. Promise of place in the kingdom (22:28-30) apostles	5. Promise of place in the kingdom (14:1-3)
6. Prediction of denial (22:31-34)	6. Prediction of denial (13:36-38)
7. Prediction of troubled future (22:35-38)	7. Prediction of troubled future (John 14-17)
8. Imminent departure (22:35-38).	8. Imminent departure (14:25-31).

This parallel is absent from the Markan LS. And of the eight corresponding themes only 2 and 3 feature within Mark's LS. These similarities lend credence to the view of F. Lamar Cribbs that Luke tends to depart from Markan tradition at points where it is contradicted or called into question by John.³⁴ Furthermore, the convergence between Luke and John suggests that they both drew on a similar tradition, but in a more developed form in John. These parallels between Luke and John indicate that Luke, in crafting his LS reconfigures the Markan account by using other traditions, one of which is the tradition he shares with John.

C Recontextualisation

Another form of scribal intertexture evident in the Lukan LS is recontextualisation. Recontextualisation concerns the use of wording from other texts without acknowledging that the words exist somewhere else. Different forms of intertextual recontextualisation are a common feature of "both oral and written compositions in a rhetorical culture."³⁵ A good

³⁴ See F. Lamar Cribbs, "St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition," *JBL* 90 (1971): 426; cited in Smith, *John Among the Gospels*, 100;

³⁵ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 48 and "Writing in Plutarch and the Gospels," 157-68.

example of recontextualisation occurs in Luke 2: 29-32. This Lukan text recontextualises a combination of texts from Isaiah (52:10; 46: 13; 42: 6; 49:6):

Luke 2:29-32	Isaiah
"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared in the presence of all peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and for glory to thy people Israel."	The LORD has bared his holy arm before the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. 46:13 I bring near my deliverance, it is not far off, and my salvation will not tarry; I will put salvation in Zion, for Israel my glory." 42:6 "I am the LORD, I have called you in righteousness, I have taken you by the hand and kept you; I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations. 49:6 he says: "It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth."

A recontextualisation could be a clear recitation that has been recontextualised by reason of its rewording, expansion, and placement.³⁶ A good example of this form of recontextualisation is Luke 4:18-19. This text recites and recontextualises Isa 61:1-2.

Luke 4:18-19	Isaiah 61:1-2
"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, 19 to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."	The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted; he has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; 2 to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all who mourn.

³⁶ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 48.

This is a clear recitation of Isaiah that Luke has placed in a new context. In the context of Isaiah's ministry, the prophet claims to have been called and anointed by the Lord in order to carry out the listed assignments. But in its Lukan context, not only does the Lukan Jesus claim to have been called and anointed for the same reason as Isaiah, the statement also becomes a prophecy that is being fulfilled in Jesus.

1. Luke 22: 37, cf. Isa 53:12

Luke 22:37 is a recitation of a portion of Isa 53:12 (he was numbered among the lawless). Although Luke indicates the words exist in scripture, it is also a recontextualisation because of its placement.

Luke 22:37 For I tell you, this scripture must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was counted among the lawless;' and indeed what is written about me is being fulfilled.	Isa 53:12 LXX Therefore he shall inherit many, and he shall divide the spoil of the mighty; because his soul was delivered to death: and he was numbered among the transgressors; and he bore the sins of many, and was delivered because of their iniquities
---	--

The parallel statements are in bold. Luke only recites a statement in Isa 53:12. The recited statement forms the first of a two-part rationale for the assertion in Luke 22: 36. Here Jesus seeks to impress on the apostles that his departure is indeed near and to invite them to begin to think of how they will take care of themselves, because he will soon depart. The second fulfilment statement in v.37b, which is the second part of the rationale, heightens the nearness of his departure. The wording from Isa 53 was given as part of the rationale for the reward of the servant; it is not a prophecy about the servant. In other words, the servant would be rewarded because he had already been "numbered with the lawless." But Luke has treated it as a prophecy, though not about Jesus, in order to

underscore the nearness of Jesus' departure and the nature of his offence. In this way, Luke has recontextualised language from Isaiah in a way that prepares the reader for the offence with which Jesus will be charged. This gives the narrative a forward-looking movement and puts the reader in suspense. Luke expands the meaning effect of the Isaiah wording by putting it within two fulfilment statements in order to show that Jesus' departure is a done deal.

2. Luke 22:21-22, cf. Mark 14:18b, 22

Luke 22:22 is a recited recontextualisation of Mark 14:21 (the foretelling of the betrayal of Jesus) by reason of its placement in Luke.

Luke 22:21-22 But behold the hand of him who betrays me is with me on the table. For the Son of man goes as it has been determined; but woe to that man by whom he is betrayed!"	Mark 14:18b, 21 Jesus said, "Truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me, one who is eating with me." For the Son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born."
--	---

The differences are in bold print. In place of Mark's γέγραπται ("it is written") Luke has ὡρισμένον ("It has been determined"). This change is significant, and we shall discuss it at greater length in our chapter on sacred texture, but it is enough to mention that while Mark sends his reader searching ἡ γραφή for where "it is written," Luke's reader must ask: who has determined it? Grammatically, Luke uses the resumptive pronoun "he" instead of Mark's "the son of man." While Luke retains the woe of Mark, he omits the curse: It would have been better for that man if he had not been born. Luke often avoids presenting Jesus in a bad light; he tends to cushion or tone down what is considered Mark's raw presentation of

Jesus. Compare, for example, Mark 11:15-17 and Luke 19:45-46, the cleansing of the temple. Again, Luke omits Mark 11:12-14//Matt 21:18-19, perhaps to tone down the notion that Jesus' action in the temple is triggered by his apparent hunger and anger at the fruitless fig tree.

Besides the differences in wordings, its placement in Luke gives added meaning effects, such as the inclusion of Judas. For instance, while it is certain that Judas was present at the thanksgiving over bread and wine in Luke, it is uncertain in Mark.

3. Luke 22:24-27, cf. Mark 9:34; 10:42-45

Luke 22:24-27 also recontextualises Mark 9:34 and Mark 10:42-45).

Luke 22:24-27 A dispute also arose among them, which of them was to be regarded as the greatest. And he said to them, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you; rather let the greatest among you become as the youngest, and the leader as one who serves. For which is the greater, one who sits at table, or one who serves? Is it not the one who sits at table? But I am among you as one who serves	Mark 9:34; 10:42-45 9:34: But they were silent; for on the way they had discussed with one another who was the greatest. 10:42-45: And Jesus called them to him and said to them, "You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many."
---	--

Luke 22: 24 is clearly both a recitation and a recontextualisation of Mark 9:34. It is also a summary recitation of Mark 10:35-41. In the same way, vv. 25 and 26 are a recitation of Mark 10: 42-44 almost totally in Luke's own words. For Mark's "rulers," Luke has "kings," which agrees with his rhetorical use of repetition of kingship terms. In place of Mark's "tyrants" Luke has "benefactors"; the former is negative and derogatory, while the

latter is, on the surface, positive. Luke 22: 27 recites Mark 10:45 in his own words in order to avoid the notion of Jesus giving “his life as a ransom for many.” This indicates Luke’s pattern of reworking Mark to avoid a notion he does not share with Mark. Mark makes no explicit reference to dining, and moves from serving to saving, a movement from the social to the sacred or from pure ethics to the sacred. On the other hand Luke remains purely at the social level. And because of this difference some scholars think Luke’s version is more original; that is, Luke is independent of Mark here.³⁷ In Mark 10:45 the Markan Jesus expressly states himself as a saviour by reason of his sacrificial death. But for Luke, as we have insisted, the death of Jesus is not salvific; for Luke Jesus is saviour not by his death, but through his healing activities, restoration of the downtrodden, the marginalized, the lowly to full humanity.³⁸ This is why Mary celebrates “God my saviour” (1:47); Zechariah speaks of God who has raised a mighty saviour (1:69) in order that “we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all who hate us” (1:71); the angel announces Jesus a saviour (2:11); and Simeon confesses that his eyes “have seen your salvation” (2:30). In Acts those who call on the name of the Lord shall be saved (2:21); “the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved” (2:47). All these we subsume under

³⁷ See John N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990): 46–48.

³⁸ For a recent treatment of Luke’s notion of salvation relative to salvation in antiquity, see Ben Witherington, “Salvation and Health in Christian Antiquity: The Soteriology of Luke in Its First Century Setting,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, eds. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998): 145–66.

“restoration of the sick to wholeness.” That is what divinely wrought salvation in antiquity is, at least in part, understood to be all about.³⁹

In reciting Mark, Luke also changes the context; it is thus a mixture of recitation and recontextualisation. The context of Mark 10:42–44 is Mark 10:35–41, which concerns the request of James and John, the sons of Zebedee, to Jesus, “to sit, one at your right hand and on at your left, in your glory” (v. 37). The other ten apostles “began to be indignant at James and John” when they heard the two brothers’ request. According to Mark, this prompted Jesus’ remark in vv.42–44. Although Mark mentions the indignation of the other apostles, he does not say they were arguing about who was the greatest; this he has reported earlier in his narrative (9:33–36).

The context of this Markan text in Luke is the LS at which Jesus bequeathes his legacy to the apostles. The Lukan Jesus’ prediction of his death (22:15–20) [WT] and prediction of the one who would hand him over (22:21–22) are the immediate narrative context for the dispute about greatness. Like Mark, Luke also has two accounts of dispute among the apostles, the first being 9:46–48. As in Mark’s first account of it, in Luke’s first account Jesus used a child as an example of the least who should aspire to greatness. But unlike Mark who says, “If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant (δίακονος) of all” (9:35), Luke has, “for he who is least among you all is the one who is great” (9:48b). Luke does not mention διάκονος. While children may be an example of the least and the humble in society, it is hard to see how they can be an example of leadership

³⁹ See Joel B. Green, “‘Salvation to the End of the Earth’ (Acts 13:47): God as Saviour in the Acts of Apostles,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998): 88.

as service of others. Luke probably also reserves the servant motif for the LS, where Jesus could portray himself as an example par excellence of a leader who serves, in order to underline its significance.

D Oral-scribal Echo

Oral-scribal echoes are subtle and indirect evocations of a previous text. They may, in fact, be so indirect and subtle that one person may hear it while another may not; even the author may not be aware of it.

1. Luke 22:21, cf. Ps 41:9; 55:12-13

Luke 22:21 echoes two texts from the Psalms:

Luke 22:21	Psalm
But see, the one who betrays me is with me, and his hand is on the table.	41:9 Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me. 55:12 It is not enemies who taunt me, I could bear that: it is not adversaries who deal insolently with me, I could hide from them. 55:13 But it is you, my equal, my companion, my familiar friend.

John, unlike Luke, recites Psalm 41:9 and makes it clear that the words are from another written text (John 13:18: I am not speaking of all of you; I know whom I have chosen. But it is to fulfil the scripture, **“The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me.”**). Psalm 55 appears to be a prayer of one in despair as everyone seems to be against him even in his sick bed; everyone wishes him dead (vv. 5-8). Even his trusted friend, who ate bread with him, also is against him (v. 9). To say his trusted friend is against him has the rhetorical effect of showing how desperate he is. In effect, he is saying, Every person is against me. But the Lord helped him to triumph over his enemies. Luke

uses only verse 9 to show that his betrayer is a companion, and not an enemy. Psalm 41:5-8 is suitable for Luke because he knows that not every person is against him (the Eleven and other disciples are still with him). And he avoids mentioning the authorities that really are against Jesus, possibly in order to avoid portraying Jesus as desperate or as a victim. Thus while the psalmist uses Ps 41:9 to portray his desperation and aloneness, Luke uses it to intensify the nature of Judas' action, which also heightens the difference between Judas' eating with Jesus on the same table and the action he is about to take against Jesus.⁴⁰ Additionally, Luke characterises Jesus as one who still invites Judas to table even as Judas contemplates handing him over.

This echo further evidences the Lukan stress on Jesus' inclusive tendency. Sociologically, eating together creates a social bond. Exclusion from table severs relationship, just as refusal to dine together severs that relationship (cf. 1 Sam 20:34). Society does not expect people who dine together to turn against each other. The friend of the Psalmist who turns against him may have stopped dining with him before he turns his back against him. But in Jesus' case, Judas is at table with him even though he has concluded to hand Jesus over. That makes it more tragic than the situation of the Psalmist.

Of the synoptic accounts of the role of Judas Iscariot in the death of Jesus, only the Matthean version is thought to have some connection with some OT textual versions of events. This connection is seen in Matthew's thirty pieces of silver, and Judas' wish not to be responsible for innocent blood (23:34-35). Raymond Brown, for instance, thinks

⁴⁰ See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1409.

Matthew's thirty pieces of silver echoes Zech 11:12, while Matt 23:34-35 (Judas' desire not to be responsible for Jesus' blood), echoes Deut 21:9; 27:25.⁴¹ Brown does not say if Matthew's thirty pieces of silver also echoes the twenty pieces of silver of Gen 37:26-28, though he notes that Judas Iscariot has the same name as Judah, who persuaded his brothers to sell Joseph.⁴² The only connection Brown draws here is Judah's desire to sell Joseph rather than shed his blood, just as Judas Iscariot does not want to be responsible for Jesus' blood.

In our view, Judas' role in the death of Jesus in the canonical gospels does echo the story of Joseph's sale into Egypt. Although we should not exaggerate the popularity of the name Yehudah, nonetheless, as William Klassen observes, "it is important to note that the name may have made it easier for those who handed on the Gospel traditions to recall certain parallels and analogies to the life of the patriarch Judah, especially the role he played in handing over Joseph to the Egyptians."⁴³ Since Luke, like the other Synoptics, knows the tradition of the twelve tribes, it is not implausible that he also knows of Judah's role in handing over Joseph to the Egyptians. The divergences in the smaller details aside, the evangelists converge on the bigger picture, namely, that one of the twelve handed over Jesus and that all the eleven denied Jesus, just as the eleven brothers of Joseph, including probably Benjamin, his full brother, denied Joseph. Is it then farfetched to suggest that through Judas' action in concert with Israelite authorities, and the denial of Jesus by the

⁴¹ See Brown, *New Testament*, 200.

⁴² See *New Testament*, 201, no. 69.

⁴³ *Judas: Betrayer or Friend of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996): 31.

other apostles. Israel again has handed over its own? Judas led Israel to hand over Jesus to the Romans; Judah led the emerging Israel to hand over Joseph to the Egyptians.⁴⁴

2. Luke 22:31-34, cf. Job 1:6-12

Another oral-scribal echo is found in Luke 22:31-34, which foretells the denial of Peter and the other apostles. This prediction echoes a scene in the book of Job (1:6-12), in which the Satan obtains permission from God to test Job's faithfulness. God allows the Satan to test Job, but requires him to spare Job's life (All that he has is in your power; only do not stretch out your hand against him):

Luke 22:31-34	1:6-12 Job
"Simon, listen! Satan has demanded to sift all of you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your own faith may not fail; and you, when once you have turned back, strengthen your brothers." And he said to him, "Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death!" Jesus said, "I tell you, Peter, the cock will not crow this day, until you have denied three times that you know me."	One day the heavenly beings came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan also came among them. The Lord said to Satan, "Where have you come from?" Satan answered the Lord, "From going to and fro on the earth, and from walking up and down on it." The Lord said to Satan, "Have you considered my servant Job? There is no one like him on the earth, a blameless and upright man who fears God and turns away from evil." Then Satan answered the Lord, "Does Job fear God for nothing? Have you not put a fence around him and his house and all that he has, on every side? You have blessed the work of his hands, and his possessions have increased in the land. But stretch out your hand now, and touch all that he has, and he will curse you to your face." The Lord said to Satan, "Very well, all that he has is in your power; only do not stretch out your hand against him!" So Satan went out from the presence of the Lord.

⁴⁴ Furthermore, this scribal echo indicates a typological connection between the denial of Joseph by his brothers and the denial of Jesus by his disciples. One should also reckon with the fact that there are two levels of παραδίδομι, namely Judas handed Jesus over to the Israelite authorities, and the Israelite authorities in turn handed Jesus over to the Romans to crucify and kill. The manner of Israel's responsibility for the death of Jesus is clear when in Acts 2:23 Peter accuses the Israelites of crucifying and killing Jesus by the hands of lawless people, namely, the Romans. The word ἀνατίθω appears in both Luke 22:2 and Acts 2:23.

Whereas Job narrates a dialogue between God and the Satan, Luke simply reports the outcome of the discussion: the phrase “Satan has demanded” suggests a prior dialogue between Satan and Jesus. All the apostles are to be tested, but Jesus requests only that Peter be spared so that his faith may not fail because he has to strengthen his brothers. Thus there seems to be a correlation between the demand to spare the two leaders. Job is to have all he has lost back; Peter is to bring all his brothers back to faith. We already know that in spite of Jesus’ prayer for Peter, Peter did indeed deny him. But the rhetorical effect of this prediction is Luke’s resolve to show Jesus’ foreknowledge of coming events, in much the same way the narrator of Job not only let God have a foreknowledge of Job’s misfortune, but also allowed God to approve of the Satan’s plan.

While the narrator in Job gives reason for Job’s misfortune, however, there is no hint as to why the Satan has demanded to sift the apostles. The word ἐξήγησάτο as an aorist middle may imply that the Satan demanded for his own sake to sift the apostles. Jesus, then, may be seen as granting the Satan’s request in much the same way God grants the Satan’s request to test Job. In this way the Lukan Jesus who resisted the Satan’s temptation at the beginning of his ministry (Luke 4:1-13), now has to succumb to the Satan’s demand. In any case Luke does signal that the Satan would return at the opportune time (4:13). The Satan returns by first taking possession of Judas for the purpose of handing Jesus over; the same Satan also obtains permission to sift the other eleven apostles so that Jesus is really by himself at this critical moment. The import of Job’s text is to show that God is not directly responsible for Job’s misfortune, just as Luke attempts to exculpate the apostles, including Judas, for denying Jesus: in both cases the Satan is responsible.

3. Farewell Speech

An interesting feature of Luke 22: 7-38 (WT) is its echo of the tradition of farewell speech by a departing leader textualised in some scenes in (a) Genesis, (b) Deuteronomy, (c) Joshua, (d) I Kings, and (e) Maccabees. These are scenes featuring speeches of departing leaders (e.g. Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, and Mattathias). We may now briefly compare these scenes with the Lukan LS: ⁴⁵

Luke 22:7-38 (WT):	OT scenes
Introduction (vv.7-14)	Gen 48 & 49 (Jacob's will)
Prediction of death (vv. 15, 16, 18)	Prediction of death (48:21) to Joseph alone
Prediction of future (vv. 16, 18)	Named leader (Joseph)
Exhortation and Legacy (vv. 24-27)	Appropriate message to each son/tribe (49:28) twelve tribes
Successor confirmed (vv. 28-30, 32, 35-36)	Prediction of death to all (49:29)
Acts 20: 17-35	Commission--specify his burial place. (Note, no commission to keep the law.)
Review of the past (vv. 17-21)	Deut 31-34 (Moses' farewell)
Prediction of death (vv.22-25)	Prediction of death (31:2) announced by God (31:14/16)
Exhortation (vv. 26-28)	Names successor (31:3-Joshua)
Prediction of future trouble (vv. 29-31)	Commission of Joshua (31)
Commendation to God's protection (v. 32)	Jos 23 & 24 (Joshua's farewell)
Legacy (vv. 33-35)	Prediction of death--I am old and advanced in years (23:2)
	Ideal behaviour urged--keep the Law of Moses (23:13)
	Prediction of attack
	Commission--keep the covenant, serve the Lord completely (historical intertexture--Joshua reminds them of God's goodness)

⁴⁵ William Kurz and Donald Senior have noted Luke's possible use of these scenes. See Kurz, "Luke 22: 14-38," 264 and Senior, *The Passion of Jesus*, 54.

to them [24:1-15]).

1 Kgs 2:1-10 (David's will to Solomon)

Announcement of death

Ideal behaviour urged--keep the Law

Assurance of continuity (you shall always have someone on the throne of Israel)

Commission: a/ revenge on Abner who wrongs him--you must not allow him to go down the grave in peaceful old age (vv.5-

7b=historical intertexture); b/ be good to the sons of Barzillai (have them eat at your table [v. 7b]); c/ punish Shimei.

1 Ma 2:49-70 (Mattathias' will)

Prediction of death is reported, not announced by Mattathias himself

Ideal behaviour urged--keep the Law

Leader is named (Simeon is named leader/father; Judas

Maccabeus is to take charge of the army)

Commission--pay back the Gentile what they deserve; observe the precepts of the Law.

The above scenes exhibit some significant features of a typical farewell speech, namely, prediction of death, appointment of a leader, ideal behaviour urged, and commission. Part of the commissioning above is in form of revenge on both actual and perceived enemy. Prediction of future attack, a prominent feature in the Lukan LS, is implied in these previous scenes only in the commissioning to revenge. This of course is consonant with the presentation of the personages in their respective stories. None of them (Jacob, Moses, Joshua, David, and Mattathias) possesses super-human knowledge; their

only item of prediction is their death. Another significant feature of a farewell speech, which is present in all of the above OT farewell speeches, is a brief review of the past as an aid towards commissioning and urging good behaviour.

Luke's text, however, differs significantly from these scenes in one respect, the featuring of a meal scene. William Kurz cannot be certain on which of the above scenes Luke is directly dependent.⁴⁶ In our view Luke seems to be aware that all these scribal scenes are different performances of the same cultural script. Hence, his is yet another performance: Acts 20:17-38 is another Lukan performance of it. But this does not make the Lukan LS less than a farewell discourse. While it is clear that the Markan Jesus and the twelve had a meal, it is not so clear in Luke. Luke's omission of Mark's "as they were eating" (Mark 14:22) lends credence to my view. In fact the so-called meal portion of the Luke 22:1-38 (WT), namely vv. 14-21 (WT), features Jesus' prediction of his death, one of the formal characteristics of a farewell discourse. Neyrey is correct then when he observes that the prediction of Jesus' imminent death begins in vv. 15-18.⁴⁷

Luke probably knows of no departing leader who holds a dinner at which the leader gives his parting words to his successors, but by scripting the LS as a farewell discourse he underlines the role of meals in the ministry of Jesus. It also helps Luke to present Jesus as a leader who serves at table, a theme that later becomes part of Jesus' parting words to the apostles. In this way, Luke seeks to reconfigure service at table. The meal setting also helps to heighten Judas' action against Jesus, just as it points up Jesus' inclusiveness, a

⁴⁶ See Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38," 252.

⁴⁷ See Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 1985): 15.

characteristic of the meals of Jesus in Luke. This supports our thesis that the Lukan LS (WT) is not concerned with the institution of any ritual meal, but with inclusiveness and leadership as service of others. In other words, Luke advocates a local enactment of common human realities of leadership and companionship. This analysis shows a positive correlation between the farewell portion of Luke's LS and Israelite farewell tradition.

III. Summary

In this chapter we explored the intertexture of the Lukan LS text, which shows that from the perspective of socio-rhetorical analysis there are four ways a text may use antecedent texts, oral or written, namely, recitation, reconfiguration, recontextualisation, and oral-scribal echo. This analysis reveals how Luke in composing his LS has reworked specific oral as well as written traditions. Our analysis indicates that Luke 22:7-38 (WT) refers to Mark directly. There are reconfigurations and recontextualisations of certain traditions that are not found in Mark, for instance, the *Didache* and John. Luke's agreement with 1 Cor, John, and the *Didache* allow us to conclude that all four must have drawn on and reconfigured similar traditions.

The elaboration pattern embedded in the Lukan LS indicates that Luke has drawn on Greco-Roman textual traditions, e.g. rhetorical handbooks and exercises, novels and commentaries. For instance, there was a book, now lost, called *On the Character of the Ten Orators*, which Caecilius of Calacte wrote at the end of 1 BCE, and there is also among the

Moralia of Plutarch a treatise, named *On the Lives of the Ten Orators*.⁴⁸ Secondly, Seneca's play (ca. 4 BCE-CE 56) involved a careful and systematic reshaping of the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.⁴⁹ The following is an example showing how Seneca later elaborated on Euripides' one-statement description of Hippolytus's fatal accident.

Euripides: And his dear head [was] pounded on the rocks. ⁵⁰	Seneca: The ground was reddened with a trail of blood: His head was dashed from rock, his hair Torn off by thorns, his handsome face despoiled By flinty stones; wound after wound destroyed For ever that ill-fated comeliness ⁵¹
---	---

Thomas Louis Brodie's view on Luke's rhetorical style may explain how Luke has used his sources as "inventive imitation." Luke 22:7-38 (WT) then, emerges as a "careful

⁴⁸ Plutarch, *Moralia*, vol X (trans. Harold North Fowler [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920]): 341-449; cited in George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980): 117.

⁴⁹ See Frank Justin Miller, *The Tragedies of Seneca* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907): 455-496; cited in Thomas Louis Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984): 23.

⁵⁰ Hippolytus, scene 6, 1238 (trans. David Grene from *The Complete Greek Tragedies*, vol. 5 [Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1955]): 231; cited in Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts," 23.

⁵¹ Phaedra, Act 4, 1092-96 (trans. E. F. Watling, *Seneca: Four Tragedies and Octavia* [Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977]): 141; cited in Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts," 23-24.

consistent adaptation” of his sources,⁵² both in content and in formal structure, which permits Luke creatively to interweave non-Markan sources for the purposes of reconfiguring and recontextualising Markan material. These ways of reworking the Markan material agree with Luke’s stated literary purpose (Luke 1:1-4).

⁵² See Brodie, “Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts,” 21, 33 and L. Gregory Bloomquist, “Rhetorical Argumentation and the Culture of Apocalyptic: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Lk. 21,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Thomas H. Olbricht and Stanley E. Porter, JSNTSS 180 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999): 173-209.

Chapter Four

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL INTERTEXTURE

I. Introduction.

We continue the exploration of the intertexture of our chosen text that we started in the preceding chapter. As we have seen, oral-scribal intertexture in the form of recitation, reconfiguration, recontextualisation, and echo concerns the reworking of specific oral and written traditions. Intertextual interaction with social codes takes us to social intertexture, while interaction with cultural traditions takes us to cultural intertexture. Here then we are analysing the social as well as the cultural intertexture of our chosen text; our aim here is to identify what any first-century Mediterranean would have understood in this text.

Before we go any further, we need to define our use of the terms culture and social system. Following Clifford Geertz, we take culture to be “a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life.”¹ Culture is “the fabric of meaning in terms of which human beings interpret their experience and guide their action.”² The world of human

¹ Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 89. Cf. Amos Rapoport’s definition in “Spatial Organization and the Built Environment,” in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture, and Social Life*, ed. Tim Ingold (London/New York: Routledge, 1994): 473-75.

² Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 145. We bear in mind Tim Ingold’s observation that “the concept of culture has obstinately resisted final definition.” See Tim

beings is a “culturally interpreted social world”³ that “consists of whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members.”⁴ It is in this way that culture can be said to “create” “patterns of shared meaning and feeling which combine to shape the social world” of a specific human group.⁵ In short, humans “live culturally.”⁶

On the other hand, “social structure is the form that action takes, the actually existing network of social relations.”⁷ This means that culture and social structure are different abstractions from the same human phenomena: culture considers social action with regard to its meaning for those who carry it out, while social structure considers social action in terms of its contribution to the functioning of certain social systems.⁸ Thus while culture is a set of persons, things, and events that are filled with meaning and feeling, social systems consist of institutions, culture and person types.

Ingold, “Introduction to Culture,” in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture, and Social Life* (London/New York: Routledge, 1994): 329; See 329-348 for his exploration of the concept of culture. See also, Alfred Louis Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963).

³ Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981): 13.

⁴ Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 11. Cf. Malina, *New Testament World*, 12-17.

⁵ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 9.

⁶ See Ingold, “Introduction to Culture,” 330.

⁷ Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 145.

⁸ Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 145. Cf. Malina, *New Testament World*, 14-17.

We should note, however, that culture and society are not mutually exclusive. For as Tim Ingold reminds us, all culture is social, insofar as its constituent meanings are drawn from the relational contexts of such mutual involvement; conversely all social life is cultural insofar as personal relationships are informed by meaning. In a nutshell, culture and social life seem to be caught up in an ongoing dialectic in which each “constitutes” the other through human mediation.⁹

Social institutions are fixed forms of social life, which aim to realise basic social requirements in certain meaningful, human ways. For instance, a kinship system is for the purpose of naturing and nurturing human beings; an economic system is for provisioning human groups and the political system for effective collective action. Person types derive from cultures characterised by the qualities of collectivism where group integrity is paramount or of individualism where self-reliance is paramount and extend along a range from one end to the other. In this way, the persons described in our NT text will not be completely unlike Nigerians or Americans in terms of human nature, but they will be unlike them in terms of their cultural interpretation of human nature for their social environment.¹⁰

II. Social Intertexture

Social intertexture concerns the kind of social knowledge with which the Lukan LS is in dialogue. One acquires social knowledge through general interaction or socialization, for

⁹ See Ingold, “Introduction to Social Life,” in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture, and Social Life* (London/New York: Routledge, 1994): 738.

¹⁰ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 10.

instance, by “observing the behaviour and public material objects produced by other people.”¹¹ On the other hand one learns cultural values and meanings by way of enculturation,¹² that is, the process by which society teaches and transmits to its human members specific traditions with careful use of language. Daniel Miller describes this process thus:

From quite early on, the infant born in one cultural context becomes recognizably distinct in manners and outlook from an infant socialized in another setting. Much of this results from the micro-routines of daily life, in which we become oriented to and by the spaces, the objects and the small but significant distinctions in object forms through which we form our classifications and habits. In turn these create our expectations, which allow much of the world to become quickly absorbed as a “taken-for-granted” context for our lives.¹³

The way humans learn their local language is a good example of how culture is transmitted. People of the same region commonly hold the same social knowledge, whether or not they belong to the same cultural location. Here we are looking for evidence of coherence between external social traditions and internal social data, for this indicates some form of

¹¹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 62.

¹² See Malina, *New Testament World*, 15 and Robbins, *Exploring*, 62. See descriptions in M. Mead, “Socialization and Enculturation,” *Current Anthropology* 4 (1963): 184-8 and Fitz John Porter Poole, “Socialization, Enculturation and Development of Personal Identity,” in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, ed. Tim Ingold (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 831-54.

¹³ Miller, “Artefacts and the Meanings of Things,” in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture, and Social Life*, ed. Tim Ingold (London/New York: Routledge, 1994): 399.

dependence of the latter on the former.¹⁴ In other words, any evidence of coherence between Israelite and or Greco-Roman traditions and data in Luke's LS text indicates Luke's dependence on these traditions. In light of our definition of "the social" above we identify the following general categories of social knowledge: (a) social institution (b) social relationship, and (c) social identity/ role.

A. Social Institutions:

Recalling our definition of social structure at the beginning of this chapter, social institutions serve social needs, which include the economic, the political, and the cultural (including the religious).¹⁵ Luke 22:7-38 (WT) features four social institutions, namely, the household (vv. 11-12), the twelve tribes (v.30), kingship (the kingdom of God, gentile kingdom), and indirectly, the temple.

1. The Household

Within the thought-world of Luke and his contemporaries, the terms οἶκος, οἰκία would cover family, household, and a dwelling place.¹⁶ Luke 22:10-13 talks about a

¹⁴ See Robert F. Stoops, "The Acts of Peter in Intertextual Context," *Semeia* 80 (1997): 73.

¹⁵ See Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System," in *Interpretation of Cultures*, 87-125 and Brian Morris, "Religion as Culture," in *Anthropological Studies of Religion: An Introductory Text* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987): 312-319.

¹⁶ See Carolyn Osiek, "The Family in Early Christianity: 'Family Values' Revisited," *CBQ* 58 (1996): 9-11; Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997): 6; and Halvor Moxnes, "What is Family? Problems in Constructing Early

household (οἶκος) with a householder (οἰκοδεσπότης). Luke in his writings has more references to house and household than any other NT writer. The term οἰκία (house) occurs in Luke-Acts thirty-six times, twenty-four in Luke and twelve in Acts, while οἶκος (household) occurs fifty-two times, thirty-two in Luke and twenty-five times in Acts. In all the οἶκος and οἰκία and their paronyms occur one hundred and thirty-three times, eighty-four in Luke and forty-nine in Acts, while their combined occurrences in the other evangelists totals one hundred—thirty-seven in Mark, fifty-two in Matthew and eleven times in John. These vast references to household and its paronyms show Luke's knowledge of this social institution in his social environment; they also indicate the significance of the household for Luke in his appropriation of the story of Jesus for his own Jesus-movement group.

In Luke the reader knows some households have an οἰκονόμος (steward), for he refers to stewards four times (Luke 12:42; 16:1, 3, 8). There is also household management (οἰκονομία) since he makes reference to it three times (Luke 16:2, 3, 4). Luke 16: 1-8 indicates that some stewards are finance managers of households. Some households also have servants as the story of the prodigal son (Luke 15: 11-32) indicates. Luke also knows that the whole inhabited world is a kind of household as he uses οἰκουμένη eight times, three in Luke (2:1; 4:5; 21:26) and five in Acts (11:28; 17:6, 31; 19: 27; 24: 5). In addition, Luke also makes two references (Acts 2:36; 7:42) to οἶκος Ἰσραήλ (house of Israel).

Christian Families.” in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor* (New York: Routledge, 1997): 13-36.

Economically, some households are rich, for instance, the ruler who inquires from Jesus what to do in order to have eternal life (18:18-27), Zacchaeus (19:1-10), and the rich man who neglected Lazarus (16: 19-31). Jesus' special attention to the poor indicates that some households are poor. While there are large households, such that they have several servants and stewards, some are small, like that of Martha who seems to be sharing a house with her sister Mary.¹⁷ All in all, Luke gives his reader a sample of households in the first-century Mediterranean world.

Analysis of relevant archaeological evidence leads Santiago Guijarro to suggest five types of houses in first-century Galilee: the simple house, the courtyard house (consisting of several houses with a common courtyard), the big mansion (with several rooms), the farmhouse, and houses with shops.¹⁸ From this archaeological evidence Guijarro further hypothesizes four family types,¹⁹ namely, nucleated families (in simple houses),²⁰ larger families (in big mansions), multiple families (in courtyard houses), and homeless

¹⁷ For substantial explorations of the household in the NT in its first-century Mediterranean social setting, see Osiek, "Family in Early Christianity," 1-24; Osiek and Balch, *Families in the New Testament World*; and Moxnes, *Constructing Early Christian Families*.

¹⁸ See Guijarro, "The Family in First-century Galilee," in *Constructing Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (New York: Routledge, 1997): 49-55.

¹⁹ Guijarro does not explain why he has five house types but four family types.

²⁰ Guijarro says he uses nucleated in lieu of nuclear in order to avoid identification with the nuclear individualistic family of post-industrial western societies. See "The Family in First-century Galilee," 60. I will simply call his "nucleated" families small families that require only simple housing.

families.²¹ I will suggest that the courtyard house type may be for a ruler or for rich and big individual families, in view of the fact of polygamous families.²² And while some of the households may be located in cities, some may be in villages.²³

A further exploration of contemporary Israelite as well as Graeco-Roman literature will help the reader understand the significance Luke gives to the household in his writings.²⁴ The household features prominently in Israelite biblical literature. In the LXX οἶκος occurs about 1827 times, while οἰκία occurs about 219 times. While we cannot attempt a detailed exploration of the social connotation of the household in the Israelite biblical tradition, it is enough to note with John Hall Elliott that οἶκος and its Hebrew

²¹ See Guijarro, "The Family in First-century Galilee," 57-61, especially his table on page 58.

²² This is a common feature of kings' palaces throughout Nigeria. In Yoruba, a courtyard house is called AGBOLE (AGO-ILE: AGBO= group; ILE=house/household/family; thus AGBOLE is a group of houses with a common courtyard).

²³ For explorations of the social setting of Luke-Acts, see Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991): 125-50; and Douglas E. Oakman, "The Countryside in Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991): 151-79.

²⁴ For explorations of the concept of Household in ancient Rome, See R. Saller, "Familia, Domus, and the Roman Conception of the Family," *Phoenix* 38 (1984): 336-55; "Corporal Punishment, Authority, and Obedience in the Roman Household," in *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Roman*, ed. Beryl Rawson (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 1991): 144-65; Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore/London: John Hopkins University Press, 1992); and Eva Marie Lassen, "The Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (New York: Routledge, 1997): 104-115.

equivalent בית "serve as a prime expression of communal identity and organization and of social, political and religious solidarity."²⁵

As in Luke we have the catch phrase "house of Israel," the "house of Jacob," or the "house of Judah" as a household (e.g. Exod. 16: 31; 19: 3; 40: 38; Lev. 10:6; Isa 2: 5-6; 5:7). The concept of the whole of Israel as a household or of the whole of the inhabited world as a household we have found in Luke's writings is similar to Caesar Augustus' view of the whole of the Roman Empire as his household (**domus Caesaris**). For instance, according to Tacitus, Augustus' addition of Egypt to the "empire of the Roman people,"²⁶ was tantamount to an incorporation of Egypt into the household of Caesar (**domus Caesaris**).²⁷

Additionally, in his attempt to show a link between household management and statesmanship in his exposition on Joseph as exemplar of βίος πολιτικοῦ (the life of the statesman),²⁸ Philo reveals that for him, his predecessors and his contemporaries οἰκονομία

²⁵ John Hall Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981): 182. For analysis of the household in ancient Israel, see De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 19-23.

²⁶ Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 5:24; cited in Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 172.

²⁷ Tacitus, *Histories* 1: 11 (Moses Hadas, ed. *Complete Works of Tacitus*, trans. Alfred John Church & William Jackson Brodribb [New York: Random House, 1942]): 425; cited in Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 172.

²⁸ See Philo, *De Iosepho (On Joseph)*, I. 2-3 (trans. F. H. Colson [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935]): 140-141; cited in Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 172.

(household management) “was a self-evident analogue for political statesmanship.”²⁹ While a normal household in first-century Mediterranean was made up of kith and kin (men, women, and children), some certainly included slaves.³⁰

The above textual evidence indicates that Luke is well within his social location concerning the social institution of the household and its impact on the nascent Jesus-movement group. For instance, Luke’s emphasis on the household indicates that he is well aware of the household as a practical model of social organisation. That is, Luke sees the household as a socially “effective element of an ideology designed to express, validate and promote intergroup” self-understanding and cohesion.³¹ The rhetorical progression of the Jesus-movement group from the temple to the household in Luke’s writings indicates that Luke conceives the household as a viable model of the kind of community he envisages, the church in miniature.³²

The picture of the household we have built so far indicates that members of the Jesus-movement group in Acts began to meet in private homes as Luke asserts (Acts 1: 13-

²⁹ Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 172.

³⁰ See Aristotle, *Politics* 1.1253b6-7 (Barnes, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, 1988; cited in Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 174. See also Richard A. Horsley, “The Slave Systems of Classical Antiquity and Their Reluctant Recognition by Modern Scholars,” *Semeia* 83/84 (1998): 19-66; Guijarro, “The Family in First-century Galilee,” 42-63; and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, “Houses and Households: Sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum,” in *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, ed. Beryl Rawson (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 1991): 191-227.

³¹ See Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 174.

³² Cf. R. M. MacIver, “The Family as Government in Miniature,” in *The Imprint of Roman Institutions*, ed. David W. Savage (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971): 7-11.

14: 2: 43-47; 4: 32-37; 5: 12-16). This was not simply because they had no option, but deliberately, as Bradley Blue has noted, because the house provided the facilities which were of vital significance for the gathering, for instance, the culinary appurtenances needed for the meal.³³

In addition to the above exploration of the make-up of the household/family, we need to briefly explore Jesus' attitude to families in Luke vis-à-vis its social context. Jesus' attitude to family in Luke, in the other canonical Gospels, and early Jesus-movement groups has been doubly characterised.³⁴ On the one hand it is labeled anti-familiar or subordinating³⁵; on the other hand, it is considered re-embedding discipleship within the

³³ See Bradley Blue, "Acts and the House Church," in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, vol. 2: *Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994): 121.

³⁴ See Moxnes, *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 3-4 and John M. G. Barclay, "The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 66-78.

³⁵ For this characterisation, see Stephen C. Barton, "The Relativisation of Family Ties in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman Traditions," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 81-79; Ingrid Sælid Gilbus, "Family Structures in Gnostic Religion," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 235-247; Dale B. Martin, "Paul Without Passion: On Paul's Rejection of Desire in Sex and Marriage," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 201-213; and Risto Uro, "Asceticism and Anti-Familiar Language in the Gospel of Thomas," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 216-227.

household.³⁶ Evidence of the so-called anti-familiar behaviour of Jesus can be found in Luke (2: 41-52; 11: 27-28; 14: 25-26). In my view, Jesus' attitude to the family in Luke is better characterised as a fusion of subordinating natural family to discipleship and a re-embedding it into fictive kinship. As we have shown in chapter two, Jesus' rhetorical progression from the temple to the household indicates a positive attitude to familial ties.

This kind of renunciation of natural familiar ties for the sake of what is considered a higher and nobler vocation finds precedent in Philo's writings. In point of fact, Philo in his *De Abrahamo* (*On Abraham*) interpreted Abraham's migration as a subordination of family to the call of Yahweh. Philo in his *De Vita Contemplativa* (*On the Contemplative Life*) also depicts the Therapeutae's vocation to philosophical contemplation as a subordination of natural familiar ties to fictive family:

When, therefore, men abandon their property without being influenced by any predominant attraction, they flee without even turning their heads back again, deserting their brethren, their children, their wives, their parents, their numerous families, their affectionate bands of companions, their native lands in which they have been born and brought up, though long familiarity is a most attractive bond, and one very well able to allure any one... they take up their abode outside of walls, or gardens, or solitary lands, seeking for a desert place, not because of any ill-natured misanthropy to which they have learnt to devote themselves, but because of the associations with people of wholly dissimilar dispositions to which they would otherwise be compelled, and which they know to be unprofitable and mischievous.³⁷

³⁶ For this labelling, see Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul," 166-180; Esler, "Family Imagery and Identity," 121-144; and Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures," 150-163.

³⁷ *De Vita Cont.* 18-20 (D. C. Yonge, trans. *The Works of Philo* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993]): 699.

As we have noted above, Philo gives aspects of communal life of the Therapeutae at communal meals.³⁸ It is the same picture that Philo and Josephus paint of the communalism of the Essenes.³⁹ Josephus' account of communal living among the Essenes confirms Philo's account of the Essenes.⁴⁰ In this way, Luke's account of Jesus' subordination of natural kinship to his movement is not without precedent.

The Cynic attitude to familiar ties differs from what we have observed among the Therapeutae, the Essenes, and in the Lukan Jesus, for the Cynics renounced familial ties not for the purpose of creating a fictive kinship, but to underscore individual freedom and self-sufficiency. In this way their contracultural attitude to family can justly be characterised as anti-family.⁴¹ Halvor Moxnes correctly captures the difference between the Cynic attitude to family and that of the Gospel tradition when he notes, "the Cynic tradition renounces kinship ties to emphasise individual freedom and self-sufficiency.

³⁸ *De Vita Cont.* 70-72 (Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 704-705).

³⁹ *Quod omnis Probus* 75-91 (Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 689-690) and *Hypothetica* II. 1-18 (Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 745-746); both cited in Barton, "Relativisation of Family Ties," 85.

⁴⁰ See Josephus, *Wars* 2. 8.1-13 (William Whiston, trans. *The Works of Josephus* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999]): 604-607; cited in Barton, "Relativisation of Family Ties," 92. See also Josephus, *Antiquities* 18.1.5 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 477).

⁴¹ Contraculture is oppositional culture rhetoric. It is deviant of other culture rhetorics. See chapter five below for definitions of different kinds of culture rhetoric.

whereas in the Gospel tradition their subordination is the price of the eschatological mission started by Jesus.”⁴²

Geographically, Luke locates the household in our chosen text in a city (22:10). Luke makes many references to cities (πόλεις) in his writings. In the Third Gospel alone Luke explicitly called Arimathea (23:51), Bethlehem (2:4), Bethsaida (9:10), Capernaum (4:31), Nain (7:11), and Nazareth (1:26) cities. It is difficult to understand Luke’s use of the word “city,” for there are places he calls cities which others call villages. For instance, in 2:4 Luke calls Bethlehem a city, while John (7:42) calls it a village. In the same way, Luke (9:10) calls Bethsaida a city, but Mark (8:23) calls it a village. Despite this difference between Luke and Mark and John, Luke distinguishes a city and a village (κώμη). For instance, Jesus went “through cities (πόλεις) and villages (κώμας), teaching, and journeying toward Jerusalem”(13:22).”⁴³ In any case, for Luke, Peter and John prepared the Passover meal in a house located in an unnamed city.

The above fleeting discussion of the “household” and “city” in Luke shows that the Palestine of the Lukan Jesus was made up of cities and villages. Luke 22:10-13 shows that cities had some houses with upper rooms large enough to hold a party of thirteen (cf. Acts 1:13; 9:37, 39). This text (Luke 22:10-13) indicates that most houses did not have water.

⁴² Moxnes, *Constructing Early Christian Families*, 4. See also Barton, “The Relativisation of Family Ties,” 96.

⁴³ For a preliminary investigation of the “city” in Luke’s writings, see Richard L. Rohrbaugh, “The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations, in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993): 125-50.

That is, if a city house that had an upper room large enough for a party of thirteen people lacked portable water, it is reasonable to assume that many houses in the city lacked water. This presents the image of an environment where normal household chores would present special difficulty. For instance, people would have to take their laundry to a riverside or near public wells. Again, for instance, Moses met seven daughters of a Midian priest, who went to draw water from a well for house chores and to the troughs to water their father's flock (Exod. 2: 16-20) and Rebekah also went to draw water for domestic uses (Gen 24: 16-20). This profile fits a pre-industrial environment of limited goods and services. For the housemaster to host a dinner party of thirteen in this kind of society must be considered an act of great generosity. We shall say more on the household in Luke in our chapter on social-cultural texture, especially in relation to the temple.

2. The Twelve Tribes of Israel

The twelve-tribal system of Israel is a social institution, which shows Israel as a federation of twelve tribes.⁴⁴ Luke 22:30 features the only mention of the twelve tribes in the Third Gospel. Another mention of it occurs in Acts 26:7 through Paul. Nevertheless, this is enough to show that Luke was aware of the tradition of the twelve-tribal confederation of Israel. It is more appropriate that the reference here is to the new Israel rather than to literal Israel.⁴⁵ But this suggests that Luke envisages the new Israel will be patterned on the old tradition of the twelve tribes.

⁴⁴ On the twelve-tribal system as a social institution and Israel's concept of the state, see De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 92-99.

⁴⁵ See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 818.

3. Kingship Institutions:

Luke's LS text features two kingship institutions, namely, Israelite kingship (kingdom of God) and gentile kingship. As our innertextural analysis (chapter three) above shows, the concept of kingship features five times in the Lukan LS discourse, namely, the kingdom of God (22:16 and 17) kings of Gentiles (22:25), a kingdom (22:29), and my kingdom (22:30). Outside the LS there are twenty-eight occurrences of "king" or "kings," ten in the gospel (1:5; 10:24; 14:31; 19:38; 21:12; 23:2,3; and 23:37) and eighteen times in the Acts (4:24; 7:10,18; 9:15; 12:1; 13:21-22; 17:7; 25:13,14; 25:24,26; 26:2,7,13,19,26 and 30). Luke's reference to βασιλεὺς (king) and the concept of βασιλεία (kingdom) in his two-volume work is an indication of his knowledge of the kingship system in the first-century Mediterranean.⁴⁶ It is a social intertextual rather than an oral-scribal intertextual reference, because kingship is more than a scribal phenomenon; it is a social institution.

a. God's Kingship

The kingdom of God features in our text. The anticipation of the kingdom of God expressed in Luke 22:16,18 corresponds to Israelite aspiration, which is indicated by the demand of the apostles to know when the kingdom would be restored to Israel (Acts 1:6). As we shall demonstrate shortly,⁴⁷ the Israel of the NT times was under the governance of imperial Rome. Thus the Israelite aspiration for restoration of the kingdom to Israel may be construed as a metaphor for their desire for political independence from Roman

⁴⁶ Luke knows, for instance, Herod, king of Judea (Luke 1:5 & Acts 12:1); Gentile kings (22:25); Pharaoh, king of Egypt (Acts 7:10,7); king Agrippa (Acts 25:24,26; 26:2,7,13,19,26,27&30); king of the Jews (Luke 23:3,35); and the kings of the earth (Acts 4:26).

⁴⁷ See our discussion on page 161ff on Gentile Kingship

colonialism. The concern of the apostles for the restoration of the kingdom to Israel points to Israelite understanding that God will restore their kingdom through the Messiah. Luke 22:16,18 alludes to the anticipated messianic banquet, while 22:29-30 confirms this expectation.

The concept of God's kingship is also present in Qumran literature. Although the expression "kingdom of God" does not occur in the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS),⁴⁸ the concept of God's kingship is present. There are clear references to God as king (see 1QH X.8; 4Qflor. I.3; 1QM XII.3; 1QS I.18, 23-24, II.19-21). In QM XII.8 God is called king of honour, while he is king of kings in 4QM XIV.6. The closest to the Lukan kingdom of God occurs in 1QM VI.6 ("And sovereignty shall be to the God of Israel, and He shall accomplish mighty deeds by the saints of his people") and in 1QM XI.7:

For Thou art [terrible], O God, in the glory of Thy kingdom, and the congregation of Thy Holy Ones is among us for everlasting succour. We will despise kings, we will mock and scorn the mighty; for our Lord is holy, and the King of Glory is with us together with the Holy Ones."

The DSS not only contains references to God as king, it also contains references to Israel as the eschatological kingdom as well. This identifies God's kingship with Israelite kingship. In this way, the DSS contains social-political dimension of the kingdom of God as the following texts show:

Whenever Israel rules there shall [not] fail to be a descendant of David upon the throne. For the *ruler's staff* is the Covenant of kingship, [and the clans] of Israel are the *feet*, until the Messiah of Righteousness comes, the Branch of

⁴⁸ All references and translations are from Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*.

David. For him and to his seed was granted the Covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations... (4QPBless) [as in original].
 The Master shall bless the Prince of the Congregation...and shall renew for him the Covenant of the Community that he may establish the kingdom of his people for ever, [that he may judge the poor with righteousness and] dispense justice with {equity to the oppressed} of the land... (1QSb V.20-21)

As these texts show the kingdom of God and its eschatological realisation in Israel was an important subject for the community that produced the DSS, as it was the case with Luke.

Our discussion of divine sonship below will show that it is Jesus as divine son,⁴⁹ that is, as king, who will restore the kingdom to Israel. What is not so clear in Luke is whether or not the eschatological is identified with Israel. Luke 22:17-18 indicates that the realisation of the kingdom is still a future event, even though it has approached in the person and ministry of Jesus.⁵⁰ Luke 22:28-29 also raises the issue of the relation between the kingdom of the Son and the kingdom of God. In any case, the kingdom of God language in the DSS helps to position the use of kingdom of God language in the LS within a particular Israelite social institution.

b. Gentile Kingship

Luke 22:25 has a double reference in that it refers to gentile kingship as well as to gentile patronage system. We treat the former here while we treat the latter under social role below. Verse 25 suggests that gentile kings have a master-servant relationship with their subjects, for they lord it over their subjects. The leadership of the apostles must not be

⁴⁹ See page 180.

⁵⁰ Scholars are agreed on these double senses of the NT accounts of Jesus' eschatological teaching on the kingdom of God. See David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983): 171.

to lord it over those in their care. This reference to gentile kings indicates that Jesus is speaking from a countercultural position in relation to gentile dominant culture.⁵¹ The reference also indicates Luke's social knowledge of gentile kingship. But it is not just a reference to a neighbouring kingdom; rather, it is a reference to a kingdom that was ruling over Israel, for at this period Palestine was under the rule of imperial Rome.⁵²

Although Jesus' charge against gentile kings in 22:25 suggests that the gentile kings were lording it over their fellow gentile subjects, it could also be a veiled reference to imperial Rome lording it over the Israelites. We know from Josephus that the Judeans were not happy with Pontius Pilate as their procurator.⁵³ For instance, twice they opposed his initiatives: his introduction of Caesar Augustus' images to Judea, and his plan to bring a current of water to Jerusalem. Pilate's soldiers killed many who protested his water scheme.⁵⁴ These may be the killings that Luke refers to when talks of "the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices" (Luke 13:1). This is strongly suggested by

⁵¹ In common parlance, a counterculture is a culture in opposition to mainstream culture; it is a culture that has ideas and ways of behaving that are consciously and deliberately very different from the cultural values of the larger society of which it is a part. See *Microsoft Encarta Reference Suite 2001* (Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2001). But see chapter five below.

⁵² See Raymond P. Scheindlin, *The Chronicles of the Israelite People* (New York: Smithmark Publishers, 1996): 39-48.

⁵³ *Antiq.* 18.3.1-2 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 479-480).

⁵⁴ See *Antiq.* 18. 3.1. (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 479-480).

Luke's assertion that Pilate and Herod the tetrarch of Galilee became friends because Pilate sent Jesus to Herod when he realised Jesus was a Galilean (Luke 23:6-7).⁵⁵

The Lukan Jesus' indictment of gentile kingship is also applicable to Roman imperial rule over Palestine: it will no doubt remind the implied audience of the contemporary political situation of Palestine. That is, Jesus' criticism of gentile kings in verse 25 is also, by extension, an indictment of Roman imperialism, for imperialism is indeed an instance of one nation lording it over another: imperialism is domineering.

As is well known, by the time Jerusalem fell to Roman rule in 63 BCE,⁵⁶ Hellenistic kingdoms had come under Roman control. Nevertheless, Hellenistic culture, language, literature and religion were not dispelled, but flourished because many Romans "considered Greek cultural traditions superior to their own."⁵⁷ This saw the birth of a new Greco-Roman world. The republic of Rome became an empire following its senate conferral of the title, Augustus (Exalted One) on Octavian in 27 BCE.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Probably, the cause of enmity between Pilate and Herod was that Pilate had meddled with Herod's jurisdiction and killed some of his Galilean subjects; and now he sends Jesus to Herod in order to correct the error. See Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 480, no. a.

⁵⁶ For a historical overview of Jews under Greek and Roman rules from 300 BCE to 100 CE, see Max I. Dimont, *Jews, God and History* (Toronto: The New American Library, 1962): 77-156.

⁵⁷ Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews*, 260.

⁵⁸ See Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews*, 283-284.

Under the Roman Empire, Palestinian kings were client kings. In other words, Rome left foreign government in the hands of native rulers (indirect rule).⁵⁹ For instance, Herod the Great, who ruled when Jesus was born and Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, were clients of the Roman Emperor. In fact, Herod the Great named Caesarea Maritima for Caesar Augustus, while Herod Antipas named the city he built on the western shore of the "sea" of Galilee, Tiberias, in honour of Emperor Tiberius Claudius Nero.⁶⁰

This indicates that during the NT period Roman emperors had a patron-client relationship with their client kings in general and Judean rulers in particular. This together with the evidence that many Israelites and members of Jesus-movement group were persecuted under Roman emperors then lend credence to the Lukan Jesus' charge that gentile kings lord it over their subjects. For instance, the Israelite revolt begun in 66 CE, resulted from continuing indignities Rome inflicted upon the Israelites.⁶¹ The people for whom Jesus was proclaiming the restoration of the kingdom of God were under the heavy burden of the Roman Empire.

Thus we can further enhance our understanding of the imperial situation of Israelite Palestine by exploring the social-political situation of Palestine of the first century, ⁶² for in

⁵⁹ See E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987): 36.

⁶⁰ See Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews*, 254, 255. Luke 2:1 cites Caesar Augustus as the Roman Emperor at the time of the birth of Jesus.

⁶¹ See Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews*, 257.

⁶² See Richard A. Horsley, "The Imperial Situation of Palestinian Israelite Society," in *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*, ed. Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993): 395-407; H. H.

the LS Jesus criticises gentile kingship. While Jesus places the kingdom of God within the context of Israelite kingship, he condemns gentile kingdoms, which suggests some tension between the kingdom of Israel and that of the Gentiles. The Judeans of NT times were a colonized people. In point of fact, since the fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE, they had been subject to one colonial rule or another.⁶³ Although the Maccabean revolt begun in 167 once again asserted the independence of Judah, still, it was part of a larger imperial system.

Following the decline of the Hellenistic empire of the Seleucids, the Romans exerted their influence and in 63 BCE, finally conquered the whole of the eastern Mediterranean, including Palestine.⁶⁴ Thereafter, the Romans controlled affairs in Judean society, whether through the Herodian kings or through the Judean priestly aristocracy.⁶⁵ With the exception of the period of rule by Herodian client kings, the imperial arrangement of ruling through the priestly aristocracy remained in effect essentially until the destruction of the second temple. Thus the Jesus-movement group, which later became Christian, began under

Ben-Sasson, ed. *A History of the Jewish People* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976; Hebrew edition, 1969): 185-276; M. Stein, "The Political and Social History of Judea under Roman Rule," in *A History of the Jewish People*, H. H. Ben-Sasson, ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976; Hebrew edition, 1969): 239-276; N. R. M. de Lange, "Jewish Attitudes to the Roman Empire," in *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, eds. P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker (NY/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978): 255-281; and Richard A. Horsley and John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999): 29-47.

⁶³ See Ben-Sasson, *A History of the Jewish People*, 185-276.

⁶⁴ Horsley, "Imperial Situation," 396; Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews*, 12.

⁶⁵ See Stein, "The Political and Social History of Judea under Roman Rule," 239-276.

Roman imperial rule and continued under direct Roman rule after Pilate and up to 70CE.⁶⁶ Coupled with this imperial rule was the resultant Greco-Roman culture occasioned by Roman assimilation of Hellenistic cultural traditions, including their literature, philosophy and religion. For instance, deification of Roman emperors was influenced by Greek conception of the divinity of the monarch.⁶⁷ This means that the nascent Jesus-movement group did not only develop within imperial Palestine,⁶⁸ it also developed under the influence of Greco-Roman cultural traditions as well.

The imperial situation resulted in an intense economic pressure on the peasant producer, for "the people struggled under a double burden of taxation: tithes and other dues paid to the Temple and priests as well as tribute and other taxes to Rome."⁶⁹ The relation between the Roman Empire and their subjects, the Israelite people, was one of power. Imperial Rome "subjugated existing cities. Historic cities were relegated to contributing 'little to the larger economic life beyond the needs of their social elites and the payment of taxes; they tapped the surpluses created by local agriculture and trade in rents and

⁶⁶ Horsley, "Imperial Situation," 396.

⁶⁷ See Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews*, 274-75.

⁶⁸ Evidence of this imperial situation abounds in Luke writings: Agrippa, king (Acts 25:13-26:32); Felix, governor (Acts 23: 24,26; 24:22-27; 25:14); Porcius Festus, governor (Acts 24:27-25:24; 26:24,25,32); Herod, king (Luke 1:5;3:1,19; 9:7,9; 13:31; 23:7,8,11,12,15; Acts 4:27; 12:1,6,11,19,20,21; 13:1); Pontius Pilate, governor (Luke 3:1; 23; Acts 3:13; 4:27; 13:28).

⁶⁹ Horsley, "Imperial Situation," 403 and Stein, "The Political and Social History of Judea under Roman Rule," 241, 244, 248-252. See also de Lange, "Jewish Attitude to Roman Empire," 261.

tribute.”⁷⁰ Though the Romans established domination by military force, they maintained it by economic and cultural means. The relations between the Roman imperialists and Israelite society of NT times can thus be understood in terms of four dimensions: the economic, the political, the military, and the cultural.⁷¹

This imperial situation must be taken into account in understanding Jesus’ activities in general, and his “kingdom of God” language in particular. For Jesus’ activity and language were motivated by the prevailing imperial situation, in much the same way that cynic rhetoric was partly motivated by the prevailing urban crisis.⁷² Under this imperial situation, the question of the apostles, “Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel” (Acts 1:6),⁷³ represents Israelite hope for restoration of the kingdom of Israel, and Luke 22:28-30 symbolizes this restoration of the kingdom of Israel. Jesus’ critique of gentile kingdoms can be construed as a call for its replacement by the rule of God, which

⁷⁰ “Cities,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15th ed. (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1992): 16. 426.

⁷¹ Horsley, “Imperial Situation,” 397.

⁷² L. Gregory Bloomquist, “Methodological Considerations in the Determination of the Social Context of Cynic Rhetorical Practice: Implications for Our Present Studies of the Jesus Traditions,” in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996): 13. Here Bloomquist finds that in cynic literature of imperial period the question of true kingship was to the fore, 16.

⁷³ Geza Vermes sees in this statement a testimony to the survival of the apostles’ political aspirations. See his *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973): 51.

Jesus calls the kingdom of God (a theocracy).⁷⁴ “a political metaphor and symbol.”⁷⁵ Jesus’ language about the kingdom of God evokes an ideal vision of religious as well as political power of how Israelite society would be run if God, not the Roman Emperor, sat on the throne.⁷⁶

The above picture of the political and social-economic world of the Jesus-movement is relevant to Jesus’ kingship language, because kingship is also associated with salvation, not only in Luke, but also in Israelite as well as the broader Graeco-Roman tradition. The first apparent Lukan identification of kingship with salvation occurs at the very beginning of the gospel when an angel announces to the shepherds, “for to you is born in the city of David a saviour, who is Christ the Lord” (2: 11). Connotations of salvation in Lukan usage

⁷⁴ Under the Hasmoneans the kingdom of Judea was a theocracy, whereas under the Roman imperial rule it was not a theocracy since the functions of the king and the High Priest could not be combined in a single ruler. This started under Herod since his jurisdiction included a significant non-Judean population. See Stein, “The Political and Social History of Judea under Roman Rule,” 239. The NT itself bears testimony to the non-combination of the two offices in one person.

⁷⁵ Richard A. Horsley, “The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel,” in *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*, ed. Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993): 410.

⁷⁶ John Dominic Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus?* (San Francisco: Harper, 1995): 48.

include forgiveness of sins, healings and restoration to social status.⁷⁷ The Lukan Jesus' "saviourship" is derivative of God's.⁷⁸

There is also an OT background to the title σωτήρ, where it is applied to God (1 Sam 10:19; Isa 45:15,21) as well as to humans (Jugd 3:9, 15: 12:3). Additionally σωτήρ appears in corresponding texts in the LXX, all applied to God (see for example, Jugd 3:9: 9:11; 12:2; Isa 12:2; Wis 16:7). So God is conceived as saviour. The conflict of terms also suggests a problem concerning the meaning of the term σωτηρία. In the imperial cult σωτηρία could mean the peace and prosperity, which the emperor provided for his subjects.⁷⁹ Besides, the title σωτήρ occurs frequently in the contemporary Greco-Roman world where it was applied to emperors, gods, kings, physicians, philosophers, and statesmen.⁸⁰ For instance, it is found on the Rosetta Stone, where Ptolemy V. Epiphanes (203-181 BCE) was hailed as "savior and god," and on an Ephesian inscription (48 CE) in

⁷⁷ See Ben Witherington, "Salvation and Health in Christian Antiquity," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, and David Patterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998): 145-166.

⁷⁸ For recent explorations of this topic, see John Nolland, "Salvation-History and Eschatology," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, and David Patterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998): 63-81; Green, "Salvation to the Ends of the Earth," 83-106; H. Douglas Buckwalter, "The Divine Saviour," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, and David Patterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998): 107-123; and Christoph Stenschke, "The Need for Salvation," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, and David Patterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998): 125-144.

⁷⁹ See A. B. Luter, "Savior," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993): 867.

⁸⁰ See *TDNT* VII, 965-1024; cited in Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 204.

which Julius Caesar was called “god manifest and common savior of human life.”⁸¹ Malina is then correct to observe that “salvation in the common Greek of the first century meant rescue from a difficult situation: it was not a specifically God-oriented word.”⁸² for in the contemporary Greek world salvation was also understood as deliverance by the gods from dangers and from the power of death,⁸³ both physical and social death. Thus Jesus’ kingdom of God language can be construed as a call not only for political emancipation but also for social-economic salvation.

The above exploration indicates that Luke 22:25 speaks within the social-political context of contemporary Palestine, for as we have argued the Lukan Jesus’ criticism of gentile kingship is indirectly an indictment of imperial Rome. This locates Luke’s LS text socially in the first-century Mediterranean environment.

4. The Temple

The Temple was a common social institution in Ancient Near East: Temples were scattered throughout the ancient world (e.g. in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Syria).⁸⁴ In the

⁸¹ See J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930): 287, 621 and Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 204.

⁸² Malina, *New Testament World*, 100.

⁸³ See Horst and Gerhard Schneider Balz, *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990/93): 327 and Foerster, “σῶζω”, 966.

⁸⁴ See Carol Meyers, “Temple: Jerusalem,” in *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 350-69; William A. Ward, “Temples and Sanctuaries: Egypt,” in *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 369-72; John F. Robertson, “Temples and Sanctuaries: Mesopotamia,” in *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 372-76; and William G. Dever, “Temples and Sanctuaries: Syria and Palestine,” in *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 376-80.

case of our text we note not only the existence of the Temple in Jerusalem but also Greek and Roman temples.⁸⁵ A temple can be described as the house in which a deity dwells, manages his/her worldly business, is served by his/her people, and ensures the happiness and good of his/her city and its inhabitants.⁸⁶ Thus the temple is a thoroughly social institution to serve people's social needs. For instance, the deity serves as patron to his/her clients, the people.⁸⁷

The Israelite temple as a social institution serves the cultural (religious) needs of Israel. Although temple terminology does not occur in our chosen text, aspects of the semantic field associated with it permit us to consider the temple as part of the innertexture of Luke's LS. For instance, Luke features the chief priests, the scribes, and temple captains in vv.2 and 4 as the social functionaries who want to destroy Jesus. The chief priests form the hierarchy of the temple: they represent the power of the temple. On the other hand, the scribes, though not cultic officials, are official interpreters of the Torah, so they represent another arm of the temple apparatus.⁸⁸ The action that these temple officials are about to take against Jesus contrasts with the action of the master of the house where Jesus intends

⁸⁵ See Susan Guettel Cole, "Temples and Sanctuaries: Greco-Roman," in *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 6 (New York: Doubleday, 1992): 380-82.

⁸⁶ Cf. E. Sollberger's definition of the Babylonian temple quoted by Robertson, in "Temples and Sanctuaries," 375.

⁸⁷ See Robertson's description of "Social Role of the Temple," in "Temple and Sanctuaries," 375-76.

⁸⁸ See John Hall Elliott, "The Temple Versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome Neyrey (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991): 218-20.

to eat the Passover with his disciples. John H. Elliott has correctly noted how scenes of these two contrasting social institutions form the framework or inclusio for Luke's two-volume work, temple scenes for the Third Gospel and household scenes for Acts.⁸⁹ Luke's allusions to the institutions of temple and household through their officials provide a context for further exploration of the functions of the two institutions in Luke's LS.

Mere allusions to them in the LS provide a window into the deliberate contrast Luke draws between the temple, a public place which embodies all matters of purity,⁹⁰ and private household, a place for family members, servants, friends, table fellowship, hospitality and domestic life.⁹¹ For instance, the resolve of the chief priests and scribes to destroy Jesus echoes their strong opposition to Jesus during his public ministry, while at the same time the householder who provides a suitable facility for Jesus to eat the Passover functions as a reminder of friendship meals Jesus had in private homes. Thus the temple remains a place of hostility and conflicts, while the household remains a place of friendship and hospitality. A further exploration of the temple versus private household is billed for our chapter on socio-cultural texture.

The LS itself is a social intertexture since it deals with a meal, a common human reality. But the way it is enacted here, for example, the thanksgiving over the bread and

⁸⁹ See Elliott, "Temple Versus Household," 215.

⁹⁰ Although the temple as a sacred locale points to sacred texture, it is also a social institution with sacred functions. This distinction is clear if we remember that social systems consist of institutions, culture and person types. There is also the cultural aspect of temple that we shall discuss later in our chapter on social and cultural texture.

⁹¹ See Elliott, "Temple Versus Household," 212.

wine, points also to cultural intertexture, which we shall discuss shortly. It is enough to conclude for now that Luke's reference to the temple, albeit indirectly, coheres with Israelite religious institutions.

B. Social Relationship:

Besides social roles and identities, our text features three types of social relations, namely, a teacher-disciple, a kinship (father-son, and brotherhood), and a patron-client relationship. While we make analytic distinction between social roles and social relationships, we should note that social relationship presupposes corresponding social roles. For example, in a teacher-disciple relationship, teacher and disciple are social roles to be enacted.⁹²

1. Teacher-Discipleship Relationship

In verse 11, Jesus characterises himself as "the teacher" and certain individuals as "my disciples." In this case Jesus is a teacher with disciples who follow him. The social function "teacher" within Israel implies close relation with the temple and the sacred. This is the only place in Luke that Jesus explicitly calls himself teacher; it is only implicit in 6:40. On thirteen other occasions others call him teacher⁹³; the disciples never call Jesus teacher. This indicates that Jesus is well known as a teacher. For Jesus to introduce himself to the master of the house simply as "the teacher" indicates that the householder is either very close to Jesus or there is prearrangement, because we know that Jesus is not the only

⁹² See Ingold, "Introduction to Social Life," 742.

⁹³ See 3:12; 7:40; 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 11:18; 19:39; 20:21,28,39; 21:7.

teacher in Israel. For instance, the boy Jesus was with some teachers in the temple (Luke 2: 46-47); Luke also mentions Gamaliel as a “teacher of the law” (Acts 5:34; cf. Qumran’s Teacher of Righteousness, 4Q171, 173).

Although Jesus performs functions that are common to teachers in Mediterranean social environment, his teaching differs, according to Luke, because he teaches with authority (see Luke 4:31-32). Besides, as an itinerant teacher he gathers disciples to whom he transmits a system of thought and action that he expects them to follow (see Luke 22:24-27). In Luke, Jesus, though a teacher “filled with wisdom” (2:40), is like any teacher in Mediterranean society (2:46-47). That means although the social role as teacher is a common human reality, Jesus’ role as teacher is similar to the local enactment of that role in first-century Mediterranean society. Jesus the teacher then can be socially located in the first-century Mediterranean society. Like many other teachers in Israel, there is a significant element of sacredness in Jesus’ role as teacher, this we shall pursue in our chapter on sacred texture below.

As we have noted above some people fulfil the social role of discipleship, which establishes a teacher-disciple relationship vis-à-vis Jesus. Luke calls them disciples or apostles (vv. 11 & 14). This indicates a teacher-disciple relationship between Jesus and his apostles. As disciples, they are to be like Jesus their teacher (22:24-27).

This kind of social relationship is not unique. That was the common practice in the first-century Mediterranean society. As we have shown above Jesus’ social role as teacher was greatly influenced by the social role of the Israelite teacher in the first-century

Mediterranean culture.⁹⁴ What is unique is the influence and power Jesus the teacher wields over his disciples. This is because God empowered him and filled him with wisdom. Jesus was in this sense, then, a teacher unlike any other.

The teacher-disciple relationship tradition in Luke finds examples in rabbinic literature⁹⁵; it has precedents in Greek philosophical tradition, notably the Socratic tradition.⁹⁶ For instance, textual evidence shows that Socrates had many disciples (e.g. Aeschines, Aristippus, Crito with his sons [Critobus, Hermogenes, Epigenes, Ctessipus], Phaedo, Plato, Xenophon).⁹⁷ Euclides also had disciples, and Plato and some disciples of Socrates joined Euclides following the death of Socrates.⁹⁸

The mode of recruitment of pupils in rabbinic tradition is for the pupil to approach the teacher.⁹⁹ The three stories below depict people's requests to be made proselyte:

A certain heathen once came before Shammai and asked him, " . . . Make me a proselyte on condition that you teach me the

⁹⁴ For a detailed analysis of Jesus' social role as teacher, see Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 75-196.

⁹⁵ Israel Epstein, ed. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (London/Jerusalem/New York: The Soncino, 1974): 138-41; cited in Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 104.

⁹⁶ See for example, Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, 2 vols. trans. R. D. Hicks (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925).

⁹⁷ See Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* II-III (Hicks, 130-373).

⁹⁸ See Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* III. 6 (Hicks, 281-282).

⁹⁹ See *Babylonian Talmud: Shabbath* 17a; 30b-31a; *Pesahim* 3b; *Yoma* 35b; and *Megillah* 21a (ed. Israel Epstein); all cited in Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 104.

Written Torah (only).” He scolded and repulsed him in anger. (When) he went before Hillel, he accepted him as a proselyte...

On another occasion it happened that a certain heathen once came before Shammai and said to him, “Make me a proselyte, on condition that you teach me the whole Torah while I stand on one foot.” Thereupon he repulsed him with the builder’s cubit which was in his hand. [When] he went before Hillel, he converted him ...

On another occasion it happened that a certain heathen was passing behind a school and heard the voice of a scribe reciting, ‘And these are the garments which they shall make: a breastplate, and an ephod.’ Said he, “For whom are these?” “For the High Priest,” they said. Then said that heathen to himself, “I will go and become a proselyte, that I may be appointed a High Priest.” So he went to Shammai and said to him, “Make me a proselyte on condition that you appoint me a High Priest.” But he repulsed him with the builder’s cubit which was in his hand. He then went before Hillel. He made him a proselyte.¹⁰⁰

This rabbinic evidence assumes school tradition. While this mode of recruitment of disciples is also evident in the Lukan tradition (9: 61-62), the Lukan tradition differs because it presumes itinerant discipleship.

Like Luke’s tradition, Greek philosophical tradition assumes itinerant teaching: the teacher goes to the pupil. For instance, Diogenes Laertius gives the following account of how Socrates recruited Xenophon:

Socrates met him [Xenophon] in a narrow passage, and stretched out his stick to bar the way, while he inquired where every kind of food was sold. Upon receiving a reply, he [Socrates] put another question, “And where do men become good and honourable?” Xenophon was fairly puzzled: “Then

¹⁰⁰ *Babylonian Talmud: Shabbath* 30b-31a (ed. Israel Epstein); cited in Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 104.

follow me," said Socrates. "and learn. From that time onward a pupil of Socrates."¹⁰¹

This call story certainly resembles Luke's account of the call of Peter (5: 1-10) and the call of a disciple in 9: 59-60. Without Jesus calling them, Peter's companions, James and John decide to follow him (5: 10-11); their following of Jesus is like the men who ask to follow Jesus in Luke 9: 57, 61. Thus in Luke Jesus calls some disciples while others he attracts without summoning them. The man who wants to follow Jesus in Luke 9: 61-62 is analogous to Elisha's resolve to be a disciple of Elijah (1 Kgs 19: 19-21). But in retelling this episode, Josephus claims it is Elijah who summoned Elisha:

So Elijah, upon hearing this charge, returned into the land of the Hebrews. And when he found Elisha, the son of Shaphat, ploughing, and certain other with him, driving twelve yoke of oxen, he came to him, and cast his own garment upon him: upon which Elisha began to prophesy presently, and leaving his oxen, he followed Elijah. And when he desired leave to salute his parents, Elijah gave him leave to so do: and when he had taken leave of them, he followed him, and became the disciple and the servant of Elijah all days of his life.¹⁰²

Although many commentators have recognised the parallel between the Elijah-Elisha tradition and the teacher-disciple tradition in the Gospels, an essential difference remains: Elijah was not a teacher like Jesus summoning or attracting disciples.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* II. 48 (Hicks, 178-179); cited in Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 93-94.

¹⁰² Josephus, *Antiq.* 8.13.7 (353-354); cited in Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 99; but above quotation is from Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 239.

¹⁰³ See Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 99.

Furthermore, the kind of self-summoning itinerant discipleship we noted above finds example in Apollonius, who also attracted disciples without summoning them. This was how Damis and Demetrius became disciples of Apollonius.¹⁰⁴ Socrates also made some disciples by way of attraction. For instance, according to Diogenes Laertius, Aristippus “was drawn to Athens by the fame of Socrates.”¹⁰⁵

The above analysis indicates that the teacher-disciple tradition in Luke differs from that of the rabbinic tradition, but agrees more with Greek philosophical tradition, at least in its Socratic form. While the rabbinic tradition presupposes a school tradition, the Greek tradition on the other hand has itinerant tradition in view.¹⁰⁶

Although we have identified “my disciples” of 22: 11 with “his apostles” of 22: 14, the apostles are not only a smaller group than the disciples in Luke’s writings (see Luke 6: 13), they perform a different social role as well. Acts 1: 21-22 defines who can be an apostle as well as his role, namely to be a witness to Jesus’ resurrection (see Luke 24: 48). Thus for Luke “the apostles” as a group have a specific duty, albeit a transient rather than a permanent one, sent to witness to Jesus’ resurrection and to guarantee his teaching; they are not “missionaries” or “ambassadors” in a Pauline sense (see 2 Cor. 8 & 9; cf. Phil 2: 25). The emphasis for Luke then is the witnessing function of the group of apostles, because

¹⁰⁴ See Flavius Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, 1. 19; 4. 25 (trans. F. C. Conybeare, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912); 50-55, 402-409; cited in Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher*, 105-106.

¹⁰⁵ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* II. 65 (Hicks, 195).

¹⁰⁶ Compare Robbins’ analysis of teacher-disciple tradition in Mark vis-à-vis rabbinic and Greek traditions in his *Jesus the Teacher*, 75-119.

they satisfy the legal requirement that to be a witness to an event one must have witnessed the event. This is clearly the implication of Acts 1: 21-22.

The origin of the use of ἀπόστολος in the substantive remains an enigma.¹⁰⁷

Originally, ἀπόστολος (apostle) is an adjective of the verb ἀποστέλλω (I send).¹⁰⁸ The adjective ἀπόστολος belongs to the semantic field of seafarers in secular Greek. Thus ὁ ἀπόστολος would mean the "sending of out of a fleet"¹⁰⁹; it could also refer to "the naval expedition itself."¹¹⁰ While the adjective occurs occasionally in Greek literature in reference to an envoy or a bearer of a message,¹¹¹ there is yet no evidence of its occurrence in the substantive in Hellenistic period, though Epictetus applied the notion of the divine

¹⁰⁷ See Francis H. Agnew, "On the Origin of the Term APOSTOLOS," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 49-53 and "The Origin of the NT Apostle-Concept: A Review of Research," *JBL* 105 (1986): 75-96.

¹⁰⁸ See Plato, *Epistles* 346a (trans. R. G. Bury, vol. VII [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929]): 544-545; cited in Walter Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church* (New York: Abingdon, 1969): 96.

¹⁰⁹ See Lysias, *Oratory* 19.21 (trans. W. R. M. Lamb [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930]): 428-429 and Demosthenes, *Orations* 18.107 (trans. C. A. & J. H. Vince [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926]): 88-89; both cited in Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle*, 96.

¹¹⁰ See Demosthenes, *Orations*, 18. 80 (Vince, 68-69); cited in Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle*, 96.

¹¹¹ See Herodotus, *Histories* I. 21 (trans. A. D. Godley, vols I [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920]): 22-25 and Herodotus, *Histories* V.38 (trans. A. D. Godley, vol. III [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922]): 40-43; Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII.300 (trans. Allen Wikgren, vol VIII [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963]): 510-511 and Josephus, *Antiq.* I.146 (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, vol. I [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930]): 70-71; all cited in Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle*, 97.

envoy to the ideal cynic.¹¹² Luke's use of it in a non-technical sense (one who is sent) finds precedent in both Herodotus (I. 21; V. 38) and Josephus (*Antiq.* 17.11.1).¹¹³

2. Kinship

Kinship relation in our text is twofold, namely, a father-son relationship between God and Jesus, and a brotherhood relationship among the apostles. Both relationships are elements of fictive kinship. We treat God as Jesus' father first, then the brotherhood of the apostles.

a. Father-Son Relation: God as Jesus' Father

Our analysis here embraces the title "son of God" and Jesus' reference to God as "my father." While at first glance it appears that titles such as "the son of God" point to sacred texture, and as such should be treated under sacred textural analysis, analysis of their social intertexture, however, indicates the intertextural weaving of kingship into the discussion. As we shall show presently, divine sonship flows from a specific human social role as a king.

In verse 29 Jesus talks about his father. We know this father is the god of Israel, for in Luke Jesus calls no one else his father except God (see Luke 10:21-22; 11:13; 12:30; 22:42; 23:34,46; 24:49; Acts 1:4, 7; 2:33). Luke 1:32 indicates that Jesus "will be called the Son of the Most High." Jesus' sonship of God creates a father-son relationship between God and Jesus. In characterising his relationship with God as father-son, Jesus suggests his

¹¹² Epictetus, *Discourses* 3.22.3; 4.8.31 (trans. W. A. Oldfather, vol I [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925]): 132-133, 386-387.

¹¹³ For a detailed exploration of the origin of NT usage of this term, see Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle*, 96-197.

uniqueness and closeness to God. Luke 22:29b (“just as my father appointed me a kingdom”) fulfils Luke 1:32b-33 (“and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, and will reign over the house of Jacob forever: and of his kingdom there will be no end”).

Jesus’ divine sonship has been muted in Luke’s version of the genealogy of Jesus (3:23-38), although, as many scholars have noted,¹¹⁴ one of the differences between the Matthean genealogy and Luke’s is that Matthew traces Jesus to Abraham, while Luke traces it to Adam and to God. From the point of view of the genealogies, the Lukan Jesus has both a human and a divine origin, while the Matthean Jesus has only a human origin. Luke’s placement of his genealogy after the baptism of Jesus, where a voice from heaven claims Jesus as God’s son, then, permits this divine origin.¹¹⁵ Yet there is more to the genealogy: Luke is impelled to include both Abraham and Adam in his because it serves Luke’s inclusive motif, which is to include all humanity in the salvation that Jesus brings.¹¹⁶

In Luke’s writings, Jesus is the miraculously born king, known titularly as divine “son of God” and whose divinisation is evidenced in his miracle-working life.

We have textual evidence of Israelites addressing God as “father” or “my father” (3 Macc 5:7; 6:3; Wis 14:3; Sir 23:1). There is also a Dead Sea Scroll Psalm addressing God

¹¹⁴ For a comprehensive analysis and comparison of both genealogies, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1994): 56-95.

¹¹⁵ That is if the voice is indeed the voice of God. For in the Gospel of the Hebrews (GHeb 3 & 4) the voice is that of Jesus’ mother, the Holy Spirit.

¹¹⁶ See Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 90-91.

in Hebrew as “my father” (4Q372); here Joseph prayed: “My Father and my God, do not abandon me to the hands of the nations...” (Vermes’ translation).

The expression “my father” in relation to God appears three times in Luke (10:22; 22:29; 24:49). It never appears in Mark. Matthew’s use of it is problematic since it lacks any synoptic parallel, the only exception being Matt 11:27 (Luke 10:22). Matthew introduces the expression where Mark and Luke lack it. For instance, we have Matt 12:50 (the will of my father) to Mark 3:35 and Luke 8:21 (the will of God) and Matt 26:29 (my father’s kingdom) to Mark 14:25 and Luke 22: 18 (kingdom of God).

Luke 22:29-30 also points to Jesus as David’s son. This text fulfils the promise in Luke 1:32-33, it also points the reader to the following prophecy of Nathan to David:

2 Sam 7:12-16

When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, **I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son.** When he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men; but I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure for ever before me; your throne shall be established for ever.

Luke 1:32-33

He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, **33 and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there will be no end."**

There is visible thematic overlap between Luke 1:32-33 and this text from the second book of Samuel. This is evident from the text in bold print. In our view Luke 1:32-33 clearly is a modified recitation and reconfiguration of the text from Samuel. It is also a cultural intertextual allusion since the promise to David of an everlasting kingdom through his descendant had become part of Israelite cultural heritage by the time Luke was writing.

i. Israelite Origin of the Title “Son of God.”

Having said this, we need to explore the Israelite as well as the Hellenistic origin of the title “son of God.” The formal title “the son of God” does not occur in the Hebrew Bible. But it mentions three types of “son of God:” (1) angelic or heavenly beings (Gen 6: 2,4; Deut 32:8; Ps 29:1; 89:7; Dan 3:25); (2) the people of Israel as sons of God (Exod 4:22; Jer 31: 9,20; Hos 11:1; Deut 32:5-6, 18-19); and (3) Israelite king (royal sonship) as Son of God (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 89:26-27). The title “the son of god” in the form of royal divine sonship appears in the Qumran text (4Q246), a pseudo-Danielic text that has been preserved in Aramaic. In this Aramaic Apocalypse (4Q246) we find two phrases similar to two phrases in Luke (1:32,35):

Luke 1:32,35:	4Q246:
He will be great, and will be called <u>the Son of the Most High</u>; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David. And the angel said to her, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, <u>the Son of God</u>.”	“...he will be great on earth...will make and all will serve...he will be called (or: call himself) [gran]d... and by his name he will be designated (or: designate himself). <u>The son of God</u> he will be proclaimed (or: proclaim himself) and <u>the son of the Most High</u> they will call him.”

The similarities are underlined. We cannot pay full attention to this Qumran parallel here, we can only note that besides the similarity in the two phrases (“the Son of the Most High” and “the Son of God”), they are in both texts prophetic statements about one to be born. While it is certain in Luke that it is people who will call the-yet-to-be born person “the son of God” and “the son of the Most High,” it is not so clear who will so designate him in the

Qumran text. Be that as it may, there may be a correspondence between the two texts, indicating a common tradition about the Messiah.

Every Israelite is considered a son of God, that is deriving from the sonship of the people of Israel. This type of divine sonship fits into the second of the three classes of sonship we have identified above. But it was formerly applied to the just man, the righteous man (Sir 4:10 LXX; Wis 2:17-18). That is, the just man is considered a son of God. This fits the first of the three classes (angelic or heavenly being). There is also textual evidence that the title "son of God" initially applied to the reigning Israelite king is later applied to the Davidic future ruler, the Messiah (Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14). Psalm 2: 7 evidences divine adoption of the king as son at coronation. And as this relates to Nathan's prophetic message (2 Sam 7: 14), we concur with Roland de Vaux that "the text speaks of the adoption of the entire Davidic dynasty, for this adoption, obviously, had to be made effective for each sovereign"¹¹⁷; it is thus applied to Solomon (1 Ch 22: 10; 28: 6). Even certain Qumran texts envisage God begetting the Messiah (IQSa-IQ28a). The Davidic king then can be seen in some texts to become son of God consequent on his social role as king of Israel.

The above analysis indicates some rhetorical progression in the evolution of the concept of divine sonship of Israelite kingship. That is, it progresses from divine sonship of angelic or human being to divine sonship of all Israelites, and to Israelite king as god's son.

ii. Egyptian Precedent

There might have been a correspondence between the Israelite concept of divine sonship and that of ancient Egypt. Or indeed Israel might have borrowed that concept from

¹¹⁷ De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 112-13.

Egypt, because Egyptian literature also indicates a father-son social relationship between their gods and kings. For instance, literary evidence shows that Egyptians portrayed their king as son of the sun-god Helios, son of Zeus. In fact, by the Middle Kingdom (c 1938-1759 BCE), each king held five names (the so-called five fold titulary), each of which encapsulated a specific aspect of the kingship: three emphasised his role as a god, while the two others underscored the supposed division of Egypt into two unified lands.¹¹⁸

The Egyptian king Amenhotep IV (1375-1350 BCE) attempted to introduce monotheistic religion in Egypt.¹¹⁹ To this end, he forced his people to worship only Aton, and changed his own name to Ikhn-aton (“Worshipper of Aton”). Amenhotep inspired a number of hymns to the glory of the deity, Aton. In one hymn king Amenhotep claimed special revelation from the deity:

Thou art in my heart,
There is no other that knoweth thee
Save thy son Ikhn-aton.
Thou has made him wise
In thy designs and in thy might.¹²⁰

In another hymn the king claimed sonship of the deity:

All that thou has made dances before thee,
Thy august son rejoices, his heart is joyous,
O living Aton, born in the sky every day.
He begets his august son Wanre (Ikhn-aton)
Like himself without ceasing...

¹¹⁸ Ian Shaw, ed. *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000): 8.

¹¹⁹ See Lewis Browne, *The World's Great Scriptures: An Anthology of the Sacred Books of the Ten Principal Religions* (New York: Macmillan, 1961): 38-44.

¹²⁰ Browne, *World's Great Scriptures*, 42.

Even me, thy son, in whom thou art satisfied,
 Who bears thy name.
 Thy strength and thy might abide in my heart.
 Thou art Aton, living forever... ¹²¹

The above textual evidence proves that the notion of divine sonship was not unique to the Israelites, even if they did not depend on the Egyptians for the concept.

iii. The Hellenistic World

That the connection Luke maintains between Jesus' kingship and his divine sonship is not unique can be confirmed by a further exploration of the Hellenistic world. There is also a father-son relationship between Roman gods and emperors. Alexander the Great was called "son of Ammon" (son of Zeus in Greek). During the Roman imperial period *Divi filius* became θεοῦ υἱός. For instance, when Julius Caesar was recognised as a Roman god (*divus*) in 42 BCE, Octavian (Augustus), his adopted son, became son of a god: Augustus also became son of a god when he was deified after his death in 13 CE.¹²²

Individual divine sonship is present in Greek literature as well. The Stoics' doctrines of the unity of mankind suggest to them the notion of divine sonship. Heracles who believed he was the son of Zeus, believed also that God was the father of all the women and children he abandoned.¹²³ The notion of divine charisma in mortals is not

¹²¹ Browne, *World's Great Scriptures*, 44.

¹²² See Michael Grant, *The Roman Emperors: A Biographical Guide to the Rulers of Imperial Rome 31 BC to AD 476* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1985): 10, 15.

¹²³ See Epictetus, *Discourses* Book I.3.2; 13.3 (Oldfather, 24-25, 98-99, 334-335); Book II.16.44; Book III.22.18; 24.14-16 (Oldfather, 137-139, 188-189); all cited in *TDNT* VIII, 337.

foreign to Greek poetry and bibliography¹²⁴; there is evidence also of “known historical figures to whom divinity is ascribed in some form, e.g., the Spartan general Lysander who was venerated as divine after the victory over Athens in 404 and to whom a cult was devoted in Samos.¹²⁵ In Celsus’ attempt to refute the Christian claim that Jesus is the only son of God, he mentioned that the Simonians regarded Simon Magus as an angelic being and Helenians regarded Helene as a divine being as well.¹²⁶ And Origen in his refutation of Celsus revealed that Simon said he was “the so-called Great Power of God,” while Dositheus said he “himself was son of God.”¹²⁷

The above evidence from the Hellenistic world,¹²⁸ as well as from Egypt indicates that one’s social role as king may earn him divine sonship in some ancient societies. In this way, the connection that Luke maintains between Jesus’ kingship and his divine sonship is not unique.

¹²⁴ Cf. for example, the seer Iamos in Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 6.29-63 (trans. William H. Race [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997]): 104-111; Oedipus in Sophocles, *Oedipus in Colonus*, 1447-1666 (F. Storr, trans. *Sophocles*, vol I [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912]): 278-295; the poet Comatas in Theocritus, *Idylls* 7.89 (J. M. Edmonds, trans. *The Greek Bucolic Poets* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912]): 100-101; all cited in *TDNT* VIII, 338.

¹²⁵ See Duris of Samos in Plutarch, *Lysander*, XVIII.1-3 (Plutarch, *Lives*, IV, trans. Bernadotte Perrin [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916]): 280-281; cited in *TDNT* VIII, 338.

¹²⁶ See R. Joseph Hoffmann, trans. Celsus, *On the True Doctrine: A Discourse against the Christians*, (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987): 90-91.

¹²⁷ See Henry Chadwick, ed. & trans. *Origen: Contra Celsum*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965): 325.

¹²⁸ For further exploration of the emperor, see Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, CN: American Philological Association, 1931).

iv. NT: Resurrection as Son of God

NT evidence suggests that Son of God is also a title given to a miracle-worker. Put differently, it is understood that it is within the nature of the son of God to work miracles (mighty works). The demons call Jesus son of God (Mark 3:18// Matt 10:4; Luke 6:15); Mark 11:9-10; Luke 19:37-38. The devil at the temptation scene (Luke 4:1-13; Matt 4:1-11) demands that Jesus perform miracles if he is the Son of God. As Jesus hangs on the cross he is challenged to save himself if he is the Christ of God, his Chosen one, or king of the Judeans (Luke 23:35-37). Here then we see a movement from Jesus' social role as Judean king to a miracle worker; it is a movement from social texture to sacred texture.

Furthermore, in Luke Jesus is the miraculously-born and miracle-working Son of God, as reflected in his birth story and ministry. In the Acts (13:33-37; 2:31) Jesus' resurrection is depicted as the point at which sonship of God is given to Jesus. For Luke divine sonship of Jesus properly begins at Easter, hence the lack of pre-existent divine sonship in Luke. It is by raising Jesus from death that the Lukan Jesus becomes Messiah, the anointed Son of God. Luke understands Jesus' resurrection as his enthronement. This is Luke's understanding of Ps 2:7; 16:9-11 and Isa 55:3.

From the above NT evidence one can conclude that the earliest use of son of God as a Christological title may have derived from Jesus' activities as a miracle-worker and exorcist, but it is difficult to know if it derives also from his "own consciousness of an immediate and intimate contact with the heavenly Father" as Geza Vermes opines.¹²⁹ This

¹²⁹ See Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*

is a step toward deification. But “Resurrection as Son of God” as Luke suggests may have coloured NT understanding of Jesus’ social relationship with the God of Israel.

In summary we can conclude, from Egyptian as well as Hellenistic textual evidence, that the concept of divine sonship was common among the ancients. The evidence from Israelite literature permits us to agree with Vermes that, it would appear that a first-century CE Israelite, hearing the phrase son of God, would have thought first of all of celestial being; “and secondly, when the human connection was clear, of a just and saintly man. The divine sonship of the Messiah was expected to be within a royal context. In a Hellenistic milieu-and there alone-the epithet would allegedly have called to mind a miracle-worker.”¹³⁰ All in all, Luke’s notion of divine sonship is not without precedent in Israelite literature and in the broader Greek and Roman literature.

b. Brotherhood of the Apostles:

Before we consider the brotherhood of the apostles as sacred texture we need to explore its social context. Luke promotes a fictive kinship relationship among the apostles.¹³¹ Jesus’ directive to Peter to strengthen his brothers (22: 32) points to a fictive familial relationship among the apostles and subsequent disciples. The notion of fictive familial ties is already evident in Jesus’ reference to those who hear and obey the word of God as his mother and brothers (Luke 8: 21). Paul also in his letters promotes spiritual

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973): 211.

¹³⁰ Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 200.

¹³¹ By “fictive family” I mean a family-like social relationship. That is, the ways in which some people, who otherwise have no familial relationship, regard and treat one another as family.

brotherhood among disciples (see for example, Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Galatians).

Like Paul, Luke in the LS uses familial imagery to create an identity for his Jesus-movement group.¹³² This shows that though discipleship demands renunciation of familial ties (14: 25-26), Jesus still couches relationship among his disciples in familial terms.

The usage of the term brother in Acts (see for example, 1:15,16; 2:29, 37; 3:17; 6:3) as a form of address, as in Pauline writings, makes it a title of discipleship. This titular use of brother in first-century texts is evidenced in materials preserved by Josephus. For instance, in a letter confirming certain grants to Jonathan the high priest, king Demetrius Soter begins thus: "King Demetrius to Jonathan his brother, and to all the nation of the Jews, sendeth greeting. We have sent you a copy of that epistle which we have written to Lasthenes our kinsman, that you may know its contents."¹³³ Josephus also records how King Alexander Balas also addressed Jonathan as "brother" in his letter soliciting Jonathan's friendship against Demetrius:

¹³² See Reidar Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plurarch and Paul: Its Role and Character," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 166-182; Philip F. Esler, "Family Imagery and Christian Identity in Gal 5: 13 to 6: 10," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 121-149; Lone Fatum, "Brotherhood in Christ: A Gender Hermeneutical Reading of 1 Thessalonians," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 183-197; and Karl Olav Sandnes, "Equality within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspectives on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother-or Sisterhood and a Family," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (London/New York: Routledge, 1997): 150-165.

¹³³ Josephus, *Antiq.* 13. 4. 9 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 343).

King Alexander to his brother Jonathan, sendeth greeting. We have long ago heard of thy courage and thy fidelity, and for that reason have sent to thee, to make with thee a league of friendship and mutual assistance. We therefore do ordain thee this day the high priest of the Jews, and that thou beest called my friend. I have also sent thee, as presents, a purple robe and a golden crown, and desire that, now thou art by us honoured, thou wilt in like manner respect us also.¹³⁴

The Essenes may have addressed one another as brother as well. Although we have no direct evidence of this practice from their literature, from Josephus we know the Essenes were a brotherhood;¹³⁵ their brotherly bond was so strict that no member was permitted to eat outside the brotherhood.¹³⁶ Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BCE to 50 CE) in his *Quod omnis Probus Liber Sit* (*Every Good Man is Free*) gives evidence of brotherhood among the Essenes.¹³⁷

Plutarch in his treatise *On Brother Love* (περὶ φιλαδελφίας) provides a rationale for the choice of fictive brotherhood as a title of discipleship among subgroups, like the Essenes and the Jesus-movement group. Plutarch's treatise can be characterised as a treatise on the "ethics" of brotherly love.¹³⁸ According to Plutarch, the familial bond is stronger

¹³⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* 13. 2. 2 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 337).

¹³⁵ Josephus, *Wars* 2. 8.3 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 605).

¹³⁶ Josephus, *Wars*, 2. 8.8 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 606).

¹³⁷ *Quod omnis Probus* XII. 79 (Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 689); cited in Barton, "The Relativisation of Family Ties," 86.

¹³⁸ See Hans Dieter Betz, ed. *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden E. J. Brill, 1978): 232; cited in Esler, "Family Imagery and Christian Identity," 127.

than the friendship bond, because the brotherly bond is natural. For this reason Plutarch prioritised brotherly honour over and above friendship honour:

But even if we feel an equal affection for a friend, we should always be careful to reserve for a brother the first place in public offices and administrations, and in invitations and introductions to distinguished men, and, in general, whenever we deal with occasions which in the eyes of the public give distinction and tend to confer honour, rendering thus to Nature the appropriate dignity and prerogative.¹³⁹

It is reasonable to presume that Plutarch displays a notion of brotherly bond common in his social environment.¹⁴⁰

This notion of brotherly bond explains why social subgroups regularly use it as a model on which to build their social relationships. Thus natural brotherly bond serves as a template for fictive brotherhood. It is this natural bond between physical brothers that Luke seeks to exploit in his fictive brotherhood of the disciples.

3. Patronage System

Patronage system creates a patron-client relationship, one of the two forms of dyadic¹⁴¹ contracts in first-century Mediterranean society,¹⁴² a society of limited goods and

¹³⁹ Plutarch, 491B (W. C. Helmbold, trans. *Plutarch's Moralia* VI [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939]): 316-319; cited in Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul," 170.

¹⁴⁰ For more detailed analyses of Plutarch's treatise *On Brother Love* (Helmbold, *Plutarch's Moralia* VI, 246-325), see Betz, *Plutarch's Ethical Writings*; Aasgaard, "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul" and Esler, "Family Imagery and Identity."

¹⁴¹ By dyadic I mean a social relationship in which two people are linked as a pair. See a further discussion of dyadic relationship in chapter five below.

¹⁴² George M. Foster is perhaps the first to call this type of social relationship a "dyadic contract." See his article, "The Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure

services; the other form of dyadic contract is colleague contract. A dyadic personality is one who needs other people continually in order to know who he or she really is. Such persons are very conscious of what others expect of them and try to live out those expectations. In contrast, individualist personalities see themselves as unique individuals because they believe they are set apart from other unique and set-apart individuals.¹⁴³ While the colleague contract is an informal contract between two people of equal status, a patron-client relationship is an informal contract between two people of unequal status.¹⁴⁴ The patronage system,¹⁴⁵ then, provides a means to keep social inferiors depend on their superiors.¹⁴⁶

Luke asserts that gentile kings are in a patron-client relationship with their subjects.¹⁴⁷ Luke's depiction of gentile kings as leaders who allowed themselves to be

of a Mexican Peasant Village," *American Anthropologist* 63 (1961): 1173-92. See also Malina, *New Testament World*, 100.

¹⁴³ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 63-116.

¹⁴⁴ On this social system, see Bruce J. Malina, "Patron and Client: The Analogy Behind Synoptic Theology," *Forum* 4, no 1 (1988): 2-32 and Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, and L. Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

¹⁴⁵ Further exploration of patronage system is billed for chapter five below.

¹⁴⁶ See Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997): 49.

¹⁴⁷ The term *εὐεργέτης* (benefactor) does not occur anywhere else in the NT outside Luke 22:25. The only place its verbal form appears in the NT is Acts 10:38 where Luke describes how Jesus went about doing good (*εὐεργετῶν*). Luke uses some other terms that fall within the semantic field of benefactor, namely, good man (*ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός*), philanthropy (*φιλιανθρωπία*). In Luke 23:50 Luke calls Joseph of Arimathea a good and

called benefactors fits Roman emperors as they capitalized on the patronage system to establish themselves as major patrons and benefactors, and to “build tiered patterns of personal loyalty.”¹⁴⁸ The *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (the achievements of the divine Augustus), for example, provides us with an *index rerum a se gestarum* (a record of Augustus’ accomplishments as emperor of Rome).¹⁴⁹ In this record Augustus characterised himself as:¹⁵⁰

1. Liberator of the people
2. Displayer of Collegiality
3. Participant in the life of Rome
4. Benefactor of the people
5. Benefactor of Veterans
6. Benefactor of the State
7. Benefactor of the needy
8. Man of piety
9. Restorer of Temples and public works
10. Generous contributor to the state
11. Sponsor of games and shows
12. Sponsor of naval spectacles
13. Generous in victory

righteous man (ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος) and in Acts 11:24 he calls Barnabas a good man (ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθός), the same Barnabas who generously gave the proceeds of his land to the apostles (Acts 4:36-37). For a detailed exploration of Luke’s show of awareness of the semantic field of the Graeco-Roman benefactor, see Frederick W. Danker, *Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987): 6-17 and *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982): 318-392.

¹⁴⁸ See Osiek and Balch, *Families*, 49.

¹⁴⁹ Caesar Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, eds. P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore (London: Oxford University Press, 1967); cited in Danker, *Benefactor*, 257.

¹⁵⁰ Caesar Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 18-37; cited in Danker, *Benefactor*, 257-270.

14. Peace extended
15. Frontiers secured
16. Coloniser
17. Redeemer of the standards
18. Expansions
19. Friends of kings
20. Host of kings
21. Negotiator of kingship
22. Man of superb distinction
23. Father of his country.

This enumeration of achievements by Caesar Augustus clearly establishes him as a benefactor. Not only did his subjects recognise him as their benefactor by a special commemoration of his birthday attested to by “The Letter of the Proconsul Paulus Fabius Maximus” and “The Decree of the Provincial Assembly” in Asia,¹⁵¹ but also he was deified at death to honour him for his benefactions.¹⁵²

The historian Cassius Dio asserts that the cult of the emperor, which began under Augustus, “has been continued under other emperors, not only among the people of Greece, but also among all the others insofar as they are subject to the Romans.”¹⁵³ Not surprisingly, then, we find evidence of benefaction being promoted in subsequent imperial depictions.

Nero (54-68), a contemporary of Luke, is another example of the public display of kingly benefaction. That Nero considered himself a benefactor is evidenced by his wish to

¹⁵¹ See Danker, *Benefactor*, 6-7.

¹⁵² See Grant, *The Roman Emperors*, 15.

¹⁵³ Cassius Dio, *Histories* L1.20.7 (trans, Earnest Cary [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917]): 56-57.

have Rome named after him.¹⁵⁴ Artaxata and Caesarea Philippi were named Neronias after him.¹⁵⁵ Additionally, Nero received the following accolade: “To Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Emperor, Saviour [σωτήρ] and Benefactor [εὐεργέτης] of the world...”¹⁵⁶ In various degrees then, most if not all, Roman emperors would fit Luke’s characterization of gentile kings as benefactors.

That Roman emperors did lord it over their subjects is evident from the fact that they were dictators. Julius Caesar, for example, declared himself perpetual dictator.¹⁵⁷ While Augustus declared that both the senate and people offered him the dictatorship (dictaturam).¹⁵⁸ Additionally, in honour of Hyracanus, high priest and ethnarch of the Judeans, Caesar willed to him and his children to be ethnarchs and high priests of the Judeans forever.¹⁵⁹ Nero bestowed on Agrippa part of Galilee, Tiberias, and Taricheae, and “ordered them to submit to his jurisdiction”¹⁶⁰; Agrippa it was who rebuilt Caesarea

¹⁵⁴ See Tacitus, *Annals* 15.40.3 (trans. J. Jackson [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937]): 276-277.

¹⁵⁵ See Cassius Dio, *Histories* LXII.7.2 (Cary, 146-147) and Josephus, *Antiq.* 20.90.4 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 538). See also Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, and Jews*, 299.

¹⁵⁶ See Danker, *Luke*, 8.

¹⁵⁷ Josephus, *Antiq.* 14.10.7 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 379).

¹⁵⁸ See Caesar Augustus, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 20 #5.

¹⁵⁹ Josephus, *Antiq.* 14.10.2-6 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 378-79).

¹⁶⁰ Josephus, *Antiq.* 20.8.4 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 535).

Philippi and named it Neronias.¹⁶¹ And Felix, the procurator of Judea arranged the assassination of Jonathan, the high priest, for admonishing him (Felix) to govern Judean affairs better than he did.¹⁶² These are all acts of “lording,” besides the fact that imperialism itself constitutes “lording.”

In summary we have in the above section identified three kinds of social relationship, namely, a teacher-disciple, kinship and a patron-client relationship. Our analysis has indicated that the teacher-disciple tradition in Luke agrees more with the Greek itinerant teaching tradition than with the Israelite tradition. Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as a divine son coheres with Israelite concept of royal divine sonship. This notion of divine sonship finds examples in Egyptian as well as Hellenistic literary traditions, while textual evidence shows that natural brotherly bond has informed the fictive brotherhood of the apostles.

C. Social Identity/ Role:

Luke 22:1-38 features certain kinds of social role or social identity. In the Lukan LS textual unit we identify the following social roles: Israelite leaders (chief priests, scribes, and temple officials) [vv. 2, 4-5]; preparing meal (v.8); drawing of water (v.10); house

¹⁶¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* 20.9.4 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 538).

¹⁶² Josephus, *Antiq.* 20.8.5 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 535).

mastering (v. 11); leadership (vv.24-27, 30); diner server (v.27); lord (vv. 33, 38); and cockcrow (v.34).¹⁶³

1. Israelite Leaders

Our text mentions three groups of Israelite leaders, namely, the chief priests, the scribes and temple captains. As we have shown in the previous chapter, these are the authorities Luke claims want to destroy Jesus. And as we have already shown also, the hostility between these Israelite authorities and Jesus has built up through the narrative of the Third Gospel. Unlike the Pharisees, whom Luke portrays as both friends and enemies of Jesus,¹⁶⁴ there is no love lost between Jesus and the chief priests and scribes. That it is temple officials who seek to destroy Jesus indicates that the bone of contention must be the temple culture itself, since the social role of the chief priests, scribes and temple captains connects them to the temple, the most sacred Israelite locale.¹⁶⁵

The three sets of leaders, namely, chief priests, scribes, and temple officials correspond to social personages within Israelite society oriented to the temple. For instance, Josephus gives prominent position to the office of the high priest in his *Antiquities of the*

¹⁶³ Although the cock crows by nature, a pre-industrial society such as the first-century Mediterranean, converts cockcrow into social benefit, as the society has to follow solar timing. It is in light of this that we talk of the cock playing a social role. We shall discuss gentile kings as benefactors under cultural intertexture below.

¹⁶⁴ On mixed portraits of the Pharisees in Luke's writings, see David B. Gowler, *Host, Guest, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts* (New York: Peter Lang Press, 1991).

¹⁶⁵ An exploration of the sacred is billed for our chapter on sacred texture below.

Jews.¹⁶⁶ And his enumeration of the high priests from Aaron to high priests in the era of Roman imperialism certainly underscores the significance of that office.¹⁶⁷ The office of chief priest among the Israelites is analogous to the *pontifex maximus* in Roman tradition.¹⁶⁸

2. Persons Preparing Meals and Fetching Water

Two further social roles are identified in 22: 8, 10, and 13. Peter and John are depicted in 22: 8 and 13 as those charged with preparing the meal. Peter and John's social role here involve, at least, the sacrifice of the Passover lamb in the temple, cooking it, and setting the table.

Secondly, in v. 10 Jesus informs Peter and John that a man carrying a jar of water will meet them. While this action indicative of a pre-industrial setting, where people have to go to draw water from a common source of water, like a well, it is strange for a man to be carrying a jar of water, since drawing water seems to be an exclusive function of women in the first-century Palestinian (cf. Gen. 24:11; John 4).¹⁶⁹

This suggestion of a man carrying out a domestic function that is exclusive to women remains an enigma. I. Howard Marshall's suggestion that it is a pre-arranged sign is

¹⁶⁶ See especially his account of the high priests under the reign of emperor Nero in *Antiq.* 20.8-10 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 534-541).

¹⁶⁷ Josephus, *Antiq.* 20.10 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 538-541).

¹⁶⁸ See Josephus, *Antiq.* 14.10.2 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 378).

¹⁶⁹ See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1383.

unlikely since it is the person carrying a jar of water that will meet the two apostles.¹⁷⁰ As the text stands the role of the person with the jar of water is simply to lead Peter and John to where they will prepare the Passover meal: it only indicates that Peter and John do not know the location of the house and that Jesus had made a prior arrangement. In light of this I take exception to Fitzmyer's rejection of a possible translation of ἄνθρωπος as a human being, because it "would deprive the saying of its intent, since the meeting of a person with a jug of water would not necessarily be as out of the ordinary as the saying seems to imply, a 'man' carrying a jug of water."¹⁷¹ Why must we assume an out-of-the-ordinary intent? In my view, a solution is to translate ἄνθρωπος as "a person."

3. House Master

A third social role is identified in 22:11. There, Jesus sends Peter and John to the master of the house in order to secure a suitable place for the Passover meal.¹⁷² A householder is simply the head of a household, usually an adult male, the *paterfamilias* (e.g. the father of the family). The *paterfamilias* in ancient Rome, for example, had enormous power over family members.¹⁷³ The master of the house in our text is fulfilling

¹⁷⁰ See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 791.

¹⁷¹ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1382.

¹⁷² Τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας is better translated as "the master of the house" as rendered in the New American Bible. See also Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1376; Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. 4th. Rev. ed. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio, 1993): 270.

¹⁷³ Adult members of the household often married only with consent of the *paterfamilias*. See R. Saller, "Corporal Punishment, Authority, and Obedience in the Roman Household," in *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Roman*, ed. Beryl Rawson (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 1991): 144-65; Eva Marie Lassen, "The

the social role of a host. He may even be Jesus' benefactor, since Jesus speaks as one who is familiar with the master of the house and there appears to be some prearrangement between Jesus and the master of the house, in spite of Luke's suggestion to the contrary (22: 13).

4. Leader and Dinner Server

Jesus' instruction to the apostles on greatness, which indicates the leadership role of the apostles in the new social order, is introduced in relation to another social role, namely, serving at meals. Thus, Jesus tells them that, while they will, in fact, dine with him in the kingdom, they will also be judging the twelve tribes of Israel, thereby giving them a new social role in the new social order, a role that will include ruling.¹⁷⁴ They will first have to be like servants at a meal, that is, slave service.

Here we distinguish service (something done to benefit another) from slave service (things slaves do to benefit their owners). This distinction is necessary, because leadership as service in a hierarchically structured society is, in fact, what patronage is all about. Slave service, however, is required service, the obligatory service of underlings, and it is that kind of service Jesus promotes here. While rulers, be they Israelite or gentile, certainly render service that benefits their subjects, nowhere do rulers perform slave service, required service. In this fashion, Jesus is asking the "new rulers" (the apostles) to undertake a new form of rule, that is, a rule that will be characterised as slave service.

Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor," in *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, ed. Halvor Moxnes (New York: Routledge, 1997): 104-107.

¹⁷⁴ See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1419.

Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BCE to ca. 50 CE) shows in his writings that serving at table was considered slave service by his contemporaries. This is evident from his account of the attitude of the Therapeutae to slave ministration to guests in his *De Vita Contemplativa* (*On the Contemplative Life*):

They do not use the ministration of slaves, looking upon the possession of servants of slaves to be a thing absolutely and wholly contrary to nature, for nature has created all men free, but the injustice and covetousness of some men who prefer inequality, that cause evil, having subdued some, has given to the more powerful authority over those who are weaker. Accordingly in this sacred entertainment there is, as I have said, no slave, but free men, minister to guests, performing the offices of servants, not under compulsion, nor in obedience to any imperial commands, but of their own voluntary free will, with all eagerness and promptitude anticipating all orders...¹⁷⁵

The point as this text indicates, however, is not to encourage the Therapeutae to slave service but to discourage them from it because it is considered inhuman.

Our analysis of gentile kingship above has already clearly suggested that gentile kings would not characterise their service to their subjects as slave service, the kind that the Lukan Jesus espouses here. For instance, none of the achievements Caesar Augustus listed in his *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (*the Achievements of Divine Augustus*) falls under slave service. Secondly, as we have observed above, Roman imperial rule over Israel was nothing but a “lording over.” Again, Philo’s account indicates that the Therapeutae consider imperial commands to be slave service. Certainly then, Roman contemporary leadership over Israel was diametrically opposed to the kind of role that the Lukan Jesus promotes for these new leaders. It would seem then that we are dealing with a society where teachers and

¹⁷⁵ *De Vita Cont.* IX. 70-71 (Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 704).

judges are of high status, while servers at table are considered low, but where somehow this situation will be reversed.

5. Cock Crow

In v. 34 Luke points up the social role of the cock. The social role of the cock is to crow at dawn; it is roughly the equivalent of modern alarm clocks. In a pre-industrial society this is an important role. Industrialised societies have little idea of this role of the cock in society. For example, in my social environment the cock crows three times: first, at about 4.00AM, second about 5.00AM, and by about 6.00AM. By the third cockcrow, the farmer who is still on his bed knows he is already late. The role of the cock alludes to the social role of the cock as a wake-up caller in the first-century Mediterranean society. The use of cockcrow by Luke, as well as by the other evangelists, for the timing of Peter's denial of Jesus indicates that our text is located within a pre-industrial society where people still follow solar timing (cf. Gen 19:23; Exod 17:12; Lev 22:7; Deut 23:11; Jos 10:12-13, 27; Judg 9:33; Dan 6:14).

D. Summary

The foregoing analysis has identified the common social realities that the Lukan LS is evoking. Every member of the first-century Mediterranean world would have knowledge of these realities. For instance, they would have known of teachers with disciples similar to Jesus (e.g. John the Baptist; Socrates). These social phenomena that Luke's LS evokes help us to locate the LS socially in the first-century Mediterranean social world.

For instance, the social role of the cock reveals that the text is socially located in a pre-industrial environment. The temple and the household show two important Israelite social institutions that will play important roles in the mission and the life of the

community of Acts, just as they were important in the ministry of Jesus. Furthermore, we see that the kind of leadership Luke's Jesus promotes is completely opposed to the kind of leadership Romans were exercising over Israel. It is thus not accidental that Jesus clearly contrasts his concept of leadership to that of gentile kings who lord it over their subjects and allowed themselves be called benefactors (Luke 22: 25-26). Our investigation so far indicates strong coherence between Israelite social systems, the broader Graeco-Roman social systems and Luke's LS text, which means that Luke is dependent on Israelite and Graeco-Roman social systems for his composition. It also suggests, however, that Luke has a rhetorical strategy for challenging aspects of that social world.

III. Cultural Intertexture

Texts relate not only to other external texts and social realities, but also to cultures and traditions.¹⁷⁶ Recalling our definition of culture, we understand that it is culture that puts meanings and values into common human realities. For instance, marriage is a

¹⁷⁶ See Abraham Malherbe, "Gentile as a Nurse: The Lyric Background to 1 Thess II," *NovT* 12 (1970): 203-17; Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)], PhD. diss., Atlanta Emory University, 1993; and Russell B. Sisson, *The Apostle as Athlete: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 9*, PhD diss., Atlanta Emory University, 1994. Robbins' works over the years demonstrate that texts relate to cultures and traditions. See for instance, Vernon K. Robbins, "The Woman Who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts," *NTS* 33 (1987): 502-15; *Jesus the Teacher*; "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994): 164-209; *Exploring*; and *Tapestry*. And even though the authors of *Intertextuality in Biblical Literature* (Kampen: Kok, 1989) did not include analysis of cultural intertexture in their various articles, they seem to presuppose cultural intertexture. See Robbins, *Exploring*, 108.

common human reality, but the meaning and value of marriage differ from culture to culture. While western culture thinks marriage is between two people, a man and a woman, there are cultures where marriage is understood as “a legal and social contract between two families,” the family of the man and that of the woman.¹⁷⁷ In some societies marriage can be for the purpose of a political relationship.¹⁷⁸ In what follows we shall be looking to see evidence of coherence between cultural data in Luke’s LS and Israelite and or Greco-Roman cultural traditions.

We will look for this coherence of Cultural intertexture by examining reference, allusion or echo.¹⁷⁹ Reference concerns the occurrence of a word or a phrase that refers to a personage or tradition that is known only to people in a culture. For instance, in Acts 14:11-12 the people of Lystra refer to Barnabas and Paul as Zeus and Hermes respectively. This is a cultural reference because only people who have been enculturated in Greek culture know the meaning of Zeus and Hermes.¹⁸⁰ Allusion concerns a statement that presupposes the existence of a tradition in textual form, without the text being interpreted attempting to

¹⁷⁷ See Osiek and Balch, *Families*, 42.

¹⁷⁸ For example, in 40 BCE political alliance between Octavian and Antonius was sealed by the marriage of Octavian’s sister Octavia to Antonius. See Grant, *Roman Emperors*, 10.

¹⁷⁹ According to Robbins, “socio-rhetorical criticism uses the term ‘culture’ to refer to the status of a phenomenon that appears in a wide range of literature that spans many centuries.” For instance, “by the first century, Elijah was a cultural rather than simply a textual figure.” See *Tapestry*, 110.

¹⁸⁰ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 59.

“recite” the text.¹⁸¹ For example, cultural allusion occurs in Luke 1:69 when Luke talks of God as having “raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David.” The phrase “a horn of salvation” occurs in 1Sam 2:10; Ps 18:2; Ps 132:17, while “the house of his servant David” is both an allusion to cultural topics and a literary echo of 2Sam 7:1-17, which contains an oracle by Nathan to David in which he refers to David as servant.¹⁸² An echo concerns a word or phrase, which evokes a concept from a cultural tradition.¹⁸³

According to Robbins “echo is subtle and indirect. One person may hear while another does not, and the speaker may or may not have directly intended the echo to be there.”¹⁸⁴ For instance, not every scholar will see in Mark 4:1-34 an echo of Greek *paideia* (instruction on how to live a successful life according to Greek values).¹⁸⁵

Cultural intertexture allows interpreters of biblical texts to go beyond canonical boundaries in their analyses. Jean Delorme appears to share this assertion when he says:

The limits of the scriptural canon do not apply to intertextuality of the biblical books. Intertextuality of a text cannot be confined to previous or subsequent texts presenting a similarity in expression or content. The Bible does not allow itself to be confined to the cultural heritage of the West whose art and literature have been inspired by it. It should be

¹⁸¹ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 58.

¹⁸² See Robbins, *Exploring*, 59.

¹⁸³ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 60.

¹⁸⁴ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 60.

¹⁸⁵ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 60; Burton L. Mack, “Teaching in Parables: Elaboration in Mark 4: 1-34,” in *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989): 155-56 and *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988): 159-60.

confronted for example with Buddhist writings. The cultural worlds are not impermeable and the writings of one world can be understood in another one. With intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, the Bible cannot be a prisoner of an original context from which it escaped a long time ago.¹⁸⁶

It is, however, disappointing that Delorme makes no reference to any extra-biblical tradition in his analysis. Nevertheless, what we need to establish, then, is a particular text's relation to cultures and traditions. Our task here is to explore the interaction among Israelite and Greco-Roman topics, codes, and generic conceptions in Luke 22:1-38, in the form of references, allusions, and echoes.¹⁸⁷ Here then, we are looking to see how Luke's LS could have been read by specific cultural standards of the first-century Mediterranean and understood because of its references, allusions, and echoes that would be clear to someone who is completely acculturated.

A. References and Allusions

Luke 22:1-38 (WT) features references and allusions to Israelite traditions, namely, particular feasts (Unleavened bread/Passover, vv.1, 7, 15), meal custom (recline at table [v. 14], break bread [v.17], prayers [v.17]), kingdoms (vv. 16,18, 29, 30) and gentile kingship and benefaction (vv 25). Our understanding of the meaning and meaning effects of these cultural personages and traditions will require an exploration of Israelite and Greco-Roman literature, because they are products of Israelite as well as Greco-Roman culture.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ Jean Delorme, "Intertextualities About Mark," trans. Marie-Patricia Burns, in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Draisma (Kampen: Kok, 1989): 36.

¹⁸⁷ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 115.

¹⁸⁸ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 63.

1. Israelite Feast

Luke alludes to the Israelite feast of unleavened bread and Passover six times (22:1,7,8,11,13,15). Above, under oral-scribal intertexture, we have shown that Luke's identification of these two feasts finds textual support in the book of Exodus and in Josephus. But Luke demonstrates more than an oral-scribal knowledge of this feast. For instance, he demonstrates also cultural knowledge of the feast by calling it Passover and by indicating that Jerusalem would be crowded because of the influx of pilgrims (v.1). He knows that the Passover lambs must be slaughtered (v.7). He also knows that every family must eat the Passover meal together by having Jesus make plans to eat the Passover meal with his disciples with whom Jesus has formed a fictive family relationship.

2. Meal Custom

Before meals become understood in particular ways in local cultures, they are first and foremost a common human reality. The meal satisfies a common human need, but the meaning and value and even what constitutes a meal differ from culture to culture.¹⁸⁹ The meaning of a meal, according to Mary Douglas, "is found in a system of repeated analogies. Each meal carries something of the meaning of the other meals; each meal is a structured social event which structures others in its own image."¹⁹⁰ For instance, for some cultures

¹⁸⁹ See Mary Douglas, "Deciphering a Meal," in *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology* (London/New York: Routledge, 1999): 239.

¹⁹⁰ Douglas, "Deciphering a Meal," 240.

the meal is a ceremony with rules and regulations.¹⁹¹ Additionally, for Israelites bread is the food that defines a meal,¹⁹² whereas for Douglas a meal includes a number of contrasts, hot and cold, bland and spiced, liquid and semi-liquid, and various textures. It also includes cereals, vegetables, and animal protein.¹⁹³

We may distinguish three kinds of meals, namely, common meals (regular daily meals), festive meals (like thanksgiving, birthday, and wedding meals), and ritual/sacrificial meals (like the Passover meal).¹⁹⁴ The Passover feast we have described above differs markedly from the daily Israelite meal custom. Besides being an annual event, it is also a ritual sacrifice, as well as a ritual meal. As a ritual sacrifice it is offered to God in memory of decisive divine intervention in Israelite history of self-understanding. In this way, Luke's allusion to the Passover feast shows Jesus as an active participant in this Israelite self-understanding, and by portraying the ministry of Jesus as a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Luke argues that Jesus also fulfils this annual cultural obligation.

Although Luke indicates that Jesus and his apostles are going to eat a ritual meal, namely, a Passover meal (22: 7-13), what he, in fact, narrates is a fusion of an aspect of that

¹⁹¹ See Jerome H. Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship, in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991): 361-87.

¹⁹² See www.Israelitegates.org/taland/talmud/ritual/food.stm.

¹⁹³ Douglas, "Deciphering a Meal," 236.

¹⁹⁴ Osiek and Balch distinguish two kinds of meals, namely, "ceremonies that celebrate the way things are, and rituals that celebrate status transformation." Among ritual meals they include initiatory banquets, birthdays, and funerary banquets. Osiek and Balch, *Families*, 45. But see Igor de Garine, "The Diet and Nutrition of Human Populations," in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, ed. Tim Ingold (London/New York: Routledge, 1994): 250-253.

ritual meal and aspects of a daily meal (22:17-19b). Consequently, our aim here is to show that the meal format in Luke is consistent with aspects of particular Israelite daily meal format as well as an aspect of a ritual meal.

The Israelite tradition of grace before and after meal in NT times may be following the prescription for meals in Deut 8:10.¹⁹⁵ The following blessing is said over bread: "Blessed are you, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe who brings forth Bread from the earth"¹⁹⁶ (cf. Ps 104:27; 145:15). The tradition of grace before meals is confirmed in some Israelite traditions by the DSS materials:

And [when] they shall gather for common [tab]le, to eat and [to drink] new wine, when the common table shall be set for eating and the new wine [poured] for drinking, let no man extend his hand over the firstfruits of bread and wine before the Priest; for [it is he] who shall bless the firstfruits of bread and wine, and shall be the first to [extend] his hand over the bread. Thereafter, the Messiah of Israel shall extend his hand over the bread, [and] all the congregation of the Community [shall utter a] blessing, [each man in the order] of his dignity. It is according to this statute that they shall proceed at every me [al at which] at least ten men are gathered together (1Qsa II.17-22).¹⁹⁷

This text evidences the tradition of blessing over meal and order of precedence at meal.

Josephus indicates knowledge of this Qumran meal practice.¹⁹⁸ Rabbinic usage contains the term "break bread" as the following text shows:

¹⁹⁵ "Berakhot" 6. 3-4 (Joseph Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987]:9-10.

¹⁹⁶ See "Berakhot" 6. 1 (Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 9).

¹⁹⁷ Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 159-160.

¹⁹⁸ Josephus, *Wars*, 2.8.5 (Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, 605).

- R. Abba said: On the Sabbath it is one's duty to break bread over two loaves, for it is written, (On the sixth day, when they apportion what they have brought in, it shall prove to be) twice as much bread (Exodus 16:5).
- R. Ashi said: I saw that R. Kahana held two [loaves] but broke bread over one, observing, "(On the sixth day) 'they gathered' (double the amount of bread)" is written, (Exodus 16:22)(and not "they ate")"[underlining mine].¹⁹⁹

Some meal calls for blessing over bread normally with a series of four prayers, called Birkat HaMazon, praising and thanking. One of these prayers is blessing over wine.²⁰⁰ The **kiddush** prayer, which inaugurates the Sabbath, is a prayer of thanksgiving and blessing over the cup.²⁰¹ The **kiddush** is sometimes followed by blessing and breaking of bread. This is why some scholars think the LS was a **kiddush** ceremony.²⁰²

But rabbinic sources indicate that to recline at table at the Passover meal was a ritual duty to symbolise freedom. "EVEN THE POOREST MAN IN ISRAEL MUST NOT EAT UNTIL HE RECLINES. It was stated: [For the eating of] the unleavened bread reclining is necessary; for the bitter herbs reclining is not necessary."²⁰³ Luke alludes to similar Israelite meal tradition when he talks of Jesus reclining at table with his apostles

¹⁹⁹ *Babylonian Talmud Shabbat* 117b (ed. Epstein).

²⁰⁰ Berakhot 6. 1 (Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 9).

²⁰¹ See The Mishnah on the Order of the Seder (*Pesachim* 10; Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 249-251).

²⁰² See Gillian Feeley-Harnik, *The Lord's Table: Eucharist and Passover in early Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981): 115.

²⁰³ *Babylonian Talmud Pesachim* 1008A (ed. Epstein).

(v.14). when Jesus offers a prayer of thanksgiving over the cup (v.17) and over the bread (v.19a).

The act of breaking of bread is part of Israelite daily meal custom as we have shown above. This can also be seen, for instance, in the feeding of the crowd (9:10-17) and at Emmaus (24:30). The following comparison clearly shows the correspondence among the actions of Jesus at the feeding of the crowd, at the LS, and at Emmaus. To these three we add the account of the risen Jesus' meal with his brother James in the gospel to the Hebrews (GHeb):

9:16:	22:19a:	24:30:	GHeb 9:4:
And taking the five loaves and the two fish he looked up to heaven, and blessed and broke them, and gave them to the disciples to set before the crowd.	And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them:	When he was at table with them, he took the bread and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them	He [Jesus] took the bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to James the Just and said to him, "My brother, eat your bread, for the Son of Adam has been raised from among those who sleep."

The foregoing textual evidence from Israelite literature indicates correspondence between the Lukan meal tradition and Israelite tradition. The Qumran tradition confirms this. This resemblance shows that Jesus is not doing anything different from certain Israelite meal practice. There is nothing extraordinary about it, for he is simply doing what every Israelite boy has learnt to do from his home. The view is strengthened by Paul's action in Acts 27:35 (And when he had said this, he took bread, and giving thanks to God in the presence of all he broke it and began to eat).

Thus while Jesus' reclining at table signifies a ritual meal context, the breaking of bread and prayers over cup and bread are characteristic of daily meal custom. This meal rite together with the breaking of bread positions the Lukan Jesus within Israelite cultural tradition, for it shows that what we find in Luke is not unprecedented.

B. Echoes

As noted, cultural echoes are a subtle and indirect evocation of an idea or concept from cultural tradition. They may, in fact, be so indirect and subtle that one person may hear it while another may not; even the author may not be aware of it.²⁰⁴

1. Son of Man and Satan

There are cultural echoes of two personages in the Lukan LS, namely, Satan (22:3, 31) and the son of Man (22:22).

While the use of Satan in 22:31 echoes the oral-scribal role of Satan in the story of Job, it also echoes the Israelite concept of Satan. In the two instances the echo is indirect and subtle. Both the Job text and the role of Satan in the LS fall within Israelite cultural understanding of who Satan is.²⁰⁵

Luke uses the term "son of Man" 26 times in his two-volume work, 25 in the third Gospel (5:24; 6:5,22; 7:34; 9:22,26,44,58; 11:30; 12:8,10,40; 17:22,24,26,30; 18:8,31; 19:10; 21:27,36; 22:22,48,69; and 24:7) and once in Acts (7:56). Of these usages twelve may be considered oral-scribal: three (Luke 21:27; 22: 69; Acts 7:56) have direct reference

²⁰⁴ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 60. See also Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29-31.

²⁰⁵ We shall say more on this in chapter six, analysis of sacred texture.

to Daniel 7:13, nine (Luke 9:26; 12: 8, 40; 17: 22, 24, 26, 30; 18: 8; 21: 36) have indirect. Of these uses, fourteen (Luke 5: 24; 6: 5, 22; 7: 34; 9: 22, 44, 58; 11: 30; 12: 10; 18: 31; 19: 10; 22: 22, 48; 24: 7) have no reference to oral-scribal material. The usage in Luke 22:22 appears to be of the latter kind,²⁰⁶ and I therefore class it as a cultural intertextual echo. That is, the language of the son of man agrees with common Israelite parlance. We shall pursue a further analysis of the “son of man” language in our chapter on sacred texture because of its sacred component.

2. Body Language

Another cultural echo occurs when Jesus identifies his body with the broken bread (22:19b). “This is my body” (22:19) echoes symbolic language that was a cultural phenomenon in the first-century Mediterranean culture. There are many allusions to Israelite tradition of symbolic language in Israelite literature. For instance, Elisha symbolizes his whole living self when he lies on a dead child in order to resuscitate him: “Then he got up on the bed and lay upon the child, putting his mouth upon his mouth, his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands; and while he lay bent over him, the flesh of the child became warm” (2 Kgs 4: 34).

Another good example of symbolic language in the OT is Ezekiel’s vision of the dry bones (37:1-14), which foretells the restoration of the house of Israel. Ezekiel’s vision of the dry bones is in two parts. In the first part (37:1-10) Ezekiel prophesied as God directed him, and the dry bones came to life. The second part (37:11-14) contains

²⁰⁶ See Vermes, *Jesus The Jew*, 178-79. Acts 7:56 is the only use of the term outside of the synoptic gospels.

elaboration, which identifies the dry bones with the house of Israel. There is also Hosea's painful marriage experience, which serves as a symbol of Yahweh's dealings with Israel and Judah (Hosea 1-3). As Hosea 2 draws its moral lessons it also serves as key to the whole book: the message of Yahweh's unquenched love for Israel in spite of Israel's longstanding unfaithfulness.

In the NT we have an example in John 2: 19-21 where Jesus dares his Judean listeners to "destroy this temple" and he would rebuild it in three days. The verbal reaction of the Judeans suggests that they take Jesus literally, a misunderstanding that the Johannine narrator quickly corrects by noting that Jesus "was speaking of the temple of his body" (2: 21). The apocalyptic sections of the Synoptics (Mark 13; Matt 24; Luke 21), and of course, the Book of Revelation together with its predecessors, Ezekiel and Daniel belong to this symbolic-language culture.

In a similar way "this is my body" (22:19a) is a symbol, which complements speech with dramatic performance. My contention is that the this-is-my-body language is a dramatic, symbolic reference to Jesus' imminent death. Jesus at the Lukan LS breaks bread to symbolise his imminent death. In other words, it means Jesus' body will be broken as the bread is broken. Although Jesus identifies his body with the broken bread, he still needs to elaborate (22:21-38) it in order to make it explicit to the apostles.

We can further our analysis of this symbolic language by exploring its sensory-aesthetic intertexture. According to Robbins, Sensory-Aesthetic texture of a text "resides prominently in the range of senses the text evokes or embodies (thought, emotion, sight,

sound touch, smell) and the manner in which the text evokes or embodies them (reason, intuition, imagination, humor, etc.).”²⁰⁷

As we have noted in chapter one,²⁰⁸ the range of senses that a text evokes is culturally conditioned. Put differently, the way people perceive reality or use body language is culture specific. There are different paths to locate sensory-aesthetic texture in a text: one is to “identify and group every aspect of a text that refers to any body part such as eyes, ears, and nose, and to actions or perceptions related to a body part, like seeing, hearing, and smelling.”²⁰⁹ Another is to identify what Malina calls “body zones” in the discourse. According to Malina, descriptions of human behaviour in the NT portray persons and events concretely, while interaction is described metaphorically, for the most part, using human body parts as metaphors.²¹⁰ Relying on the work of Bernard de Géraodon, Malina identifies classification of three body zones and their correlated phenomena in the thought-world of the Mediterranean culture, namely, the zone of emotion-fused thought, zone of self-expressive speech, and zone of purposeful action:

5. *Zone of emotion-fused thought*: eyes, heart, eyelids, pupils, and the activities of these organs - to see, know, understand, think, remember choose, feel, consider, look at. The following representative nouns and adjectives pertain to this zone as well: thought, intelligence, mind, wisdom, folly, intention, plan, will, affection, love, hate, sight, regard, blindness, look; intelligent, loving, wise, foolish, hateful, joyous, sad, and the like.

²⁰⁷ Robbins, *Exploring*, 29-30.

²⁰⁸ See page 31, no 101.

²⁰⁹ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 30.

²¹⁰ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 73-74.

6. *Zone of self-expressive speech:* mouth, ears, tongue, lips, throat, teeth, jaws, and the activities of these organs -to speak, hear, say, call, cry, question, sing, recount, tell, instruct, praise, listen to, blame, curse, swear, disobey, turn a deaf ear to. The following nouns and adjectives pertain to this zone as well: speech, voice, call, cry, clamor, song, sound, hearing; eloquent, dumb, talkative, silent, attentive, distracted, and the like.
7. *Zone of purposeful action:* hands, feet, arms, fingers, legs, and the activities of these organs - to do, act, accomplish, execute, intervene, touch, come, go, march, walk, stand, sit, along with specific activities such as to steal, kidnap, commit adultery, build, and the like. The following representative nouns and adjectives pertain to this zone: action, gesture, work, activity, behavior, step, walking, way, course, and any specific activity; active, capable, quick, slow, and so forth.²¹¹

All the above characterised body zones are present in Luke's LS text. For instance, Jesus and the apostles definitely use their eyes to see one another and their hearts to understand one another (zone of emotion-fused thought). As well, they use their mouths and ears to speak to and hear one another respectively (zone of self-expressive speech). The three body zones converge in Jesus' body language when he identifies a piece of broken bread with his body, his whole being (22: 19a). What is relevant to our discussion here, however, is the body zones that have been used in explicit, metaphorical way.

My thesis is that since the range of senses, namely, the zone of emotion-fused thought, zone of self-expressive speech, and zone of purposeful action we have identified are culturally conditioned, Jesus' body language at the LS is a cultural echo.

²¹¹ Malina, *New Testament World*, 73-77.

As Malina reminds us, cultural cues such as perception, feeling, acting, and believing are culture specific.²¹²

The most obvious use of body language is Jesus' reference to his body (22:19a). But before then the narrator reveals the intention of the Judean authorities to "destroy" Jesus (22: 2); this implies a destruction of Jesus' body, and not his spirit, for when they eventually destroyed his body, Jesus committed his spirit to his Father (23: 46). Another body language occurs when Satan "enters" Judas (22: 3), for it is a metaphor for demon possession. Jesus also refers to Judas as "the hand of the one handing me over is with me on the table." Although the hand refers to "the zone of purposeful action," and hands are used most of the time to do a handing over, here it refers to Judas, for Judas has already concluded to hand over Jesus (22: 4-6). In fact Judas does not hand Jesus over using his hands, rather he does so using his feet (he walks the authorities to Jesus) and his mouth, that is, with a kiss (Luke 22: 47; Acts 1: 16).

Jesus' body language in 22: 19a acts as a dramatic metaphor for the imminent handing over of his body and its destruction. When he identifies the broken bread with his body, he is still able to use his body parts. For instance, he is still able to speak with his mouth, to see with his eyes, to understand with his heart, and with his hands to give the broken bread to the apostles. But when Jesus' body is handed over physically and broken, he will be powerless and his body will be there for anyone. In point of fact, by the time his body is physically handed over, Jesus' body belongs to

²¹² See Malina, *New Testament World*, 14-17.

no one any more. For instance, it is a member of the Judean council, Joseph, whom Luke characterised as “a good and upright man,” who “went to Pilate and ask for the body of Jesus” (23: 52). Thus we see that it is not even his closest friends, the apostles, who buried him, but a non-disciple (23: 50-53). Such has become the body of Jesus that, according to Luke, it takes “a good and upright man” to bury him. People can do whatever they like with the body of Jesus; it can even be missing. In fact the women who attempted to anoint his body the following Sabbath did not find the body of Jesus (24: 1-5, 22-24).

In the end, the speaking body at the LS has become speechless at crucifixion, a clear difference between Jesus’ symbolic handing over of his body to his apostles at the LS and a physical handing over of the same body at crucifixion. In other words, when Jesus’ body is physically broken it ceases to perform its social functions. Thus Jesus’ body language at the LS echoes a cultural pattern in which individual interaction with others is described metaphorically, using human body parts as metaphors.²¹³ In other words, Jesus makes, not a physical, but a symbolic identification of the broken bread with his body.

The above analysis of the cultural intertexture of Luke’s LS text reveals the cultural traditions that Luke is evoking knowingly or unknowingly. Our analysis uncovered what someone properly acculturated in the first-century Mediterranean would have read and understood Luke’s LS. For instance, every adult Israelite would have been accustomed to

²¹³ Cf. Malina, *New Testament World*, 73-74.

certain of the meal customs that Luke evokes; they also would have been accustomed to Passover feast as a ritual meal. The cultural traditions we have identified help to locate our chosen text culturally in the first-century Mediterranean.

IV. Summary

In summary, this chapter indicates that the Lukan LS stands in relation to certain social roles and cultural scripts in the first-century Mediterranean society. In other words, Luke's LS text depends on certain traditions in the first-century Mediterranean society and culture. Together with our analysis of the oral-scribal intertexture in chapter three, Luke 22:7-38 emerges as the result of the processes of configuration, reconfiguration, contextualisation, and recontextualisation of external texts and textures.²¹⁴ Furthermore, this analysis of the socio-cultural intertexture demonstrates that Luke is participating in the social roles and cultural scripts of his environment while using Greco-Roman modes of argumentation, namely, rhetorical elaboration of themes. This interaction with certain social codes and cultural scripts in the first-century Mediterranean calls for further and detailed investigation, through analysis of socio-cultural texture, for the purpose of determining the socio-cultural rhetoric of the Lukan supper text. This exploration of intertexture thus puts us at the very door step of advancing our hypothesis that Luke has crafted his LS text for the purpose of changing the attitude of his community to accord with

²¹⁴ Traditional interpreters have long recognised the composite nature of Luke's LS in their quest for the sources Luke may have used.

his own notion of Jesus-group as an inclusive group where leadership is equated to serving like a slave.

Chapter Five

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE

I. Introduction

The previous chapter permitted us to begin to explore Luke's interaction with oral-scribal material external to his two-volume work, as well as with the social institutions, cultural codes, and person types Luke is evoking. We cannot say conclusively on which social and cultural systems Luke has "drawn," because he may not be conscious of doing it, but he is almost certainly participating in some social and cultural systems (like table fellowship, patron-client relationship, kinship, the twelve-tribal institution, etc.) that can be discovered from the world of the first century.

Recalling our definition of the cultural and the social at the beginning of chapter four above reveals that social institutions and cultural systems provide the common social and cultural topics "that everyone living in an area knows either consciously or instinctively."¹ Analysis of these topics belongs properly to the arena of social and cultural rhetorical analysis for the purpose of determining the social and cultural function of the rhetoric in the text. The aim of this chapter, then, is to investigate the social and cultural implication of the language in the Lukan LS discourse in order to determine how the text can be seen to function socially and culturally. In other words, we shall attempt to determine the social rhetoric as well as the cultural rhetoric of the Lukan LS discourse. The issue here is the

¹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 75.

social and cultural nature of Luke's LS as a text. Put differently, what sort of a social and cultural person would anyone be who lives in the world of Luke's LS text?² For any culture to survive it must spin a successful set of "webs of significance"³; for an alternative social structure to exist it must spin alternative webs from those of the dominant society. Thus this arena differs from the arena of social and cultural intertexture by "its use of anthropological and sociological theory to explore the social and cultural nature of the voices" in our chosen text.⁴

II. Social Rhetoric of Luke's LS

As we begin this section we need to recall the main hypothesis of this dissertation, namely, that Luke has crafted his LS (1) to change the attitude of his community in favour of his own view of the Jesus-movement group as an inclusive community in which leadership is for the service of others and (2) to anchor this approach in the time of the earthly Jesus. This section advances this hypothesis by taking a closer look at Luke's social language. As Malina and Neyrey remind us, a major social function of language from the perspective of sociolinguistics is to mean, and "the purpose of meaning is to have some social effect."⁵ We have already in chapter four determined the social and cultural intersection of the language in the text. Here we are concerned to determine the kinds of

² See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 144.

³ Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 5.

⁴ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 71.

⁵ Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988): xiv.

commitment, reasoning, or responses the Lukan LS envisages in its readers. This involves an exploration of “specific social topics” in the discourse. Specific social topics in a text such as ours exhibit political religious responses to the world in its discourse. Our task, then, is to determine the kind of social response to the world that the Lukan LS discourse exhibits.

The framework for investigating the social rhetoric of the Lukan text is based on the work of sociologist Bryan Wilson.⁶ By a typology of sects, Wilson has established a taxonomy of seven kinds of social responses to evil in the world: Conversionist, Revolutionist, Introversionist, Gnostic-Manipulationist, Thaumaturgical, Reformist, and Utopian.⁷ (a) The conversionist response is based on the view that the world is corrupt because people are corrupt. The world will change only if people can be changed. Salvation

⁶ See Bryan R. Wilson, “A Typology of Sects in a Dynamic and Comparative Perspective,” *Archives de Sociologie de Religion* 16 (1963): 49-63; “A Typology of Sects,” in *Sociology of Religion*, ed. Roland Robertson (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969): 361-83; and *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples* (London: Heinemann, 1973). In Malina’s view, application of Wilson’s models from the sociology of religion to the first century is anachronistic, since “the separation of religion and politics as well as economics and politics took place only in the 18th century.” That is, “there was no religion or economics in the perception and analysis of the ancients” (Malina’s note to the author). We disagree with Malina. The issue is not whether the ancients self-described their experience in one way or another. Rather, the issue is whether they experienced it that way. So whether or not the ancients distinguished political religion, domestic religion, and political economy, domestic economy does not mean they did not experience it that way.

⁷ See Wilson, “A Typology of Sects in a Dynamic and Comparative Perspective,” 49-63; “A Typology of Sects,” 361-83; and *Magic and the Millennium*; Robbins, “The Magnificat,” 164-209; *Exploring*, 72-75; and *Tapestry*, 154-59. See also John Hall Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter: Its Situation and Strategy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981): 75-78, 102-06.

is available only through a supernatural transformation of the self. (b) The revolutionist response believes that people can be saved only through the destruction of the social order. Supernatural powers must perform the destruction. (c) The introversionist response sees the world as irredeemably evil and believes only full withdrawal from it can save people. Renouncing the world and leaving it may purify the self, but as the response of a social movement it leads to the establishment of a separated community where participants believe holiness of life is possible. (d) Unlike the foregoing social responses, the gnostic-manipulationist pursues only a transformed set of relationships. Those who hold this view believe that people can overcome evil; they reject only the traditional ways and means of attaining it. (e) The focus of thaumaturgical response is on the individual's concern for relief from present and specific ills by special divine intervention (e.g. by way of miracles). In this kind of social response, the request for divine assistance is personal and the answer comes as salvation in form of healing, relief from grief, restoration of loss, and the assurance of life after death. (f) The reformist response sees the world as corrupt because its social structures are corrupt. The social structures must be changed if salvation is to be available in the world. This response presumes that evil can be overcome according to supernaturally given insights regarding ways in which social organisation should be reformed. (g) The utopian response seeks to reconstruct the whole social world in accordance with divinely-given principles. Thus the utopian response seeks to establish a new social organisation that will eliminate evil; the goal then is a complete replacement of the present social organisation.⁸

⁸ See Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium*, 27-28 and Robbins, "The Magnificat."

A number of NT scholars have applied Wilson's taxonomy of social responses to the world. For instance, James A. Wilde used Wilson's typology of social responses in his study of the social world of the gospel of Mark. Based on his intrinsic analysis of the language in Mark, Wilde concludes that the text of Mark predominantly exhibits a fusion of conversionist, revolutionist, and thaumaturgical social responses to the world.⁹ On the other hand, Robbins' analysis of Mark's Gospel reveals that Mark contains all the responses but one, namely, the introversionist response. In Robbins' view the dominant modes of discourse in Mark are the thaumaturgical and revolutionist discourse.¹⁰ John H. Elliott also relied on insights from Wilson's work in his study of 1 Peter and concludes that in 1 Peter's discourse conversionist response is dominant.¹¹

More relevant to our project is Philip Francis Esler's use of Wilson's taxonomy in his study of Luke-Acts.¹² Esler concludes that Luke-Acts exhibits primarily conversionist and thaumaturgical social responses. Robbins agrees with Esler, though he notes that Luke's "reversal" rhetoric appears utopian or reformist within the context of his conversionist and thaumaturgical rhetoric that brings salvation to the world. Robbins' challenge of Esler appears to overlook Esler's conclusion, for, while Esler began by entertaining the

147-50. For a detailed treatment of Wilson's taxonomy of responses to the world, see his "Typology of Sects".

⁹ See James A. Wilde, "The Social World of Mark's Gospel: A Word About Method," *SBLSP* 2 (1978): 50-51 and Robbins, *Tapestry*, 150-52.

¹⁰ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 74-75.

¹¹ See Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 75-78, 102-06.

¹² Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*.

possibility of a revolutionist social response as the third social response of Luke-Acts, he concludes that it cannot include a revolutionist response because he concurs with Hans Conzelmann that Luke's eschatology is delayed rather than imminent.¹³

L. Gregory Bloomquist argues that "the Lukan Jesus' calls for an essentially subversive approach to the Temple culture" that is best characterised as "revolutionist."¹⁴ By "temple culture" Bloomquist means that Luke does not view the "temple as inherently opposed to Jesus, but derivatively opposed, that is, opposed through what others have made of the temple."¹⁵ For instance, the Israelite purity system renders the temple exclusive, for it demarcates the temple from all that is impure, that is, unholy.¹⁶ Bloomquist's emphasis is on the subversive nature of Jesus' approach, because, even though Jesus never calls for violent (brutal) destruction of the temple, or the violent destruction of those who run it, a slow, eating away of the structures that replace them eventually with something new is revolutionist if it is supernaturally achieved, which Luke appears to suggest it is. That means the substitution of the household for the temple and which destroys the temple, though not violently, can be characterised as revolutionist.

These applications of Wilson's typology of social responses to the world have shown that a discourse as long as Luke-Acts may exhibit not one social response but rather a

¹³ Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 64, 58-63 and Robbins, "The Magnificat," 186-87.

¹⁴ Bloomquist, "Rhetorical Argumentation," 198.

¹⁵ Bloomquist, "Rhetorical Argumentation," 198.

¹⁶ See Bloomquist, "Rhetorical Argumentation," 198 and Elliott, "The Temple Versus Household in Luke-Acts," 219.

combination of at least two responses.¹⁷ Thus we should be prepared for the Lukan LS discourse to exhibit any or all the social responses that are prominent in Luke-Acts.

Recalling our analysis of innertexture in chapter two we note the following: Luke talks of the preparation of the Israelite authorities to destroy Jesus and of Satan's possession of Judas for the purpose of handing Jesus over to the authorities away from the crowd (22:1-6); Jesus and his group of disciples prepare to eat the sacred Passover meal at a designated upper room (vv 7-13); Jesus announces in both words and action his death as suffering (vv 14-22) [WT]; I also identified the LS as a rhetorical elaboration of theme. In all these Luke's language is consistent with the language of the dominant society. This is what our analysis of social and cultural intertexture in chapter four revealed. Even Jesus' identification of broken bread with his body has been shown to be consistent with the use of symbolic action and body language in the Israelite society. This means that Luke's language in scene one to scene three (vv. 1-22) [WT] does not indicate intention to create a group subordinate to the Israelite society; language and the control of it are always at the heart of struggle between a subordinate group and a dominant society.¹⁸

The above scenario, however, begins to change in scene four (vv. 23-34) where Jesus talks of a different kind of leadership. The social rhetoric of the LS properly begins to

¹⁷ Wilson is of the view that "at any given time a movement may manifest more than one response to the world, even though an examination of its history will usually enable the analyst to say unequivocally which particular response was dominant at particular stages of a movement's development"[*Magic and the Millennium*, 49]. See also Robbins, *Tapestry*, 150.

¹⁸ See Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991): 123.

emerge in v. 25 where Jesus indicates the kind of leadership he enjoins on the apostles. The analogy of the server and the diner (vv.26-27) indicates that the apostles do not associate service of others with leadership. The rhetorical question in v. 27 shows that the status of a server at table is part of the social knowledge of the apostles. In other words, it is socially known in the contemporary Greco-Roman society that “the one sitting at table” is greater than the one serving. This traditional understanding of leadership within the contemporary society is indicated by Jesus’ depiction of gentile kings as leaders who lord it over the Gentiles; this characterisation is also confirmed by our exploration of social and cultural intertexture in chapter four. This suggests that the apostles define leadership as a position for lording it over others and not for service of others. But Jesus wants the apostles to be leaders who serve others. In this way, Jesus’ response to the world is to adopt a non-violent subversive approach, to the traditional concept of leadership.

The leadership discussion in vv. 25-27 also envisages the formation of a new group of which the apostles will be leaders. The assignment of a kingdom to them in v. 29 indicates that the new community will be a kingdom. Verse 30b (“and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel”) marks the boundary of the kingdom Jesus assigns them, in addition to indicating that their kingship, like his, continues in the age to come. The bequeathing of the kingdom to the apostles ensures that the kingdom lives on. Thus the formation of a community based on the concept of leadership as service of people is central to the LS discourse. It is in this section (vv. 25-30) that Luke defines the kind of group he seeks to create. Verses 25-30 then, assume a central position in our analysis.

Our aim here is to show the kind of community we can detect in vv. 25-30 and how the Lukan Jesus intends to replace the old social order with a new one, based on leadership

as service. The kingship language in vv. 28-30 envisages the emergence of a new social order, a kingdom where the disciples will become rulers over the twelve tribes. The new social order will replace the present one in which the disciples are not yet rulers. This does not indicate how the new social order will replace the old. For instance, will it happen through violent overthrow, through peaceful infiltration of the old order or through change of attitude?

Luke 16:16 is the only text in Luke's writings that talks of force in connection with the kingdom of God. Luke 16:16 remains a *crux interpretum* for at least two reasons. The first concerns its relation to the so-called Lukan periodisation of salvation history. The issue is whether or not v.16 includes John the Baptist in the period of Jesus. In our view it is difficult if not impossible to say whether this verse should be understood exclusively or inclusively.¹⁹ The issue, which is more relevant to our previous discussion of specific social topics, is what to make of the word βιάζεται. The word in its Lukan form here is either passive or middle. Translators have rendered it differently. The following table presents a sample of English-Bible translations:

New American Bible (NAB)	Revised English Bible (REB)	New King James (NKJ)	New Jerusalem Bible (NJB)	Revised Standard Version (RSV)
"and everyone who enters does so violently."	"everyone forces a way in."	"and everyone is pressing into it."	"and everyone is forcing their way into it."	"and every one enters it violently."

¹⁹ For extensive discussion of this issue, see for instance, Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*; W. Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968): 42; and Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 102-10.

Of the above translations only the NKJ does not translate βιάζεται as force or violent. Both the NAB and RSV render it as violent, while the REB and NJB translate it as force. Despite the NKJ minority rendering of the word, the above table shows a lack of consensus on the translation of it. We agree with Fitzmyer's translation of verse 16 as, "Up till John it was the law and the prophets; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached, and every one is pressed to enter it." Fitzmyer's translation accepts the middle in its positive sense, meaning, "try hard."²⁰ In this sense, 16:16 means that up till the time of the Baptist, the law of Moses and the preaching of the prophets were the way in which God's presence and will were manifested to Israel. But the preaching of the kingdom of God by Jesus ushers in a new beginning, and because Jesus' invitation to enter the kingdom is radical, demanding and pressurising, people are trying hard to enter into the kingdom: people are trying hard to leave the old Torah-based theocracy for a new theocracy (kingdom of God). A modern structural equivalent to the dynamic of Jesus' social project, namely, the kingdom of God, is the recent shift in Iran by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, who has instituted a theocracy in lieu of a previous theocratic monarchy.²¹ According to Fitzmyer, the only problem is with how the positive sense would be true of "everyone" (πάντες) in view of the fact of opposition to Jesus by Israelite authority. Be that as it may, Luke 16:16 is not asking for a violent (brutal) overthrow of the current social order.

²⁰ For discussion on this issue, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1114-18 and Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 626-30.

²¹ Here we distinguish what happens and how it happens; reference to Iran is on "the what" and not on "the how."

This understanding of 16:16, the only Lukan narrative statement to mention force in connection with the kingdom of God, seems to indicate that Luke's social rhetoric excludes a revolutionist response to the world. But such a conclusion will undermine Jesus' subversive approach and eventual rejection of the temple culture. In addition, Luke's emphasis on the active role of the Holy Spirit both in the ministry of Jesus and that of the apostles suggests that Luke entertains the view that the overthrow of the current social order may be supernaturally achieved.

It is thus our view that because of Jesus' subversive approach and eventual rejection of the temple culture, and because of the need to transform the self, Luke's social response in the LS is of conversionist bent but embedded in revolutionist discourse. It is partly conversionist discourse because emphasis was on changing people's view of life in order to change the world itself.²² In other words, it is based on the notion that the corrupt world will change if people can be changed. Jesus' response to the apostles' dispute about greatness is intended to prescribe leadership attitudes in the new social dispensation: "the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like one who serves" (22:26).²³ Jesus does not seem to be asking that the structure of power be violently destroyed; he is promoting a transformation of the attitude of the apostles in the new community that will be separated from the previous one by a gradual chipping away of the old structures and replacing them eventually: they are to be leaders who serve others. This

²² See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 172.

²³ For a detailed discussion of Luke's reversal rhetoric, see York, *The Rhetoric of Reversal*. See also Tuckett, *Luke*, 107-09.

requires a reversal of the apostles' definition of leadership because Jesus' instruction on leadership as service (vv.26, 27) suggests that the larger contemporary society, like the apostles, does not understand leadership as service of others.

Here we must differentiate service that is freely done to benefit another and slave service that contains a social obligation of an unequal kind. As Orlando Patterson reveals, the slave is a socially dead human being who is required to do things to benefit their owners; slaves are without birthright, isolated from the ancestral social heritage, "not allowed to inform their understanding of social reality with the inherited meanings of their forebears, or anchor the living present in any conscious community of memory."²⁴ Slave service, required service, and obligatory service of underlings, can never be honourable. According to Horsley, "Not only was it beneath the dignity of honorable Greeks and Romans to work with their hands, but it was shameful to work for another person."²⁵

The notion of leadership as slave service is foreign to a hierarchically structured society such as the first-century Mediterranean, yet this is the kind of leadership that Jesus advocates. Jesus' instruction on leadership, in our view, is a clarion call for a radically different form of leadership with which his followers would have been familiar, as we saw in the previous chapter. As we shall show below in our analysis of Lukan meals, the social rhetoric of the LS envisages the formation of a community that is differently led and is also inclusive, the kind Luke describes in Acts 2:44-47.

²⁴ Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, 5; quoted by Horsley in "The Slave Systems of Classical Antiquity," 29. For a recent survey of slavery in antiquity, see *Slavery in Text and Interpretation*, *Semeia* 83/84 (1998).

²⁵ Horsley, "The Slave Systems of Classical Antiquity," 55.

We characterise this rhetoric as “communitarian social rhetoric.” That is, a rhetoric that seeks to create a cooperative community.²⁶ By “communitarian” we mean a social organisation whose goal is the practice of communal living in which the community by itself meets the needs of its members.

Luke’s communitarian social rhetoric, however, takes place within the environment of existing social systems of household, temple, patron-client-broker, meals and table fellowship, and honour of the first-century Mediterranean society. We need then to explore the role these social institutions have played in Luke’s social rhetoric.²⁷ In other words, how have the social institutions and cultural systems in the LS discourse helped to shape its social rhetoric, which we have called communitarian? This leads us to explore the common social and cultural topics we have identified in our chapter four (social and cultural intertexture), namely, meals and table-fellowship, patron-client system, temple and household, and cultural script of honour.²⁸

²⁶ For the use of this term “communitarian social rhetoric.” see Wilson, “Typology of Sects,” 370 and Wachob, *The Social Rhetoric of James*, 186.

²⁷ What Bruce Malina calls social and cultural codes David B. Gowler calls cultural scripts. In rhetorical terms these are common social and cultural topics. See Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 1.2.19-24, 1.3.7-9; George A. Kennedy, *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991): 45-47, 50-51, 174-223; David B. Gowler, *Host, Guest, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*, Peter Lang Press (New York, 1991): 359-76; Malina, *New Testament World*, 14; and Robbins, *Tapestry*, 150-60 and “The Magnificat,” 187.

²⁸ In chapter two we noted Aristotle’s distinction among three types of rhetorical topics, namely, “common topics,” “specific topics,” and “strategic topics” (enthymemes). See Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.4-8; 2.19, 23. See also Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 20-22. Again, enthymeme is a syllogism with one premise suppressed.

A. Meals and Table-fellowship

Lukan scholars have long recognised the pervasive presence of meals and table-fellowship in Luke-Acts and concluded that this social institution is a significant theme for Luke,²⁹ even though the role of meals in the Lukan writings is only implied at the LS. We must then rely on the cumulative effect of other Lukan meals for our understanding of certain aspects of the character of the LS.³⁰

In first-century Mediterranean society meals were ceremonies with rules and regulations.³¹ Meals as ceremonies "replicate the group's basic social system, its values, lines, and classifications, including its symbolic world."³² For instance, Luke 22: 27 indicates that one's function at dinner indicates one's status: the one sitting at dinner is greater than the one who does the serving (cf. Luke 17:7-10). Luke also indicates that there are places of honour at feasts reserved for high-ranking people, and that is why one must wait to be seated by the host (Luke 14: 7-11; 20-46). Thus distinctions of status are symbolised by where one sits at dinner or who sits and who serves (see Luke 14: 7-11).

²⁹ See, for instance, Neyrey, *Passion According to Luke*, 8-11; Halvor Moxnes, "Meals and the New Community in Luke," *Svesk Exegetisk Årsbok* 51-52 (1986/87): 158-67; Canoy, *Perspectives on Eucharistic Theology*; Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 1-109; McMahan, *Meals as Type-Scenes*; Dennis E. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 106.4 (1987): 613-38; Kraus, *Symposium: Just, The Ongoing Feast*; and LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom and The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1996).

³⁰ For this kind of approach, see Canoy, *Perspective on Eucharistic Theology*, especially, 202-215.

³¹ See above and Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts," 262-274.

³² Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts," 363.

Meals-as-ceremonies function socially, to confirm roles and statuses within the main institutions of a given group. For instance, because of their significant position within the Israelite community, scribes expect to be seated “in places of honor at feasts” (Luke 20:46; Mark 12:46; Matt 23:5-6) in order to confirm their role. Sociologically, meals bind people together. For instance, a daily meal within the household confirms the social role of the parents as providers for their family, while a Passover meal confirms “membership in the covenant people of Israel.”³³

A specific kind of meal, ritual meals, not only bind people to a deity but also serve as social controls on people’s bond to the deity. Any ritual exercises a real form of social control, because it “draws people’s attention, and invokes their loyalties, towards a certain powerfully-evoked representation of the social and political order.”³⁴ This is, for instance, what Paul is trying to achieve by identifying the communal meal of the Corinthians with the Lord’s Supper, and arguing that whenever they eat this bread, and drink this cup, they are proclaiming the Lord’s death until he comes (1 Cor. 11:17-34).

Another significant social function of meals revolves around the relationship between meals and the purity system.³⁵ In any society dietary regulations or codes are boundary

³³ See Neyrey, “Ceremonies in Luke-Acts,” 363.

³⁴ Steven Lukes, “Political Ritual and Social Integration,” *Sociology: Journal of the British Sociological Association* 9, no. 2 (1975): 302; quoted in Catherine Bell, *Ritual Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 84.

³⁵ The Sixth division of the Mishnah, Purities, underscores purity concerns of Israelites. See Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 893-1137.

markers,³⁶ both within and without: sinners cannot eat with saints; the poor cannot eat with the rich; outsiders cannot eat with insiders. That is why Israelites cannot eat with Gentiles. For instance, the problem of table-fellowship between Israelite members of the Jesus-movement group and gentile members of the Jesus-movement group in Acts showcases dietary regulations as boundary marker.³⁷ One's companion at table is important, for it is a function of one's social standing. However, in the new dispensation (in Jesus' kingdom), as the Lukan Jesus' meal habit has shown, everyone will be honoured as they eat at the same table.³⁸ In other words, role reversal at table helps to obliterate any social distinction or

³⁶ Malina characterises this as "purity codes." According to him, purity is about social and cultural maps of people, time, and place; it is about setting boundaries separating insiders from outsiders. Everything has its time and place. The clean and unclean do not belong together. And lack of adherence to social and cultural boundaries breeds confusion. See Malina, *New Testament World*, 125. See also, Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988): 71-75 and Robbins, *Exploring*, 85. These Israelite purity codes help to explain the negative reactions to Jesus' eating habit (Luke 5:30; 15:1-2; 19:5-7). Also, it will help to put into proper perspective Luke's open concern for table fellowship between Jews and gentile members of his community in his second-volume work, and how table-fellowship in the first-century Mediterranean society provides an important environment for Luke's social rhetoric (social response).

³⁷ Today, for instance, Islamic regulations on meat make it difficult if not impossible for Moslems to accept dinner invitations from non-Moslems or eat in restaurants not run by one of their own; and of course anyone who eats pork is certainly not a Moslem (Q. 5.3, 5. 96).

³⁸ Even if Fitzmyer is correct to say that Jesus' instruction in v.26 may not be interpreted as eliminating distinction or rank in Christian life, it certainly has the effect of subverting the inequality and hierarchy that is the bane of the patron-client social system. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1417 and Scott, *Hear Then the Parable*, 215.

discrimination. It is a clarion call for a community of impartiality.³⁹ In societies where kinship is the focal institution, meals, usually among males, are lengthy affairs that cement belonging among social equals.

To serve purity needs there are four basic maps, which mark boundaries: maps of persons, things, places, and times.⁴⁰ The most relevant of these maps for our purpose is the map of persons, for it is in this area that Jesus' meal habits throughout the Third Gospel most anger the Pharisees. The Pharisees criticize Jesus for eating with sinners and tax collectors (Luke 5:29-30; 7:34; Mark 2:15-16; Matt 9:11-12) because one eats with those with whom one shares values: like eats with like. According to Cornelius Tacitus (CE 56-120) all Israelites "sit apart at meals."⁴¹ It is for this reason that Israelites are not expected to eat with Gentiles, in the same way that Paul cautions Corinthians, who partake of the table of the Lord, not to eat at the table of demons (1 Cor 10:20-21). The Lukan Jesus' meal habit subverts established elitist boundaries (a map of persons). For there are among Jesus' table companions people that are considered sinners or unclean, for instance, tax collectors. Thus Jesus ignores the traditional boundary of meal companions.⁴²

³⁹ Some scholars call it "discipleship of equals." See for instance, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesia-Logy of Liberation* (New York: Crossroad, 1993).

⁴⁰ Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts," 363. See also, Malina and Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names*, 79-80.

⁴¹ Tacitus, *Histories* 5.5 (trans. C. H. Moore & J. Jackson [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931]): 180-183.

⁴² In our particular case, however, Luke is silent on whether or not Jesus dined with women. Craig Thomas McMahan's claim that Jesus ate with Peter's mother-in-law (4:38-39), with women who ministered to him and the apostles out of their means (8:1-3), and

Luke's LS confirms this radically divergent map of persons as Jesus reclines at table with his socially unequal apostles (22:14). For a teacher and his disciples to eat together is still within the traditional boundary of table companions, but we must reckon with the inclusion, in the group, of Judas the one who would hand Jesus over. Luke's inclusive theme is obvious from the inclusion of Judas, in light of the fact that Luke has recontextualised the foretelling of Jesus' "betrayal" from its Markan location. This inclusion of Judas then adds a significant subversive dimension to the map of persons at the LS. And as we have observed in chapter four, Jesus' silence on the identity of who will hand him over is intended to advance his inclusiveness.

Thus by use of the social system of meals and table-fellowship, Luke argues for inclusivity in his Jesus-movement group and traces such an approach to the earthly Jesus. This concurs with a main hypothesis of this thesis: that Luke seeks to persuade his community to be inclusive by appealing to Jesus' inclusive meal practice.

B. Patron-client System

In addition to the social role of meals, we can further our exploration of Luke's social rhetoric by attention to the social institution of patronage. Recalling our discussion in the previous chapter, patronage is a social system based on dyadic and legal contracts and agreements. A dyadic contract is an informal contract between two people. The contract may be between either people of unequal social status (patron-client) or people of equal

with Mary and Martha (10:38-42) is dubious. On the three occasions, the women reportedly served Jesus (and or his apostles). So we simply do not know if the Lukan Jesus ever had women as table companions. In spite of this silence Jesus' meal habit can still be characterised as inclusive to the extent that it transcends the traditional "map of persons."

social standing (peer contract).⁴³ This kind of agreement is based on the notion of mutual assistance and is a very important form of cooperation in an environment such as the first-century Mediterranean world where goods and services were limited, since, via the patron-client relationship, goods and services are provided that are otherwise not available in the wider society.⁴⁴ Patron-client relationships between two people of unequal social status in which one party is patron who gives favours to his client involve, but are not limited to, money, food, land, employment and social advancement.⁴⁵ The client has the obligation of gratitude, which could be in the form of proportionate loyalty, honour and respect to the benefactor.⁴⁶

⁴³ For example, there are two forms of peer contract in my Nigerian culture; one is for financial assistance, **AJQ** (common contribution), while the other is for agricultural assistance, **ESU** (mutual help on farm). **AJQ** concerns a group of people who agree to contribute monthly the same amount of money into a common fund, which is given to individual members on a rotational basis. That is, every member takes the total monthly contributions in turns. This kind of peer cooperative is common among teachers.

ESU on the other hand, can involve anywhere from two people to several people. It can be a long-time contract or occasional. On a long time a number of people agree to be working on each other's farm weekly in turns. The occasional **ESU** occurs when a farmer needs the assistance of another farmer on his farm in order to get his farm ready for the planting season; he will have to return this assistance whenever the helper needs it. I took part in occasional **ESU** several times. The peer contract like **AJQ** permits members to save money for special projects, for instance, purchasing an automobile or building a new home.

⁴⁴ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 100-01; Robbins, *Exploring*, 70-80; and Sisson, *1 Corinthians* 9, 139-50.

⁴⁵ See David Arthur DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical, 1999): 11.

⁴⁶ See Seneca, *On Benefits* 2.22.1; 2.24.2 (Seneca, *Moralia* III, trans. J. W. Basore [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935]): 96-101; cited in DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*, 11, no 21.

Patron-client relations may also be between a person and the society at large, like we have in Augustus. According to Gnaeus Arrius Cornelius Proculus to the Lycian League, “generous people are deserving of honor.”⁴⁷ For instance, military prowess displayed on behalf of one’s land or city could earn such person a merit called ἀρετή (excellence). According to Danker, “this phenomenon coincides with the popular understanding that the primary duty “of deities and rulers is to ensure the safety and the well-being of those who rely on their services. If they discharge their task well they are recognized as benefactors or saviors.”⁴⁸ That is, deities and rulers provide services (not slave service) to their clients. Such public benefactions are rewarded publicly as the following decree from 411 BCE shows:

Gods! Resolved by the Council, that Hegelochos of Tarentum be declared proxenos and benefactor, together with his children, and that they receive public maintenance whenever they are in the city, and that they be free of levies and receive front seating at the contests, in view of his contribution to the liberation of the city from the Athenians.⁴⁹

In this decree the people of Eretria bestowed on a non-citizen, Hegelochos of Tarentum, the status of proxenos (public friend); this is the highest honour that Greeks could bestow. The patron-client system also represents a major way in which people in the first-century Mediterranean culture saw the world. The Greco-Roman culture held

⁴⁷ René L. Victor Cagnat, Pierre Jouguet, G. Lafaye, and Jules François Toutain, eds. *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*, vol. III (Roma: L’Erma di Bretschneider, 1964): 1524 ; cited in Danker, *Benefactor*, 436.

⁴⁸ Danker, *Benefactor*, 26.

⁴⁹ Adolph Wilhelm, *EphArch* (1890): 195-203; cited in Danker, *Benefactor*, 30, 65.

ingratitude to be the “cardinal social and political sin,” and “failure to memorialise benefactions conferred by generous people is its flipside.”⁵⁰

The above provides a useful framework for our discussion of patron-client relations exhibited by Luke in the LS. Our text exhibits awareness of a patron-client relation between the gentile kings and their subjects when Jesus cautions the apostles not to be like gentile kings who lord it over them and who allow themselves be called (καλοῦνται = middle passive) benefactors (22:25).⁵¹ And our exploration of social and cultural intertexture in the preceding chapter confirms that Roman emperors gloried in being called benefactors. Instead of being benefactors in the manner of gentile leaders, Jesus urges the apostles to be leaders who serve: “Real apostolic leadership must be service of others!”⁵² Leadership as service has no room for any leader to lord it over others. A leader who serves cannot see himself/herself as a benefactor of those he serves. The apostles must not behave in such a manner that they will be called benefactors, like the gentile authorities. There is no room for transforming the service they performed or a favour done into status and honour.⁵³

⁵⁰ Danker, *Benefactor*, 436. Deification of a benefactor is one form of memorialising benefactions.

⁵¹ I think Fitzmyer is correct in holding that the middle voice suits the context better and should be so rendered. Whereas the passive rendering appears to shift the blame to those who call the gentile rulers “Benefactor,” the middle voice puts the blame at the feet of the rulers themselves; they are responsible for letting people call them benefactors. The apostles must not let that happen to them. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1416-17.

⁵² Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1415.

⁵³ See Halvor Moxnes, “Patron-Client Relations,” 261 and “Honor, Shame, and the Outside World in Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” in *The Social World of Formative*

There is a twist to Luke's logic here: While Jesus teaches the apostles to be a leader like him and cautions them not to allow themselves be called benefactors, he seems to present both himself and his father as benefactors in rewarding his apostles just as his Father rewards him (22:29-30). This action would make the Lukan Jesus a benefactor like his Father. But it would seem that Jesus did not see himself as a patron when he described himself as a leader who serves. The overall picture of Jesus in Luke agrees more with the notion of Jesus as a broker of God's benefaction than as a patron. Verse 29 can be understood as Jesus giving the apostles the right to rule just as his Father gave him the right to rule. The Father is the ultimate patron, both of Jesus and of the apostles, and Jesus can be more properly characterised as one through whom God dispenses his favours and who mediates God's benefactions. In this way, God himself does not assign a kingdom to the apostles; he assigns a kingdom to Jesus, who in turn assigns a kingdom to the apostles. As Moxnes notes, "Jesus is not a patron in his own right, distributing his own resources, but a broker who gives access to the benefactions of God."⁵⁴

But Jesus is not a broker because of acquired economic or social status: Jesus is a broker of God's benefaction as a son.⁵⁵ Not that every son qualifies to represent his father's interest! Jesus, however, qualifies to be his father's trusted client because, as depicted in Luke, he is the father's beloved son with whom the father is well pleased (Luke 3:22). Jesus

Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee, ed. J. Neusner (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988): 261.

⁵⁴ Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations," 258.

⁵⁵ See Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations," 258.

brokers God's benefactions through his preaching of the kingdom of God and healing activities, which are God's saving acts (cf. Acts 2:22).

I see evidence of this broker role of Jesus at the LS when Jesus bequeathes a kingdom to his apostles in order that they may eat and drink with him in his kingdom. In this way, Jesus' criticism at the LS of the gentile kings who allowed themselves to be called benefactors becomes understandable. Understanding *καλοῦνται* as indicative present middle voice will permit one to construe Jesus as saying that the gentile kings are wrong in claiming to be benefactors, because God is the only benefactor.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, in all this the Lukan LS evidences no transformation of the notion of patronage and of patron-client relations as such. The institution remains as the human analogue for a sacred reality. Luke criticises the gentile patronage system, and presents God as the only alternative, but couches his alternative in terms of patronage, the language that his audience understands. Luke's goal is thus not to deny the reality of patron-client relationships but rhetorically to use them in order to transform them. He does so by declaring that God is the ultimate patron and benefactor of all, and that Jesus the broker of God's benefactions. Everyone else can only be servants and clients of the one, true benefactor. And if they seek to be patrons themselves, like the gentile kings, they will

⁵⁶ This is a Lukan equivalent of Matt 23:8-10: "But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren. And call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven. Neither be called masters, for you have one master, the Christ." Here Matthew identifies God as the only Father, and Jesus as the only teacher, in the same way that Luke portrays God as the only patron, and Jesus the broker. All others are equally brothers. And Matt 23:11 ("He who is greatest among you shall be your servant") next verse to the citation above, Luke 22:26-27, identifies greatness with serving.

necessarily be viewed as opposing patrons for the limited goods for which the true patron is responsible.

As we have pointed out, the social institution of patronage is based on inequality, and it thrives on reciprocity. Thus as a form of social relation among humans it defines the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless. The Lukan Jesus' claim that God has assigned him a kingdom (v. 29) is a declaration of God as his patron and benefactor. Jesus portrays himself as a patron and benefactor to the apostles when he in turn assigns the apostles a kingdom. But since his assignment of a kingdom is consequent on God's benefaction, Jesus is not in the proper sense a benefactor, but appropriately a broker of God's patronage.⁵⁷ Luke thus puts God forward as the only patron, and invites members of his Jesus-movement group to see God as their sole patron. In asking members of his group to see God as the only patron, Luke puts all the members on the same social pedestal, on the same level playing ground, members are no longer obligated to reciprocate benefits to humans but to God. Human-to-human interaction now becomes divine-human interaction: the purely social has been raised to a sacral level.⁵⁸ Luke's spin on the patronage system is decidedly in favour of his ideal, utopian community in which all

⁵⁷ This is against Danker, who characterises Jesus as a benefactor. See Danker, *Luke*, 6-17.

⁵⁸ As novel as this may look, we must realise that at the heart of divine-human relationship in religious practices is the notion of reciprocity of goods and services: human worship gods for the services the gods are expected to render to their devotees as exemplified in the story of how Bo Juyi (772-846), a Chinese poet in a severe drought scolded the Black Dragon for dereliction of duties: "we are asking you for favor, but you depend on us for your divinity. Creatures are not divine on their own account; it is their worshippers that make them so. If within three days there is a real downpour, we shall give your holy powers credit for it." Bell, *Ritual Perspectives*, 115-16.

members are on the same social pedestal, since only God is patron while all others are his clients and are therefore indebted to God alone.

C. Temple and the Household

The impact of temple and household on Luke's social rhetoric is significant. The temple and the household are two social institutions that feature prominently in Luke's two-volume work. Household scenes provide a framework for Acts, just as temple scenes frame the Third Gospel: Luke 1:5-23, Zechariah's priestly service, and announcement of the birth of John the Baptist in the temple and Luke 24:50-53, in which the disciples are continually in the temple, form an *inclusio* to the Third Gospel, while Acts 1:12-14, in which the disciples are in the upper room and Acts 28:30-31, Paul's Roman house confinement, provide an *inclusio* to Acts. As Elliott argues, "temple and household and their respective networks of relations depicted in Luke-Acts contrasted styles of piety and behavior."⁵⁹ For instance, Luke shows in the early part of Acts a contrast between the household, where the disciples pray, break bread, share their food generously and gladly, and have everything in common (Acts 2: 44-47; 4:32) and the temple as the locale of political-religious control, a place for begging for alms, the scene and object of conflict (e.g. the lame man begging at the temple gate (3:1-10); Peter and John before the Sanhedrin (4:1-22); the arrest of the apostles (5:17-42); and Stephen's arrest and stoning to death (6:8-8:1)). Luke regards the temple as a holy place that has lost its power to sanctify and save, because temple officials

⁵⁹ Elliott, "Temple Versus Household," 215.

“had become preoccupied with status and class differentiation”: they overburdened and ignored the needy; they neglected justice and thus rendered the temple exclusive and unjust.⁶⁰ It is this injustice and exclusivity, coupled with its purity system, which Jesus challenges.

Thus, not the temple but the temple culture stands diametrically opposed to Jesus’ ministry and mission. Jesus’ attitude is a rejection, not of the temple building, but of its officials (the temple culture), who under the control of the Roman governor “represented the power of the temple over all aspects of Israelite political, economic, social, and cultural.”⁶¹ The struggle between Jesus and the temple hierarchy, therefore, concerns power and honour, a topic we shall discuss below.

The household, on the other hand, becomes the favoured locale for the ministry of Jesus and his disciples. The household “gradually replaces the temple as the actual sphere of saving presence.”⁶² In the case of the L.S., Jesus makes suitable arrangements to eat the Passover meal with his disciples, even though he knows of plans to destroy him, and he does so in the household. The household also provides a friendly locale for Jesus to summarise his ministry and teaching (22:7-38) [WT].

Socially, this movement from the temple to the household is a movement from the public arena to the private: Jesus began his first public act in the temple (2:46-50), but his

⁶⁰ Elliott, “Temple Versus Household,” 233, 236. See Luke 10:29-37; 11:42-43, 52; 15:2; 16:15; 18:11.

⁶¹ Elliott, “Temple Versus Household,” 220.

⁶² Elliott, “Temple Versus Household,” 217.

last public act takes place in the household (22:7-38) [WT]. Thus, even though the temple forms the *inclusio* in the narrative of the Third Gospel, Jesus begins in the temple and ends in the household. In the former, he was among the teachers teaching while in the latter he was not only a teacher, but also the teacher. Elliott puts it thus: "in Luke's account, the Spirit of God and its sanctifying power moves from the temple to household, from the chief symbol of Israelite national identity to the principal symbol of a community united with a heavenly God."⁶³ Thus the Lukan LS serves a crucial, social, rhetorical function since it is there that we first observe that the new community will be organised not around the temple but around the household as the second part of Luke's work demonstrates.⁶⁴ The centrality of the household as the sphere of activity in Acts is, then, a logical extension of the shift that Jesus began at the LS.

The organisation of the new community around the household evidences a further radical section that is evident in Luke's rhetoric of inclusiveness. For the shift from the temple, a public arena, to the household, a private arena, is a movement to the locale that is, in traditional Mediterranean society, the sphere of women's activities.⁶⁵ In the socially analogous world of ancient Greece women had virtually no political role (the public arena) and were relegated to running household duties in addition to bearing of children. In fact Greek custom dictated that a woman limit her time outside the house to visiting her female

⁶³ Elliott, "Temple Versus Household," 230.

⁶⁴ See Elliott, "Temple Versus Household," 225.

⁶⁵ See David Cohen, "Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens," in *Women in Antiquity*, ed. Ian McAuslan, and Peter Walcot (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 136-137. See also Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic*, 2-3.

neighbour.⁶⁶ As P. Bourdieu reminds us of the Kabyle village in Algiers, “The opposition between the inside and the outside...is concretely expressed in the clear-cut distinction between the feminine area, the house and its gardens, and the masculine area, the place of assembly, the mosque, etc.”⁶⁷ This conclusion confirms the prominence Luke gives to the household in his writings, as we have observed in the preceding chapter.

D. Cultural Script of Honour

Another important cultural system that will enhance our exploration of the social rhetoric in the Lukan LS is honour. The first-century Mediterranean person lives in an “Honour, Guilt, and Rights Culture.” Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics* provides a classical picture of the importance of the role of honour in his society, a picture that, while subsequently nuanced, remains more or less constant. Although he considers happiness as the true and “final” goal in life,⁶⁸ he concedes that honour remains “clearly the greatest of external goods,” for honour is the gift that is offered to gods:⁶⁹

⁶⁶ See www.museum.upenn.edu/Greek_World/Daily_life/Women_life.html

⁶⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, “The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society,” Philip Sherrard trans. in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. Jean G. Peristiany (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966): 221.

⁶⁸ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1.7.5 (trans. H. Rackham [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926]): 27-29; cited in David Arthur deSilva, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995): 63.

⁶⁹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 4.3.10 (Rackham, 215-217); cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 63.

Men of refinement ...and men of action think that the Good is honour - for this may be said to be the end of the Life of Politics. But honour after all seems too superficial to be the Good for which we are seeking; since it appears to depend on those who confer it more than on him upon whom it is conferred, whereas we instinctively feel that the Good must be something proper to its possessor and not easy to be taken away from him. Moreover, men's motive in pursuing honour seems to be to assure themselves of their own merit; at least they seek to be honoured by men of judgement and by people who know them, that is, they desire to be honoured on the ground of virtue (LCL).⁷⁰

Isocrates in his advice to Demonicus (*Ad Demonicum*) also gives evidence of the place of honour in his society and in doing so, shows the relevance of honour in rhetorical address. His advice is that one should:

Strive by all means to live in security, but if ever it falls to your lot to face the dangers of battle, seek to preserve your life, but with honour and not with disgrace; for death is the sentence which fate has passed on all mankind, but to die nobly is the special honour which nature has reserved for the good (LCL).⁷¹

Furthermore, Isocrates holds that "the praise of people is better than many possessions,"⁷² and encourages one to "pursue the enjoyments which are of good repute: for pleasure attended by honour is the best thing in the world, but pleasure without honour is the worst."⁷³ Honour concerns a person's social standing in the court of public opinion.

⁷⁰ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1.5.4-5 (Rackham, 14-15); cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 63.

⁷¹ Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum*, 43 (trans. George Norlin [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928]): 31; cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 67, no 62.

⁷² Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum* 37 (Norlin, 26-27); cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 68, no 66.

⁷³ Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum* 16 (Norlin, 12-13); cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 67, no 64.

Honour is either acquired or ascribed. Acquired honour is honour actively sought and gained usually at the expense of one's equals in the social contest of challenge and response.⁷⁴ There are various ways in which one may acquire honour. One may acquire honour because of services one rendered to society.⁷⁵ One could also acquire honour by being a teacher. The teacher has a recognised social standing in the community. He commands the respect of the community and of his disciples. The community will be dishonouring him if at social functions he is not recognised or his authority is questioned.

In the case of Jesus, social honour appears to have been acquired by Jesus in his role as teacher, though Luke clearly does not limit Jesus' honour to his acquired honour. That is why challenges to what Jesus says or does in the Gospels are challenges to his honour as a teacher. In the same way his disciples will be dishonouring him if they disagree with his teaching. That is equivalent to not acknowledging his teaching authority. Disciples never question the authority of their teacher.

⁷⁴ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 34.

⁷⁵ Two decrees from the Greco-Roman society show how three individuals acquired honour from their respective societies: (1) the City of Iasos in a decree (about 241 BCE) conferred honour of proxy (citizenship) on Physician Philistos for the services he rendered to the community, especially for curing citizens of serious ailments. See Jost Benedum, "Griechische Arztinschriften aus Kos," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (1977): 265-270; cited in Danker, *Benefactor*, 57. (2) The people of Dionysopolis in a decree (about 48 BCE) honoured Akornion, priest and envoy, for the services he rendered to the community. For example, as a priest, he reportedly "administered the processions and the sacrifices in [splendid] fashion and shared the meat with the citizens. And when he was envoy of Sarapis, "he [conducted] himself ably and generously in connection with his expenditure." See, Wilhelm Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, ed. Hiller von Gärtringen Friedrich (Hildesheim: Olms, 1960): 762 and Cagnat, *Inscriptiones Graecae*, I. 662; both cited in Danker, *Benefactor*, 77.

Ascribed honour, on the other hand, comes by birth. One becomes honourable by being born into an honourable family, for example, a royal family. Being a father is also an ascribed honour, since a father has power (i.e., ability) to exercise control over his children. (e.g. the power to choose a wife for his adult son).⁷⁶ Children must treat their father honourably, since to disobey the order of one's father in an honour culture is to dishonour him. Isocrates, for example, does not just advise one to honour the gods, he enjoins one to honour one's parents as well: "Fear the gods, honour your parents, respect your friends, obey the laws."⁷⁷

Not only do definitions of honour differ from group to group, they also differ between male and female.⁷⁸ In other words, what is honourable for a male person will not be honourable for a female person in an honour society. For instance, manliness, authority, concern for prestige, the willingness to challenge and affront another male, defence of the family's honour are all honourable behaviour for the male. On the other hand, female honour is symbolised in the maidenhead and likewise covers a range running from the ethically neutral to the ethically valued.⁷⁹ For instance, feelings of sensitivity to reveal

⁷⁶ See C. S. Keener, "Man and Woman," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993): 584; De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 29-30. See also Gen 21:21; 24:35-53; 28: 1-2, 8-9; 34: 4-6; 38: 6; Jos 15: 16; Jdg. 14: 2-3; 1 Sam 18: 17-27; 25: 44; Tob. 4: 12-13; 7: 9-12.

⁷⁷ Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum* 16 (Norlin, 12-13); cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 67.

⁷⁸ See DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*, 13-14.

⁷⁹ Malina, *New Testament World*, 51.

nakedness, shyness, blushing, timidity, restraint, sexual exclusiveness, and virginity, all make a female honourable,⁸⁰ while they dishonour the male. This observation together with the movement from the masculine “temple” to the feminine “household” suggests a “feminisation” of leadership in Luke.

In an honour, limited-good society, equals are constantly challenged. To survive in a society of limited and insufficient goods, like the first-century Mediterranean society, the peasant had to cut his “coat according to his cloth.” This is the peasant concept of limited goods, namely, that “all good things, food, land, honour— were in fixed quantities and short supply.”⁸¹ Thus it is only at the expense of others that one could have a greater share of any thing.⁸² The challenge may be in the form of a word, a gift or an invitation. And since it is the society that awards honour, both challenge and response are public. Failure to respond successfully to a challenge is a loss of honour; one person’s loss is another’s gain. (Ascribed honour is not challenged since it comes by birth, like royal status.)⁸³

⁸⁰ Malina, *New Testament World*, 51-52.

⁸¹ Malina, *New Testament World*, 95.

⁸² See Malina, *New Testament World*, 90-116; Thomas F. Carney, *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity* (Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1975): 189-99; Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 52; and Robbins, *Exploring*, 84-85.

⁸³ See Malina, *New Testament World*, 28-32, 36-38, 49-52 and Robbins, *Exploring*, 80-82.

Honour discourse features prominently at Luke's LS. The apostles' dispute about greatness (22:24) appears to be a dispute among equals over honour.⁸⁴ Since their dispute follows Jesus' prediction of his imminent death (cf. Luke 9:42-46), the apostles are probably fighting over who would succeed him as leader. But though Jesus' instruction on true leadership, coupled with the analogy of the gentile kingship, indicates that leadership is an honourable social role, Jesus points them towards a higher honour, namely, the honour to rule and dine in the kingdom of God (Luke 22:30a), that is gained only and ironically by service.

The narrative portrayal of the dispute among the apostles about greatness is also a challenge to their honour by the implied author, since it is in this way that the implied author portrays not only their ambitious aspiration to greatness⁸⁵ but also their failure to understand Jesus' teaching, the most recent of which is his just concluded action at the supper table. Although as we have demonstrated in chapters one and two, this dispute has the rhetorical effect of providing a context for the elaboration that follows (22:25-38), the placing of it right after the foretelling of the "betrayal" heightens this portrayal. Jesus rebukes this ambition by foretelling their imminent denial. Peter responds to this challenge

⁸⁴ This is a recitation of Luke 9:46 ("And an argument arose among them as to which of them was the greatest.") which parallels Mark 9:33-34 and Matt 18:1. The recitation of this dispute right after Jesus announced his imminent betrayal, coupled with the passion context of it, heightens the concern of the apostles about leadership. If Fitzmyer is correct in saying that the dispute is about "how they (the apostles) will be seen in the eyes of others," then the discourse features the social system of "dyadic personality." See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1416.

⁸⁵ Cf. Brutus' claim he murdered Caesar for his ambition to be king. Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act III, Scene II, in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington (New York: HarperCollins, 1992).

and attempts to reclaim his honour (22:33). but Jesus insists that there is nothing Peter can do about it (22:34). Peter's response to the challenge to his honour is therefore unsuccessful. This has the effect of shaming Peter who may be aspiring to the leadership of the group. When Peter eventually becomes leader of the group in the early section of Acts, it is not out of personal merit, but out of some restoration that Luke does not detail.

I observed above in my innertextural analysis how Luke programmatically narrows down leadership among the disciples: Peter is the first to encounter Jesus (5: 1-9), and with him were his fishing partners, James and John, sons of Zebedee (5: 10). While Jesus specifically calls Peter (And Jesus said to Simon, "Do not fear: from now on you shall be catching people") [my translation], he does not call his fishing partners: they simply forsook their boats "and followed him" (5:11). Secondly, when Jesus chooses twelve, he does so from among many possible candidates. Third, a circle of three (Peter, James and John) forms an inner circle within the Twelve. Fourth, a circle of two, Peter and John, and finally, Peter, the first to be chosen becomes the final focus in Luke 22:7-13 and 22:31-34 respectively, and the beginning focus in Acts. But this has hardly resolved the leadership problem: it has only short listed candidates for the leadership position. The reported dispute in 22: 24 makes this clear.

In my view, we may now conclude that the singling out of Peter in 22:31-34 is intended to prepare the reader for Peter's leadership of the group in the early part of Acts without explaining to the reader how that leadership came about. I say, in the early part of Acts because Luke presents an ambivalent picture of Peter's headship of the Jesus-movement group vis-à-vis James the brother of Jesus in the rest of Acts. That means that it remains to be proved that Peter did indeed succeed Jesus as leader of the Jesus-movement

group. In fact Robert Eisenman has presented a strong case for James the brother of Jesus as the real successor to Jesus, and not Peter.⁸⁶ The precarious nature of Peter's leadership of the Jesus-movement group is indicated in the gospel to the Hebrews (GHeb), which indicates that James the brother of Jesus was the first to see him after his resurrection, not Peter or Mary of Magdala as in the canonical gospels (GHeb 9). Coupled with this is the gospel of Thomas' (Thom) account of Jesus' appointment of his brother James as the leader of the group (Thom 12). Thus, just as James will eventually appear to be leader of the Jerusalem community, without ever having been so distinguished, so here Luke prepares the reader for Peter's surreptitious leadership.

Finally, the dispute about greatness is intended to advance Luke's reversal motif, for it provides a context for Jesus to redefine the apostles' understanding of leadership as the position of the low. This redefinition is what Peter K. Nelson rightly calls reversal in terms of definition.⁸⁷ In other words, the world as represented by the gentile kings defines leadership in terms of high and mighty, while Jesus defines it in terms of leading like a slave. For Jesus the social function of leadership is not lording it over others but serving like the lowly: the greatest is the one who serves. In this way, Jesus' redefinition of greatness seeks to persuade the apostles not to seek greatness as defined by the dominant culture—because the dominant cultural notion of greatness will lead the apostles away from honour as defined by Jesus—but to lead by a new notion of leadership. This redefinition is

⁸⁶ See Robert Eisenman, *James the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Penguin Books, 1997).

⁸⁷ See Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 78.

a reversal of values as well as a reversal of fortunes in so far as those who serve (servants) become greater than those who lord it (leaders) over others. Reversal is required if the apostles are to be like their master (Luke 6:40), who is in fact God's distinguished leader.⁸⁸

John O. York, then, is not correct to insist against Peter K. Nelson that the reversals in 22:24-27 involve only a bi-polar reversal,⁸⁹ understood as a reversal of 'poles' (e.g. the poor become rich and the rich become poor).⁹⁰ Nelson notes that vv.28-30 feature a "reversal of fortunes in which the trial-laden apostles are promised that they will become lofty rulers over Israel."⁹¹ This permits him to characterise further the reversals in vv. 24-30 as a 360-degree high-low-high progression. In other words, the apostles, who consider themselves great, are put down socially by Jesus through his teaching on true greatness but are truly exalted by him as he makes them rulers in his kingdom.

Yet, I would argue that Nelson's view is not adequate either. In my view, this reversal of the fortunes of the apostles should be viewed against the background of their life: the reversal of fortunes actually takes place in the life of the apostles. For some of them (for example Peter, James and John) the progress from being ordinary fishermen who sometimes "toiled all night and took nothing" (5:5 cf. John 21:4), to being promised a place in the kingdom of Jesus and as rulers of the twelve tribes of Israel (22: 29-30) is evident.

⁸⁸ See Robert L. Brawley, *Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1990): 52.

⁸⁹ See York, *The Rhetoric of Reversal*, 170-71; Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 86.

⁹⁰ See York, *The Rhetoric of Reversal*, 42.

⁹¹ Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 77.

Consequently, the reversal that takes place in the life of the apostles at the LS is consistent with Luke's statement of reversals in the Magnificat (1:46-55). Mary's praise goes beyond what God has done for her, to include what God had done for the lowly and the poor (vv. 52-53) understood not just economically. Although Luke through Mary speaks of what God already did, in Fitzmyer's opinion, "Luke can put such sentiments" on the lips of Mary at this introductory "stage in his narrative because he is writing with hindsight and knows that each of the details can be interpreted figuratively of the career of Jesus."⁹² In fact, in the story it is interpreted not figuratively, but literally. Our analysis of the reversal of fortunes of the apostles permits us to go further than Fitzmyer to add that the reversals spoken of in the Magnificat are also true in the career of the apostles.

Perhaps the most important reversal Luke portrays in his Gospel is that which takes place in the life of Jesus,⁹³ for Jesus who suffers a shameful death is raised from the dead by God, thereby making the rejected stone "the head of the corner"(20:17; Acts 4:11). The reversal that takes place in the life of Jesus is perhaps best characterised as one of York's bi-polar reversals, since pre-existence discourse is absent in the LS discourse, as indeed in the rest of Luke's writings: Jesus suffered a humiliating death, but was raised by God. This reversal already is anticipated at the LS as Jesus, who faces imminent suffering and death, reveals that his father has assigned him a kingdom (v.30), suggesting that he would survive

⁹² Fitzmyer, *Luke I-X*, 361.

⁹³ York, *The Rhetoric of Reversal*, 171. Donald Juel shares this view. See Donald Juel, *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1983): 50.

his passion. But this reversal will not occur until he has suffered crucifixion, the nadir of his fortunes.

This reversal of Jesus' fortunes is in fact the focus of Luke's concern for Jesus' honour, which features prominently throughout the LS discourse, through the agency of Jesus' foreknowledge of coming events and the will of God. The determination of the chief priests and the scribes to destroy Jesus coupled with Satan's complicity, and Jesus' *πειρασμοὶ* (trials) are challenges to his honour. The Lukan Jesus responds by showing that his passion is the will of God: it is intended to fulfil what has been written about him, and he is aware of it. In sum, Jesus embodies paradigmatically the reversal of the definition of greatness and thus advances Luke's notion of leadership as slave service.

III. Summary

The foregoing analysis has shown the social nature of Luke's LS text. The analysis confirms the findings in our previous analysis of social intertexture that the language of Luke's LS can be located in the first-century Mediterranean society, for the social institutions of meals, patron-client, temple, household, and honour in the first-century Mediterranean provide the social environment for its social rhetoric.

Our analysis of the social function of the temple and the household reveals a further shift from the temple to the household, a shift that favours inclusiveness as the sphere of the new social order. In the end Luke's social rhetoric emerges as revolutionist with a conversionist bent. This we have characterised as communitarian social rhetoric. The new social order will not come violently, but through a change of attitude and conversion. Our exploration of the honour script, for example, reveals that the redefinition of what is

honourable, as well as the court of opinion, constitutes an important stage in this conversion process.

IV. Cultural Rhetoric of Luke's LS

After examining relevant details of the social system at the time of Luke, we have some idea of how the Lukan LS configures a new social reality. Now we must turn to an investigation of Luke's cultural rhetoric,⁹⁴ that is, the particular way in which the Jesus-movement adopts this social reality. In such an investigation, we explore the impact of alternative scenarios in the LS discourse indicating how Luke wishes to shape the values of his audience. This section, then, is an analysis of the rhetorical goals or purposes communicated in the LS text for the community itself, and is thus a rhetorical analysis of "final cultural categories" in the LS text.⁹⁵

Following the works of certain cultural anthropologists, Robbins identifies five categories for the purposes of analysis and interpretation of the kind of culture rhetoric in a

⁹⁴ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 86-89; *Tapestry*, 167-70; "The Magnificat," 189-90; and "Rhetoric and Culture: Exploring Types of Culture Rhetoric in a Text," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Thomas H. Olbricht and Stanley E. Porter, JSNTSup, 90 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993): 443-63. See also Wesley H. Wachob's use of Robbins' analysis, *The Social Rhetoric of James*, 189-193.

⁹⁵ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 167 and Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989): 38, 58. See also Aristotle, *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, I.1421b, 21-1422b, 12; *Rhet.* I.1421b, 21-1422b; See Mack's use of this kind of analysis in *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).

text.⁹⁶ The first two cultural rhetorics are mirror perspectives of each other. Dominant culture rhetoric is a cultural rhetoric in which attitudes, values, dispositions, and norms are supported by social structures with authority to impose its goals on people within a significantly broad territory. Subculture rhetoric is a cultural rhetoric that imitates the attitudes, values, dispositions, and norms of a dominant culture. It claims to enact them better than members of dominant standing. This rhetoric implies the existence of a network of groups and institutions for the sole purpose of supporting persons within their region. A subculture maintains its own set of rituals and patterns of behaviour, which define it as a subgroup of a particular society. The subculture may be founded on religion or ethnic origin; it may be based on gender or sexuality and may be real or perceived. According to Keith J. Matthews, "The early Christian communities in the Roman empire, the European Romanies and gay communities all comprise a subculture. Each subculture has its own unique material culture."⁹⁷

Next, we need to distinguish two forms of culture rhetoric that are often not distinguishable. Counterculture rhetoric rejects the rhetoric of either the dominant culture or

⁹⁶ Robbins draws this taxonomy of cultures from, Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (New York: Basic, 1983); J. Milton Yinger "Counterculture and Subculture," *American Sociological Review* 25.5 (Oct 1960): 625-35 and *Countercultures: The Promise and Peril of a World Turned Upside Down* (New York: Free Press, 1982); Keith A. Roberts, "Toward a Generic Concept of Counter-Culture," *Sociological Focus* 11 (1978): 111-26; G. F. S. Ellens, "The Ranting Ranters: Reflections on a Ranting Counter-Culture," *CH* 40 (1971): 91-107; and Milton M. Gordon, "The Subsociety and the Subculture," *Subcultures*, ed. D. Arnold (Berkeley: Glendessary Press, 1970): 150-63.

⁹⁷ Keith J. Matthews, "Archaeological Data, Subcultures and Social Dynamics," *Antiquity* 69.264 (Sept 1995): 586.

the subculture by suggesting an alternative cultural rhetoric. Contraculture rhetoric, on the other hand, is an oppositional culture rhetoric, that is not only short-lived and deviant of other cultural rhetorics (i.e. non-programmatic), but also unlike counterculture, has no fixed goal. This definition, then, not only distinguishes it from countercultural rhetoric but also takes seriously the warning of J. Milton Yinger of the need to make a conscious analytic distinction between "subculture" and "contraculture": while some values of a subculture may sometimes conflict with the dominant culture, the conflict element is central in a contraculture.⁹⁸ Finally, we can discern what has been called liminal culture rhetoric. This cultural rhetoric, like the contracultural, has a limited existence; however, here the existence is only linguistic. Liminal cultural rhetoric may thus be said to exist among people or groups of people who are yet to establish their own social and cultural identity.⁹⁹ Many initiation rituals place the initiates in a state of liminality, for during the initiation the initiates are linguistically in a state of betwixt and between.¹⁰⁰

The cultural rhetoric of the Lukan LS discourse may be assumed to be located within the overall rhetoric of Luke's two-volume work. The preceding discussion, together with our analysis so far, assumes that the Lukan LS discourse is in dialogue with two cultures.

⁹⁸ See Yinger, "Contraculture and Subculture," 629.

⁹⁹ See Victor Witter Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (New York: Gruyter, 1969; reprt 1995): 94-130; Robbins, *Tapestry*, 170; and Homi K. Bhabha, "Postcolonial Criticism," in *Redrawing the Boundaries*, ed. S. Greenblatt and G. Gunn (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1992): 437-65. See also Catherine Bell's exploration of the social function of ritual in her *Ritual Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 23-60.

¹⁰⁰ See Turner, *Ritual Process*, 95.

namely, Israelite and Greco-Roman cultures and their social institutions. In this respect, Luke's two-volume work was one of many efforts to appropriate the story of Jesus for different communities in relation to the same cultures and institutions. What Luke provides, then, is a unique way in which he perceives the Jesus movement as living out the dimensions of that story. Luke's reshaping of previous scribal texts (e.g. Mark) as we saw in our analysis of oral-scribal intertexture indicates that Luke was likely aware of the potential of texts not only to speak within cultures but also to create alternative cultures.

But what kind of alternative? From his analysis of the Lukan text that features Mary and Elizabeth (Luke 1:26-56), Robbins suggests that the discourse of Luke-Acts "perpetuates a contracultural Israelite rhetoric as an ethnic subcultural form of Roman culture."¹⁰¹ This means that the Lukan discourse does not reject pivotal values of Israelite systems and tradition; it inverts only the objectionable Israelite culture thought and behaviour. Likewise, Luke's discourse does not reject "explicit and mutable characteristics" of Roman rhetoric.¹⁰² Bloomquist reverses Robbins' cultural targets, but not Luke's cultural rhetoric, by arguing that the discursive culture to which Jesus' essentially subversive approach to the temple culture points is best characterised as subcultural, since Jesus is shown by Luke to enact "the attitudes, values and disposition and norms of the dominant culture [Israelite] better than the members of the dominant status,"¹⁰³ while in relation to

¹⁰¹ Robbins, "The Magnificat," 193.

¹⁰² See Robbins, "The Magnificat," 190-94.

¹⁰³ Bloomquist, "Rhetorical Argumentation," 12.

Greco-Roman culture Luke's cultural rhetoric is contracultural.¹⁰⁴ Both Robbins and Bloomquist, then, see Luke's rhetoric as having contracultural and subcultural emphases but differ on which rhetorics are being "connected" by Luke.

In chapter four we saw that the Lukan Jesus' apostleship-for-service evidences a contrast not with Israelite leadership, but with the gentile kingship system (22:25-26) and is thus a rejection of explicit and central value of the dominant culture. This indicates that, contrary to Bloomquist's suggestion, Luke's Jesus is speaking from a countercultural perspective to the Greco-Roman dominant culture.¹⁰⁵ In place of that dominant cultural rhetoric we find Luke's countercultural rhetoric in which leadership is for service of the people, for while, according to the dominant culture, slave service is dishonourable, in Luke's counterculture it is honourable. Luke's view is not to follow the values of the dominant culture. It is possible that the Jesus-movement group initially started out as a contraculture, but by the time Luke was writing it has emerged as a counterculture with adequate rationale to support its concern. One way it supported its concern¹⁰⁶ was with a revolutionist view of a sudden change that would occur in the world.

¹⁰⁴ See L. Gregory Bloomquist, "Methodological Criteria for the Determination of Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Suggestion for the Expanded Use of Socio-Rhetoric Analysis," in *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetoric Dimensions of Early Israelite and Christian Apocalyptic Discourse*, ed. L. Gregory Bloomquist and Greg Carey (St. Louis: Chalice, 1999): 193-94.

¹⁰⁵ See Richard A. Horsley, "The Imperial Situation of Palestinian Israelite Society," in *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*, ed. Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993): 395-407 and Emil Schürer, *A History of the Israelite People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 5 vols. trans. Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995; orig. T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1890).

¹⁰⁶ See Robbins, *Tapestry*, 172.

Luke's rhetoric also redefines Greco-Roman patronage as slave service, rather than as a means to status. This new concept of *διακονία* is first illustrated when Luke points the reader to "some women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary, called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who provided for them out of their means" (8:2-3). In order to reciprocate benefactions received from Jesus, these women-clients ministered to them (Jesus and the apostles) out of their means (*διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς*). Within the patron-client framework the women are grateful clients of God, reciprocating God's benefaction by supporting the work of God done by Jesus and his group.¹⁰⁷ But, while this might have been construed as dishonourable, in the end, we see that this is not dishonourable, for Luke portrays these women-disciples as performing the kind of *διακονία* that Jesus will associate with true leadership.

In adopting a countercultural rhetoric in which the values of the dominant culture are reversed, Luke engages in a politics of meaning, that is, the language of honour becomes an important social and cultural tool by which Luke creates and maintains his cultural rhetoric.¹⁰⁸ Put differently, Luke at the LS creates and encourages the maintenance of his cultural rhetoric, not only by redefining what is honourable and shameful, but also by redefining the court of opinion before whom members of his Jesus-movement group should

¹⁰⁷ Against Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Boston, MA: Beacon, 1992): 63-64.

¹⁰⁸ See DeSilva, *Despising Shame*, 80.

feel shame or accept honour. God is this court of opinion. for in Luke's view only the will of God counts.

David Arthur deSilva has demonstrated that this kind of redefinition of honour finds examples in Greco-Roman philosophical writings. Here we briefly consider Plato, Seneca, and Epictetus.¹⁰⁹

Plato (ca 429-347 BCE) through his writings sought to distance himself and his students from the common notion of honour in the dominant culture into which he was born. He taught his students not to consider themselves responsible to the opinion of the many, but to the ideals of philosophy and the opinion of the wise. For Plato only the opinion of the "wise person" counts, rather than the opinion of the "lay person" (non-philosopher). In the *Crito*, for example, Plato discusses Socrates' objection to Crito's formulation of a plan concerning the opinion of the many. Crito had gone to inform Socrates in prison that he and certain friends of Socrates planned to help Socrates escape from prison so as to avoid public disgrace. In reaction to Crito, Socrates says: "But, my dear Crito, why do we care so much for what most people think? For the most reasonable men, whose opinion is more worth considering, will think that things were done as they really ought to be" (44C). What matters to Socrates is not what the many will say, but what he who knows about right and wrong, and truth herself, will say. In the *Gorgias*, as well,

¹⁰⁹ See, deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 82-96.

Socrates offers a redefinition of the honourable and the shameful and the court of opinion: the court of God.¹¹⁰

Like Plato, Seneca also redefines honour and the court of opinion. For Seneca the value of honour depends on who gives it. The wise person does not conduct himself in order to gain public approval, only those not perfected do. The wise person respects neither the honour nor the disgrace conferred by the many, for he regards them as children:

In the same spirit in which he sets no value on the honours they have, he sets no value on the lack of honour they show. Just as he will not be flattered if a beggar shows him respect, nor count it an insult if a man from the dregs of the people, on being greeted, fails to return his greeting, so, too, will he not even look up if many rich men look upon him. For he knows that they differ not a whit from beggars.... For men may all differ one from another, yet the wise man regards them as all alike because they are all equally foolish.¹¹¹

Seneca holds the hope that the virtuous person will be vindicated by future generations if his own contemporaries should deny him such:

Virtue is never lost to view; and yet to have been lost to view is no loss. There will come a day which will reveal her, though hidden away or suppressed by the spite of her contemporaries. That man is born merely for the few, who think only of the people of his own generation. Many thousands of years and thousands of peoples will come after you: it is to these that you should have regard.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ See Plato, *Georgias*, 508C-D, 526D-527A-D (trans. W. R. M. Lamb [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925]): 471-478, 528-533; cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 85.

¹¹¹ *De Constant*, 13.2, 5 (Seneca, *Moralia* I, trans. J. W. Basore [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928]): 84-89; cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 87-88.

¹¹² *Epistulae* 79.17 (*Epistulae Morales* II, trans. R. M. Gummere [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920]): 210-211; cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 88.

Our third and final example is Epictetus (ca 55-135 CE). Epictetus engaged in countercultural rhetoric in prescribing an alternative way of life and alternative value to those of the dominant culture. Epictetus divided things into two provinces: those that belong to province of the “moral purpose” and those that belong to “externals.” The moral purpose, which is under personal control, is superior to the externals:

Some things are under our control, while others are not under our control. Under our control are conception, choice, desire, aversion, and, in a word, everything that is our own doing; not under our control are our body, our property, reputation, office, and, in a word, everything that is not our own doing. Furthermore, the things under our control are by nature free, unhindered, and unimpeded; while the things not under our control are weak, servile, subject to hindrance, and not our own.¹¹³

For if the true nature of the good is one of the things that are under our control, there is no place for either envy or jealousy; and you yourself will not wish to be a praetor, or a senator, or a consul, but a free man. Now there is but one way that leads to this, and that is to despise the things that are not under our control.¹¹⁴

The Stoic vocation and the distinction they draw between moral purpose and externals are based on their claim to kinship with Zeus, and it is God who ascribes honour to the philosopher.¹¹⁵ Thus God, and not the public, is the court of opinion.

¹¹³ Epictetus, *Encheiridion* 1.1-2 (trans. W. A. Oldfather [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928]): 482-83; cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 91.

¹¹⁴ Epictetus, *Encheiridion* 19. 2 (Oldfather, 496-97); cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 96.

¹¹⁵ See Epictetus, *Dissertations* 1.XXIX.44-49 (*Discourses*, trans. W. A. Oldfather [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925]): 198-199; cited in deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 95.

The above samples from the writings of Plato, Seneca, and Epictetus show that the ancients used the cultural script of honour as social tool for creating and sustaining their culture, as well as for overturning alternatives. It also shows that honour and shame are an essential component of what makes sense to the ancients. Honour is the *summum bonum*. The language of honour and the control of it is central to the struggle between subordinate groups and the dominant society.

This kind of politics of meaning can be observed in Luke's redefinition of suffering at the LS (22: 37). In Israelite culture hanging on a tree is shameful (see Deut 21:20-23; cf. Gen 40:19; Num 25:4). Only sinners suffer. Clearly, the Israelite culture reflected in the OT will not attribute suffering to the will of God. But Luke turns this Israelite dominant cultural rhetoric on its head by arguing that the suffering of Jesus is according to divine will. But, since for Luke, God is honourable, and whatever God does is considered honourable, no matter how humanly incomprehensible it may be, it, then, must be that God's action vis-à-vis Jesus is also honourable. Luke seeks in this way to persuade members of his group that there is a suffering that is indeed honourable, and that suffering is reflected in Jesus.

The death of Jesus is also honourable because it leads to an act of divine vindication. This is a redefinition of the social stigma of death by crucifixion, and it foreshadows the rhetoric of martyrdom, which later became "the enactment and symbol of Christian perfection."¹¹⁶ This indicates that the rhetorical discourse present in Luke's LS is death-

¹¹⁶ Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991): 51.

resurrection discourse.¹¹⁷ This suggests that while Luke's LS (vv. 7-38) [WT] is form-critically a farewell discourse, it is rhetorically, a death-resurrection discourse, a discourse that becomes full-blown in Luke's second-volume work.¹¹⁸ That Luke's LS is not just about Jesus' death, but about his resurrection as well can be seen in the kingdom-of-God language (22: 16, 18, 29-30), which implies that Jesus hopes to survive his death (resurrection). This rhetorical genre (death-resurrection) indicates that Luke's LS is a religious discourse rather than a historical or philosophical discourse.¹¹⁹

A still closer example of Luke's countercultural rhetoric as we argue here can be found in classical Cynic movement, in the sense that Cynicism was a thoroughly countercultural movement, not in words but in deeds. Unlike the above philosophical writers who chose to achieve their aim through words or system of doctrines (λογοί), classical Cynicism as represented by Antisthenes (ca 445-336 BCE), Diogenes of Sinope (ca 404-323 BCE), and Crates of Thebes (ca 360-280 BCE), thought actions (ἔργα) were sufficient.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Vernon Robbins identifies five other rhetorical genres that an interpreter may find in the NT: wisdom, thaumaturgic, apocalyptic, oppositional, and pre-creation discourses. See Robbins, "Response to 'Vernon Robbins's Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: A Review,'" *JSNT* 70 (1998): 103. For example, the prologue to the Fourth Gospel is rhetorically pre-creation discourse.

¹¹⁸ See Robbins, "Response," 105.

¹¹⁹ See Robbins, "Response," 104.

¹²⁰ See Margarethe Billerbeck, "The Ideal Cynic from Epictetus to Julian," in *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, ed. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996): 219. And for the history and ideology of the Cynics, see R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, eds. *The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy* (Berkeley: University of

Classical Cynicism was a form of voluntary cultural estrangement, in which the individual came to view customs and values of the dominant society as arbitrary in nature and disdained to observe them.¹²¹ In a nutshell, classical Cynicism was characterised by *παρρησία* (freedom to speak always the truth), *ἀναιδεια* (shamelessness), *ἀρετή* (virtue, that is self-mastery, virtuoso, strength of character).¹²² and open disdain for things the dominant culture considers necessary for happiness (e.g. wealth, fame, political power).¹²³ Diogenes, for example, used *παρρησία* as a visible expression of his exemption from social control, of his immunity to *doxa* [praise] or public opinion; it confers on his conduct the sanction of nature. The clearest example of Diogenes' commitment to Cynic freedom, that is, "to use any place for any purpose,"¹²⁴ is "his willingness to live with his body in public view, his refusal to hide or disguise the bodily functions conventionally deemed strictly private

California Press, 1996); Luis E. Navia, *Classical Cynicism: A Critical Study* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1996); Donald Reynolds Dudley, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century Ad* (Chicago: Aries, 1980); and Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, VI.

¹²¹ See James Romm, "Dog Heads and Noble Savages: Cynicism Before the Cynics?" in *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996): 122.

¹²² On this Cynic connotation of virtue as different from connotations that Judeo-Christian tradition has foisted on it, see Navia, *Classical Cynicism*, 71-72.

¹²³ See Anthony A. Long, "The Socratic Tradition: Diogenes, Crates, and Hellenistic Ethics," in *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996): 30.

¹²⁴ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, 6.22 (Hicks, 24-25).

or obscene.”¹²⁵ Explicit in the life of the Cynic then, was a subvention and a redefinition of established concept of honour: Diogenes may not have “defaced the currency,” but he most certainly “defaced” established values of the Athenian dominant culture.¹²⁶ In this way, Cynicism was thoroughly a countercultural movement. In point of fact “Cynicism remained a vital source of oppositional discourse through its history, which consists of a continual process of reevaluation beginning with the Christians, as one dominant culture after another attempts to “house-break” the Dogs.¹²⁷ And some have argued that the Cynics provided a significant model for early Jesus-movement groups.¹²⁸

While we are not claiming Luke was influenced by the Cynics, though his awareness of them is not inconceivable, like them his cultural rhetoric places emphasis on ἔργα (actions), and not on λόγοι (words or doctrines). For instance, when John the Baptist sends two of his disciples to find out if Jesus is “the one who is to come” (7: 20-24), Luke gives a summary of Jesus’ healing activities plus his preaching of the kingdom of God (7:24) as evidence that Jesus is indeed “the one who is to come.” For Luke, Jesus’ actions come before his preaching, a pattern that Luke

¹²⁵ R. Bracht Branham, “Defacing the Currency: Diogenes’ Rhetoric and the Invention of Cynicism,” in *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996): 100.

¹²⁶ See Branham and Goulet-Cazé, *The Cynics*, 24.

¹²⁷ Branham and Goulet-Cazé, *The Cynics*, 19.

¹²⁸ See F. Gerald Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992) and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, « Le cynisme à l’époque impériale. » in *ANRW*, vol 2. (Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990): 2788-99.

maintains in Acts. For instance, he begins his second volume by summarising his first volume as containing “all that Jesus did and taught” (Acts 1:1) and have Peter characterise Jesus as one who “went about doing good” (Acts 10:38; cf. 2: 22); and of course Acts is really about the deeds of its major actors.

We find this kind of emphasis on actions at the LS, first in the breaking of bread, which as we have analysed it in chapter four above (215-219), is a symbolic announcement of his imminent death, and it could, as we observed too in chapter two above (104), also be seen as a mixed *chreia* (action and saying *chreia*). Our analysis of Jesus’ instructions on leadership (22: 25-27), coupled with his inclusive meal practice, suggests that for Luke actions are enough to subvert values of the dominant culture. This is also true of Jesus’ action in bequeathing a kingdom to the apostles so that they dine with him in his kingdom and sit on Israelite royal thrones (22: 29-30).

V. Summary

This chapter sets out to explore the social and cultural rhetoric of Luke’s LS discourse for the purpose of furthering our hypothesis that Luke has constructed his LS text in order to change the attitude of his group to accept his own notion of the Jesus-movement group as an inclusive social group where leaders should serve like slaves. We have found that the language in the text can be socially and culturally located in first-century Mediterranean setting, that is, within Israelite as well as the broader Greco-Roman culture of the first century CE.

We used Wilson’s typology of sects as the framework for determining the social response to the world in our text. This, together with an analysis of the language in the text,

allows us to conclude that the text indicates a revolutionist response, with a conversionist tendency that seeks to reconstruct the old social order for the purposes of establishing a new social order, the kingdom of God (theocracy), the kind of primitive community that Acts describes. Put differently, Luke is “interested in creating a better society, but not by legislative reform or by violent opposition to the dominant culture, but by providing an alternative, and to hope that the dominant society will ‘see the light’ and adopt a more ‘humanistic’ way of life.”¹²⁹ The envisaged new social group we characterise as communitarian social response, for “it sets out through its activities to construct the world on a communitarian basis.”¹³⁰

Furthermore, our analysis reveals how Luke evoked social and cultural systems to shape this social response. Jesus’ subvention of cultural meal habits serves to reverse relationships and roles at meals, a mainstay of the purity system. In Jesus’ meals, the reversal of roles indicates that the honoured one is no longer the leader, but the one who serves; honour is no longer ascribed but must be acquired.

In addition, our cultural textural analysis leads us to the conclusion that the cultural function of Luke’s LS is the creation of an inclusive community in which such a social response endures. Luke’s LS speaks to a subculture within Israelite culture, while it speaks to a counterculture in relation to the dominant Greco-Roman culture: the Lukan Jesus rejects the rhetoric of imperial Rome but only inverts certain Israelite cultural systems.

¹²⁹ Keith A. Robert, “Toward A Generic Concept of Counter-Culture,” *Sociological Focus* 11 (1978): 121.

¹³⁰ Wilson, “Typology of Sects,” 370.

What Luke's inclusivity suggests is that in the new social order, God, not the gentile kings, will be the patron, while Jesus will broker God's benefactions. When the apostles become rulers in the new dispensation they will also act as brokers of God's benefactions through Jesus, the broker. The rule of God, which Jesus dubbed the kingdom of God, is identifiable with Luke's social rhetoric. Luke's LS narrative discourse is a thoroughly political act. In the end Luke's LS emerges rhetorically as a death-resurrection discourse as it seeks to focus attention on the death and resurrection of Jesus as an example for others. As a death-resurrection discourse Luke seeks to turn away attention from the death of Jesus, a shameful thing in the eyes of the dominant culture, to his resurrection which Luke interprets in Acts as Jesus' divine sonship (Acts 13:33-37).

Our samples from Greek philosophers show that Luke's honour language in the LS discourse finds precedents in some Greco-Roman philosophical writings. Luke's redefinition of what is honourable and the court of opinion may not be as clear as what we have seen in Plato, Seneca, and Epictetus, but in his own way Luke employs the cultural script of honour to create and nurture his cultural rhetoric. Like the Stoic the court of opinion for Luke is God. On the other hand, the classical cynic movement provides an example of Luke's countercultural rhetoric that we have identified in his LS text.

Chapter Six

SACRED TEXTURE

The biblical text as sacred literature or story attempts to narrate some human encounter with the divine. To analyse the sacred texture of the biblical text then is to explore that encounter as it is found in the text. Readers of the biblical text are “interested in locating the ways the text speaks about God or gods or talks about the realms of religious life.”¹ The biblical text, understood as a text that mediates words about God, evidences rhetorical activity in the area of sacred texture insofar as the text seeks to prescribe to an audience a particular view of the deity.²

In terms of socio-rhetorical analysis, we find sacred texture embedded in the innertexture, intertexture, and social-cultural texture of any text with religious dimension. For example, the way people talk about reality in general, and the sacred in particular, is a function of their social and cultural location. In this way, discussion of the sacred is culture specific, that is, how a culture speaks about deity, the holy. Or again, as we saw in our intertextual analysis Luke’s language about the kingdom of God is located within Israelite social and cultural milieu; accordingly, our discussion of the sacred will take place in relation to the Israelite cultural context including its sacred texts. For instance, when we

¹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 120.

² See Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethics*, 177-178.

talk about the deity, we mean Israelite deity,³ the god of Israel (see Acts 3:13; 5:30; 7: 32, 46; 13:17; 24:14) and not some other deity among the numerous deities in the world.⁴ A major way to gain a fuller understanding of the meanings and meaning effects of sacred texture, then, will be through analysis and interpretation of other textures in the context of understanding sacred texture.⁵

The sacred texture of a text includes (a) deity, (b) holy persons, (c) spirit beings (d) divine history, (e) human redemption, (f) human commitment, (g) religious community, and (h) human responsibility.⁶ Our analysis of the innertexture above demonstrates that the Lukan LS discourse exhibits seven aspects of sacred texture: (1) Deity; (2) Holy persons; (3) Spirit beings; (4) Human redemption; (5) Discipleship; (6) Brotherhood of the apostles; and (7) Religious community.

³ See Michael A. Fishbane, "Judaism as an Ideological System," in *Religious Traditions of the World: A Journey through Africa, North America, Mesoamerica, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, China, and Japan*, ed. H. Byron Earhart (New York: HarperCollins, 1993): 390-431 and Clifford Geertz on, "Religion as a Cultural System" and "Ideology as a Cultural System," in *Interpretation of Cultures*, 87-125, 193-233.

⁴ For an idea of the numerous deities of the world see, Robert Turcan, *The Cults of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992); H. Byron Earhart, ed. *Religious Traditions of the World: A Journey through Africa, North America, Mesoamerica, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, China, and Japan* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993); and Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, two vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

⁵ Robbins, *Exploring*, 130.

⁶ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 120-31.

I. The Deity

Just as the deity is silent throughout Jesus' ministry, so is he also silent during the LS and throughout the passion. In fact, the only exceptions in the deity's silence in Luke-Acts are at Jesus' baptism and at the transfiguration (3:22; 9:35), if the voice at both occasions is in fact that of the deity (e.g. the deity of Israel).⁷ But, even in these two cases, Luke reveals little about how the deity specifically communicates with Jesus.

Nevertheless, Luke identified the deity that Jesus speaks of as the father with the God of Israel. For instance, Zechariah identifies God as the God of Israel (Luke 1:68); Jesus identifies him as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (20:37). Both Stephen (Acts 7:32) and Peter identify the God who raised Jesus as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the God of our fathers (Acts 3:13), while Paul also identifies the God who raised Jesus as the God of Israel (Acts 13:17). It appears that it is the same God who assigns Jesus a kingdom, which he in turn shares with his apostles at the LS (22:29).

By claiming that "the power of the Lord was in him to cure" (5:17),⁸ Luke shows that, although the deity hardly speaks, the deity is clearly identified as Jesus' father. Furthermore, the Father is always present to the Son. This is no doubt why the deity in Luke acts in and through the Son (Luke 7:16). Thus, although the deity is silent in the LS, he is identified in direct speech about him. But what kind of deity do we find identified in

⁷ The reason for this caution is that in the gospel to the Hebrews' (GHeb) account of Jesus' baptism the voice is that of the holy spirit identified as Jesus' mother, not that of God (GHeb 3- 4).

⁸ Luke has already identified the Lord with the deity in 4:8, 12, 18.

Luke's LS? We have touched on this partly when we observed that the deity does not speak.

As we shall show below, Jesus' claim to divine sonship, that is, both to the Davidic throne and to broker God's grace to humanity, are challenged by Satan and the Judean authorities. That means that Jesus' claim to mediate benefactions of the deity is not unambiguous but contentious. Furthermore, all other Lukan claims regarding Jesus-divine relationship are uncertain. For instance, does Jesus suffer and die according to the will of the deity? Is it the nature of the deity to reward faithfulness, even if this means that the faithful suffer and die? The deity appears to empower Jesus for the purpose of acting through Jesus, but the reader is not privileged to hear any communication between Jesus and God, and thus the deity's role must be construed narratively.

II. Holy Persons

Sacred texture also depicts holy persons, by which we mean "humans who have a special relation with God or to divine powers."⁹ Humans such as John the Baptist, the chief priests, scribes and the Pharisees, who are connected with the sacred in the temple, fall within the realm of the holy.

Jesus is presented in the NT texts as the holy person par excellence.¹⁰ In fact it is only Jesus who is explicitly identified as a holy person (Luke 4:34). Even the Demons identify him as the holy one of God and son of God (4:34,41; 8:28). While other holy

⁹ Robbins, *Exploring*, 121.

¹⁰ See Robbins, *Exploring*, 121.

persons are holy because of their association with the temple. Luke presents Jesus as holy by birth (1:35). Even other holy persons are holy through their encounter with Jesus.¹¹ This means that the other holy persons are narratological foils to Jesus, the holy person par excellence in Luke's writings. Their holiness is derivative from Jesus, but it is understood only in relation to Jesus' holiness.

But the holiness of others is often shown in contrast to Jesus, that is, culturally "holy" persons are often shown to be "unholy" in Luke's perspective. As our earlier analysis reveals, the chief priests, the scribes and other temple functionaries are regularly in opposition to Jesus. This opposition, which focuses on dietary regulations, the temple and Sabbath laws, suggests that what is at issue between Jesus and culturally identifiable holy persons who are his opponents concerns who best represents socially, culturally and sacredly the invisible deity in sacred matters: Jesus or his opponents? Luke argues that God has chosen Jesus as the authoritative mediator of divine benefactions to humans.

A. Jesus as a Faithful Israelite

One of the characteristics of Jesus as a holy person in Luke's presentation is Jesus as a faithful Israelite. We see this in the LS account when Jesus makes elaborate plans for celebrating the sacred Passover feast, even though he is aware of plans to destroy him.

The presentation of Jesus as a devout Israelite is a logical conclusion to the characterisation of him throughout the Third Gospel (see 2:21-24, 41, 46; 4:16; 19:45; 21:37-38). Luke informs his reader that at the beginning of his public ministry, Jesus "went to the synagogue, as his custom was, on the Sabbath day" (Luke 4:16). Jesus teaches daily

¹¹ See Darr, *On Character Building*, 41-42, quoting R. A. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983): 104.

in the temple (Luke 19:45). At age twelve Jesus is depicted as showing deep interest in the Israelite cultural tradition (Luke 2:46).¹² Just before Jesus began his passion Luke has this summarising statement about his cultural devotion to the temple: “And every day he was teaching in the temple, but at night he went out and lodged on the mount called Olivet. And early in the morning all the people came to him in the temple to hear him” (Luke 21:37-38). In fact, for Luke, Jesus’ parents provided him with the proper Israelite cultural background. They not only fulfilled the Law of Moses by circumcising Jesus on the eighth day (2:21) and going through the rite of purification at the proper time (Luke 2:22-24), but they also “went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover” (2:41). Jesus’ great desire to eat the Passover with his apostles before he suffered (22:15) is thus a final reflection of his respect for the cultural traditions of Israel, even as he prepares to die a violent death. It is a final reflection of his character as holy person.

B. Titles of Jesus

Our innertextural analysis reveals that the LS features three titles for Jesus: teacher (22:11), Son of man (22:22), Son of God, and Lord (v.33). Exploration of these titles reveals further aspects of Luke’s understanding of Jesus as holy person.

1. Jesus as Teacher

The Lukan LS uses the title “teacher” for Jesus once (22: 11) and from the mouth of Jesus himself. Elsewhere in the Third Gospel people call Jesus teacher fourteen times; his disciples, by contrast, regularly and almost exclusively call him master (ἐπιστάτα), which

¹² Some people will call this religious tradition. But this will be anachronistic for the ancients religion was a cultural phenomenon. And as Geertz reminds us, religion is a cultural system. See Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 87-125.

points to their relationship to him as disciples; the only exception occurs in 17:13 when others address Jesus as master. Furthermore, the only six synoptic occurrences of the term ἐπιστάτης are in Luke (5: 5; 8: 24, 45; 9:33, 49; 17: 13). Luke uses (ἐπιστάτα) where Mark has either διδάσκαλε (teacher) or 'Ραββί (Rabbi) [Mark 4:38 // Luke 8: 24; Mark 9: 5, 38 // Luke 9: 33, 49]. In this way, Luke uses ἐπιστάτης of Jesus in his authoritative function, which includes his teaching, within a specific group, namely, his disciples.¹³

The usage of the title by the people suggests strongly that the earthly Jesus was popularly known as such. Jesus' one use of the term, in which he asks to be identified to the householder as "the Teacher," lends credence to this view. In the mouth of Luke's Jesus the title "the teacher" in 22:11 retrospectively subsumes his career in the eyes of the people as the one who ultimately proclaims God's salvific dominion by his prophetic word and example, as someone whose teaching authority in Israel supersedes even that of Moses (cf. Acts 3: 21-23; Luke 24: 19, 27, 44; 9:30-35).¹⁴

2. Jesus as the Son of Man

Like "teacher," "the son of man" appears only once in the LS text (22:22). Although we have noted that its use has no reference to Daniel 7:13, we need to briefly explore whether it further develops the nature of Jesus as holy person.

The NT son of man language continues to generate discussions among scholars because of its perceived connection with Daniel 7:13 and because in most of its occurrences

¹³ See W. Grimm, "Ἐπιστάτης," in *EDNT*, vol. 2, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981): 37.

¹⁴ See Brawley, *Centering on God*, 128.

in the Synoptics, it is used only by Jesus.¹⁵ The only difference in Luke's usage is its titular use in the mouth of Stephen in Acts 7: 56 where Stephen identifies the son of man with Jesus standing at the right hand of God. From a socio-rhetorical perspective, our understanding of its use by Jesus will require exploration of its contemporary oral-scribal use.

In fact, a careful analysis has shown that Luke has introduced the title in passages where the parallels in other Gospels lack it, which suggests that the evangelist himself has put the title on the lips of Jesus.¹⁶ This appears to be the case in, for instance, 6:22 (cf. Matt 5:11) and 12:8 (cf. Matt 10:32).

"The son of man" comes to the NT reader through its Greek rendering as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. But in that it is almost certain that Jesus spoke not Greek but Aramaic, we may suggest that the term is a later translation of an originally semitic term. According to Vermes, "the semitic original is unlikely to be Hebrew because neither biblical nor post-biblical language [Hebrew] employs the definite article before son of man."¹⁷ Thus its usage must be located in Aramaic, the vernacular in common use in the Palestine of the first-century CE. In Aramaic common parlance, **bar nash** (son of man) is employed as a circumlocution for the personal pronoun "I." An Aramaic synonym of **bar nash** (son of

¹⁵ For a recent historical overview of debate on this issue, see Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

¹⁶ See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 210.

¹⁷ Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 162.

man) is believed to be **hahu gabra** (that man).¹⁸ Vermes concludes his exploration of the Aramaic use of this phrase by noting that “in Galilean Aramaic, the son of man occurs as a circumlocutional reference to the self,” while “‘that man’ is employed in a context where humiliation or death are mentioned...but whereas ‘that man’ can designate either ‘I’ or ‘you,’ all the son of man sayings so far analysed refer back to the speaker.”¹⁹ Because of textual evidence of its use in pre-Christian Syrian and Palestinian literature,²⁰ one must concede that it is historically plausible that the earthly Jesus used it, not in a titular sense, but as a circumlocutional reference to self. Accordingly, the son of man is not helpful in giving us a picture of Jesus as holy person, both in Luke’s writings in general or in the LS in particular.

3. Jesus as Son of God.

Recalling our exploration of the title “son of God” in our analysis of intertexture, we concluded there that Jesus’ sonship of God probably derived from Jesus’ miraculous birth and miraculous works. And although textual evidence shows that every Israelite is considered a son of God, Jesus’ employment of “my Father” in relation to God is intended to indicate his unique relationship with the deity. Jesus’ authority to mediate God’s benefactions flows from his unique relationship with the deity as son.²¹ At the end Jesus

¹⁸ See Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 163.

¹⁹ Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 168.

²⁰ See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-LX*, 208.

²¹ See Brawley, *Centering on God*, 116.

demonstrates his abiding trust in his father in his last words before he dies: "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit" (23:46). In this way, Luke portrays an unbroken bond between Jesus and his father. This is why Jesus could act and speak in his own name without applying the prophetic formulaic "thus says the Lord,"²² and ably represents his father as the saviour (2:11), more so because he has knowledge of his father's will and intentions.

At the LS Jesus shows that his Father is still well pleased with him when Jesus reveals that his father has assigned him a kingdom. Jesus indicates that the assignment of a kingdom is a reward for his faithfulness to God. His willingness to face a humiliating death because it is the will of the deity (22:37)²³ underscores his faithfulness to his father.

Strikingly, perhaps, in spite of the unique father-son relationship between the deity and Jesus, Jesus never addresses his father as God. He also teaches others to address the deity not as God but as father. For example, he instructs the apostles the "Our Father" (Luke 11:2,13; see also 12:30). This suggests that Jesus illustrates his relationship analogously to human relationships father-child, and as such Jesus' understanding of his father as God must be construed narratively.

Luke does not tell the reader whence Jesus derives his extraordinary knowledge, especially his foreknowledge of future events, his knowledge of God and of humans, and even the unspoken thoughts of audience. But since Luke occasionally tells his reader that

²² See Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 171.

²³ Luke understands what has been written to be the will of God.

Jesus performs a mighty work because the power of God was with him (5:17; cf. 8:39: 17:18), we can assume that his father is the source of his foreknowledge.

This is crucial for a proper interpretation of the sacred texture of the LS. For the LS discourse itself follows the same framework of Jesus' foreknowledge. Luke presents Jesus' foreknowledge at the LS discourse of impending events much more consciously than Mark. For example, Luke introduces the LS discourse with Jesus giving instructions to two of his disciples (Peter and John) to go prepare the Passover meal (v. 8); in Mark (14:12), as we have noted in chapter two, the disciples take the initiative and ask him. Also in Luke's LS account Jesus makes three other predictions that are likely a characteristic feature of a holy person defined by his intimate conversation with his father, namely, the foretelling of his betrayal (v.21-22), foretelling of his denial by Peter and the other apostles (vv. 31-32), and the prediction of future trouble for the apostles (vv. 36-38). The three predictions depict Jesus as someone who knowingly and willingly goes to his impending death.

In our intertextual analysis we had noted that from Luke's perspective, Jesus' divine sonship properly begins at Easter. We need to clarify the apparent contradiction between that assertion and the one made here by underscoring that Easter represents for Luke the deification or a divine honour of Jesus. And as Marleen B. Flory reminds us, divine honours were traditionally "a method of repayment from a grateful people to a great benefactor."²⁴

²⁴ Marleen B. Flory, "The Deification of Roman Women," *The Ancient History Bulletin* 9, 3-4 (1995): 131.

Having said this, we should also mention objections to Jesus' divine sonship.

The innertextual analysis of the LS has shown that the Israelite authorities and Satan are opposed to Jesus. The innertexture of the Third Gospel itself indicates that Satan and the authorities are opposed to Jesus. Jesus' divine sonship is the focus of Satan's challenge at the temptation scene (4: 1-13). In the infancy narrative Luke announces Jesus to be the son of God who would sit on the throne of his father David (1:26-35).

Before the passion the Israelite authorities appeared to have opposed Jesus only on dietary regulations, as we have earlier noted. But at the trial scene they, with the people, give clear reasons for their opposition to Jesus: because he claims to be the son of God and to be the anointed king (22: 67-70; 23:2-3). There is thus an explicit, narrative connection between divine sonship and kingship. In fact as we have shown in chapter four, not only did ancients apply divine sonship to their kingships, divine sonship was also applied to the Davidic future ruler. Since Satan collaborates with the authorities we can assume that Satan was equally opposed to Jesus' claim to the Judean kingship. This, together with our discussion of Israelite royal sonship of God in chapter four suggests strongly that opposition to Jesus' divine sonship is correspondingly a denial of his claim to Judean kingship.

Thus, Jesus' claim to the Judean throne assumes a centre position, given Luke's contrived attempt via his infancy narrative (Luke 1-2) to prove that Jesus is of a royal blood (cf. John 7: 41, 45-52).²⁵ Additionally, given the regional differences between Galileans and Judeans, coupled with a history of Galilean rebels in the period,

²⁵ See Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 213-222.

the non-recognition by the Judean authorities of Jesus' claim to the throne of David takes on a political dimension.²⁶ In fact one can easily agree with Vermes that, "Jesus became a political suspect in the eyes of the rulers of Jerusalem because of his Galilean descent"; it is possible also that his Galilean roots made him a religious suspect, since the Judeans considered Galileans unorthodox and uneducated.²⁷ Thus there is the historical improbability that a Galilean can lay claim to the Judean throne (cf. John 7:41, 45-52). This indicates the political nature of Luke's writings in general and his LS in particular.

4. Jesus as Lord

Unlike the phrases "Jesus the teacher" and "Son of man," which occur once each, the word, "Lord" used of Jesus in the Lukan LS occurred twice, once by Peter (v. 33) and once by the apostles as a group (v. 38). This contrast, with the high frequency of it in Luke-Acts, makes it the title most often used for Jesus by the evangelist.²⁸ As is well known, Luke applies this title to the deity as well (Luke 1: 16, 32, 68; 4: 8, 12; 10: 27; 20: 37; Acts 2: 39; 3: 22; 4: 24; 17: 24). Its use for both Yahweh and Jesus has generated the argument as to whether Luke is expressing the divinity of Jesus, much more so as "there is now evidence from pre-Christian Palestine that Israelites did speak of Yahweh in Hebrew *'ādōn*, as "Lord," in Aramaic as *māarē'* and *māryā'* and in Greek as *kyrios*," leading Fitzmyer to

²⁶ See Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 42-57.

²⁷ See Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 57 and S.W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, I (London/New York: Columbia University Press, 1952): 278.

²⁸ See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 200-01.

conclude that early Israelite Christianity in Palestine had transferred the title “Lord” or “the Lord” to Jesus.²⁹ We should also recognise the frequency of the use of the title for Jesus in the mouth of the narrator of the Third Gospel (7:13,19; 10:1,39,41; 11:39; 12:42; 13: 15; 17:5,6; 18: 6; 19: 8,31,34; 22: 61; 24: 3,34). Many also address the Lukan Jesus as Lord during his ministry (5:8,12; 7: 6; 9: 54,59,61; 10: 17, 40; 11: 1; 12: 41; 13: 23,25; 17: 37; 18: 41; 22: 33,38,49). But Luke declares in Acts that “God has made him both Lord and the anointed this Jesus whom you crucified” (Acts 2: 36). This implies that for Luke Jesus was not Lord and was not anointed before his resurrection, that is, his lordship and anointing properly begin at Easter. This further supports our earlier conclusion that in Luke’s perspective Easter represents deification or a divine honour. It then means, as Fitzmyer has opined, “Luke has retrojected this title into the phase of Jesus’ earthly ministry.”³⁰

In our view, it is difficult if not impossible to know the exact connotation of the title “Lord” as used for both Yahweh and Jesus. As Fitzmyer observes, Luke refrains from using other titles that are reserved twice for Yahweh, such as *δέσποτα*, “sovereign lord” (Acts 4:24; Luke 2:29). This may indicate that Luke seeks to avoid confusing Jesus as holy person with God as deity. Or, we may be dealing with a problem unique to the Westerner, who thinks that using “lord” for a human being is tantamount to identifying the person with God. To the western mind, “linking God’s name to that of Jesus, and calling Jesus ‘Lord,’ which was God’s own title (*Adonai*) in Hebrew Scriptures, was tantamount to saying that

²⁹ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-LX*, 202.

³⁰ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-LX*, 202.

Jesus was God, or at the very least, someone ‘in the form of God who had descended from heaven’” (all emphases hers).³¹

My conclusion is that the title κύριος is better understood as expressing a more functional reality than an ontological one.³² Jesus’ lordship does imply his prescience. As we have observed above, Jesus’ foreknowledge is consequent on the power of the deity in him, that is, his being filled with the Holy Spirit. His lordship on the other hand expresses the authority that the deity gives to Jesus. That this is the case is clear when Peter declares: “Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ [the anointed] this Jesus whom you crucified” (Acts 2: 36). For Luke, then, Jesus’ Lordship and anointing is a divine honour, a kingship authority similar to Jesus’ claim in Matt 28: 18-20. This implies that in Luke’s perspective Jesus was not “Lord” during his earthly life, which means that the use of “Lord” in the LS, as indeed in the rest of the Third Gospel, is narrational rather than historic. Thus I agree with Fitzmyer that Luke has simply retrojected the title κύριος “into the first phase of Jesus’ earthly existence,” and that this retrojection does not amount to an expression of divinity.³³ Luke’s use of the title κύριος for Jesus here probably reflects his broader tendency to retroject a title born of resurrection

³¹ Charlotte Allen, *The Human Christ: The Search for the Historical Jesus* (New York: Free, 1998): 3.

³² Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996): 114.

³³ After all Luke uses the absolute ὁ κύριος of the emperor in Acts 25:26. He also uses it in the Third Gospel twelve times of other humans (12:36,37,42,43,45,46; 14:21,23; 16:3,5,8). In fact, prior to the LS, Peter has thrice addressed Jesus as ἐπιστάτα, master (5:5; 8:45; 9:33). See 8:24; 9:49; and 17:13 where the apostles, John, and ten lepers address Jesus as ἐπιστάτα respectively.

faith back into earlier parts of his story, thereby surrounding the pre-Easter Jesus with a post-resurrectional aura,³⁴ because from Luke's perspective Jesus truly becomes lord only after his resurrection (see Peter's Pentecost speech, 2:14-35, especially, vv 29-36).

Although the use of the title κύριος in the LS follows Luke's tendency to retroject post-Easter titular force on a more ordinary, secular use of it for Jesus by his followers, it is significant that the only place this happens in Luke's LS occurs in the two final pericopes, both of which explicitly anticipate the situation of the church soon after the departure of Jesus. Thus, the use of the title κύριος here is meant to anticipate the lordship of Jesus after his resurrection. It also underlines the character of the death of Jesus as a transition to glory.

In summary, our exploration of Jesus as holy person in Luke's LS reveals his special identity as God's son, chosen to mediate God's benefactions to people. The Lukan Jesus is a teacher who summons his disciples to be like him, relating to God as their father. As our analysis has suggested, the title teacher would have been the title that was applied to Jesus during his earthly ministry, while his lordship, divine sonship, and anointing came as a divine honour at Easter.

III. Spirit Beings

The biblical text often refers to special divine or evil beings that have the nature of a spirit rather than a human being. It is these beings that we call "spirit beings," and they

³⁴ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 203.

include angels, demons,³⁵ the devil, evil spirit, holy spirit, unclean spirit, and the Satan.

According to Robbins, “the sacred texture of a text often emerges in the context of conflict between good and evil spiritual forces.”³⁶ Conflict between Jesus and Satan is evident in the synoptic Gospels. This is strongly suggested by the stories of his exorcisms, healings, and personal encounters with Satan. The following table displays occurrences of Satan, demons and evil spirits in the synoptic Gospels.

Luke	Mark	Matthew
1. Devil/ Evil spirits: 4:2,3,5,13; 7: 21; 8: 2, 12	1. Demons: 1: 32, 34,39; 3:15, 22; 5:18; 6:13; 7:26, 29, 30 ; 9 :38 ; 16 :9, 17	1. Devil/Evil one: 4: 1, 5, 8, 11; 13: 39; 25: 41
2. Demons: 4: 33, 35, 41; 7: 33; 8:8:2, 27, 29, 30, 33,35, 36, 38; 9:1, 42, 49; 10:17; 11: 14, 15, 18, 19, 20; 13:32	2. Satan: 1:13; 3:23, 26; 4:15; 8:33	2. Demons: 7:22; 8:16, 31; 9:33, 34; 10:8; 11:18; 12:24, 27, 28; 15:22; 17:18
3. Satan: 10 :18 ; 11 :18 ; 13 :16 ; 22 :3, 31		3. Satan: 4:10; 12:26; 16:23

The synoptic accounts of the role of Satan in the ministry of Jesus show that Jesus carried out his ministry in an environment haunted by Satan.³⁷

Luke, in telling this dimension of the ministry of Jesus adds his own emphases and nuances. Luke 22:3, 31 and Acts 5:3; 26:18 suggest that for Luke the devil has influenced opposition to Jesus and his gospel. In Luke’s view, Satan is Jesus’ arch-adversary, the

³⁵ In its pre-Christian usage δαιμόνιον often designates a spirit being in the neutral sense. See Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 149.

³⁶ Robbins, *Exploring*, 123.

³⁷ See Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 146.

enemy (Luke 10:19). Like Jesus, Satan has a kingdom and exercises authority over demons and humans, who do his bidding.³⁸ This is what Emmanuel Milingo means when he talks of the “agents” or “disciples” of the devil.³⁹ It is more correct to say, then, that after the desert temptation Satan did not withdraw totally from the contest but bided his time: throughout Jesus’ public career the devil worked through human agents.⁴⁰

Specifically, Luke makes a connection between Jesus’ enemies and the “evil one,” thus making explicit what Mark and Matt only imply: at the time of his arrest, the Lukan Jesus suggests that “the chief priests and officers of the temple and elders” are allied with “the power of darkness” (22:52-53; cf. Acts 26: 17-18).⁴¹ The human agents can be more appropriately characterised as clients of Satan. Satan, then, acts as patron to the chief priests, the scribes and temple officials. In accordance with the patronage system, Satan acts through the Israelite leaders in the war against Jesus: Satan acts within the spiritual realm, while the Israelite authorities operate within the physical realm.

The Satan’s possession of Judas (22: 3) represents a nuance of this situation, for while it might at first be thought that Judas is a clear evidence of Satan’s patronage, Judas’ role in the whole drama as Luke presents it argues in favour of characterising Judas as client of Satan. As our oral-scribal intertextual analysis shows, Luke differs from Mark’s

³⁸ See Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991): 13.

³⁹ See Emmanuel Milingo, *The World in Between: Christian Healing and the Struggle for Spiritual Survival*, ed. Mona Macmillan (New York: Orbis Books, 1984): 42.

⁴⁰ See Elaine Pagels, *The Origin of Satan* (New York: Vintage, 1996): 96

⁴¹ See Pagels, *Origin*, 89 & 93.

account of the role of Judas in the passion of Jesus. This is evident, not only in the fact that the Markan account lacks Satan's possession of Judas, but also in the fact that for Mark it was Judas who, out of his own volition, approached the chief priests for the purpose of handing Jesus over to them (Mark 14:10-11). In this way, Mark implies that Judas has vested interest in the plan of the Israelite leadership against Jesus.⁴² No such interest can be found in Luke's account of Judas' role in the passion of Jesus; rather the Lukan Judas is a client of Satan.

Thus for Luke the conflicts between Jesus and the Israelite leaders are a reflection of the "spiritual warfare between God and Satan,"⁴³ or in our language, between a particular deity (the god of Israel) and the spirit being known as Satan. These conflicts intensify through the Gospel and come to a head when the Satan causes Judas to hand Jesus over for destruction. As Pagels correctly observes, Luke's presentation of the conflicts between Jesus and his human opponents is intended to "show that those who reject Jesus accomplish Satan's work on earth."⁴⁴ It is in this way that the Third Gospel "like the other gospels associates the mythological figure of Satan with specific human opposition."⁴⁵ This correlates with the view of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (c. 260- c. 300) when he opined: "all history was a contest between God, acting through patriarchs, prophets, and the church

⁴² Judas' monetary interest in the whole drama is clear in Matthew's version (26:14-16).

⁴³ Pagels, *Origin*, 91.

⁴⁴ Pagels, *Origin*, 98.

⁴⁵ Pagels, *Origin*, 105.

on the one hand, and the Devil, instigating Israelites, persecutors, and heretics, on the other.⁴⁶ In social relational parlance, Eusebius believed then that the patriarchs, prophets and the church are clients of God, while the Israelites, persecutors and heretics were clients of the Devil.

The clearest example of Luke's emphasis on spiritual forces of evil can be found in the temptation account (Luke 4:1-13; cf. Mark 1:12-13; Matt 4:1-11),⁴⁷ which, some scholars have often noted, has a connection with the satanic possession of Judas Iscariot (Luke 22:3).⁴⁸ The temptation forms part of and conclusion to Jesus' preparation for his public ministry. For, although Jesus has been endowed with the Holy Spirit and publicly acknowledged by God as his "beloved son," the temptation is intended to show that he still has to contend with the power of darkness. But unlike Mark and Matthew, Luke signals that the devil might attack Jesus directly again, at the opportune time, which gives Luke's narrative a forward look. In point of fact, by juxtaposing God's acknowledgement of Jesus as his beloved son, coupled with Jesus' endowment with the Holy Spirit and the temptation, Luke indicates that the forward movement of Luke is overshadowed by the struggle

⁴⁶ Eusebius, *Eccle. Hist.* I. XV-XVI. See also, J. Stevenson, ed. *A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to AD 337*. Revised by W. H. C. Frend (London: SPCK, 1987): 61 and Karl Georg Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. Krister Stendahl and James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1992): 96-97. Kuhn argues that Christianity borrowed this dualism from the Qumranites, and not from Judaism.

⁴⁷ See Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 151, no 6.

⁴⁸ See Johnson, *Luke*, 75; Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 158; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 174, 788; Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 156; and Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, 104-05.

between God and the evil one in the form of a struggle between two kingdoms, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan⁴⁹; a struggle between the leadership of Jesus and Israelite leadership.

Not all, however, agree there is a connection between Luke 4:13 and 22:3. This is due, in large part, to Conzelmann's exaggerated claim that Satan was absent in the period (ministry) of Jesus.⁵⁰ In Conzelmann's words, "When Jesus was alive, it was the time of salvation; Satan was far away, it was a time without temptation (cf. Luke iv. 13 with xxii. 3 and xxii. 35). Since the Passion, however, Satan is present again and the disciples of Jesus are again subject to temptation (xxii. 36)."⁵¹ Conzelmann provides further clarification of his view when he insists that "temptation is finished decisively (πάντα), and the devil departs," by which he means that, "where Jesus is from now on, there Satan is no more (ἄχρι καιροῦ)."⁵²

While Conzelmann himself recognises a connection between Luke 4:13 and 22:3,35, he fails to notice also a connection with 22:28 when Jesus credited the apostles for having remained with him during the trials (πειρασμοὶ) that Jesus underwent throughout his ministry. Since Luke uses the same word in 4:13, it is reasonable to assume that Jesus' trials included an encounter with Satan. Luke 8:26-39 (the healing of the Gerasene

⁴⁹ See Johnson, *Luke*, 75.

⁵⁰ See Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 156. Fitzmyer correctly refutes this claim. See his *Luke the Theologian*, 158-64.

⁵¹ Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 16.

⁵² See Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 28, see also 156, 188 n. 4.

demoniac), 10:17-20 (the report of the seventy-two that the demons were subject to them), and 11:14-20 (the accusation that Jesus casts out demons by the power of Beelzebul) are further examples of how Luke identifies the presence of Satan in the period of Jesus.

If we reckon also with the fact that in pre-industrial societies the devil is considered the cause of sickness and any form of misfortune,⁵³ the healing activities of Jesus indicate he has conflict with evil spirit beings, understood as clients of Satan, during his ministry. As the enemy of humans, one way that Satan oppresses people is "by afflicting them with sickness and disease."⁵⁴ This conclusion agrees with I. Howard Marshall's conclusion that the evidence provides no substantiation for the view that the period of Jesus was Satan-free.⁵⁵

The Lukan characterisation of Satan further indicates an intertextural, oral-scribal shift away from the traditional Israelite perception of Satan as God's client. This is the picture we are given in the story of Balaam (Num 22:5-35) and the story of Job.⁵⁶ There, Satan appears as a semi-independent, spiritual adversary.⁵⁷ For instance, Paul would seem

⁵³ See J. K. Campbell, "Honour and the Devil," in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, ed. Jean G. Péristiany (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966): 165.

⁵⁴ Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke*, 13.

⁵⁵ See I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Pater Noster, 1970): 137.

⁵⁶ See Pagels, *Origin*, 39-43.

⁵⁷ See Pagels, *Origin*, 35-62 and "The Social History of Satan, the 'Intimate Enemy': Preliminary Sketch," *HTR* 84.2 (1991): 105-28.

to be still holding to a traditional, Israelite concept of the Satan figure when he suggests that a Jesus-movement-group deliver an errant member “to Satan for destruction of the flesh that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (1 Cor. 5:5).⁵⁸

Yet Conzelmann is right in one matter, namely, that the primary role of Luke’s Jesus is not the defeat of the kingdom of Satan. As Fitzmyer notes, “Jesus’ ministry is not primarily aimed at the defeat of Satan’s ‘kingdom’ (11:18)”; this is a secondary theme. The primary emphasis is “Jesus’ role in proclaiming the kingdom of God,” a conclusion that Fitzmyer draws largely from 4:43, where Jesus declares: “I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose.”⁵⁹

While correctly perceiving the focus of Jesus’ ministry, however, Fitzmyer fails to recognise that first-century Mediterranean people, and indeed pre-industrial societies, view the world dualistically as a battle field for the forces of good and the forces of evil⁶⁰; there are only two kingdoms, the kingdom of the forces of good (the kingdom of God) and the kingdom of the forces of evil (the kingdom of Satan).⁶¹ Pagels recognises this when she correctly observes that NT evangelists attempt to show that Jesus has conquered Satan so as to assure them of victory over their struggles of life. “This apocalyptic vision has taught

⁵⁸ See Pagels, *Origin*, 183. See also D. G. Reid, “Satan, Devil,” in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993): 866.

⁵⁹ Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 169.

⁶⁰ In this understanding, humans who are possessed by the devil are considered clients of Satan in his kingdom.

⁶¹ See Daniel G. Reid, “Satan, Devil,” in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove, ILL: InterVasity, 1993): 865.

even secular-minded people to interpret the history of Western culture as a moral history in which the forces of good contend against the forces of evil in the world.”⁶²

The “lesson” from the “apocalyptic vision” about which Pagels talks is “common-sense” for pre-industrial cultures,⁶³ for whom there are only two kingdoms, the kingdom of a good spirit world and the kingdom of an evil spirit world. The primary role of the Lukan Jesus is to proclaim the kingdom of God, but that can only happen as a proclamation directed against the kingdom of Satan, represented by his clients, the evil spirits and Jesus’ opponents. As Marshall observes, “the activity of Jesus was evidence of God’s saving power. The obverse of this fact is that the activity of Jesus represented an attack upon Satan and the powers of evil.”⁶⁴ There would have been no need to proclaim the kingdom of God if there were no opposing kingdom.

The framework as we have described it, then, requires a rethinking of the traditional understanding of the role of Satan at the LS. Our thesis is that Luke’s LS is haunted by the presence of spirit beings in the world. As we have shown in chapters two and three, Satan is explicitly mentioned twice in the LS (vv. 3 & 31), implicitly three times (vv. 2: 21, 22:28, and 22: 37; cf. 13:32-33), and still more indirectly in vv. 35-36 (cf. 9:1-4).

Satan’s possession of Judas connects satanic influence and opposition of the Israelite authorities through the Gospel. This agrees with our observation above that Luke associates

⁶² Pagels, *Origin*, 181.

⁶³ See Clifford Geertz’s exploration of “Common Sense as a Cultural System” in his *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1983): 73-93.

⁶⁴ Marshall, *Historian and Theologian*, 137.

Satan with specific human opposition. Luke's more direct association of the action of Judas with satanic possession is intended not only to exonerate Judas but to explain the oddity of handing over a close friend to his enemies as well. Luke is expressing a view that many of his contemporaries in the first-century Mediterranean society would share: Judas could not have gone against Jesus unless he was a client of the evil one (cf. Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5:1-11). In any case, from now till Jesus is handed over (22: 48) Judas is under Satan's control. In fact, Satan is the one handing over Jesus through Judas his client. This situation suggests that Judas, who does not appear to have been privy to the plan of the authorities, knows not only their plan but their need as well as a result of spiritual possession by which humans possess superhuman knowledge.

It is in light of this that we must consider that Satan is mentioned, though indirectly, in verse 21 when Jesus reveals to his apostles that one of them would hand him over. Put differently, Satan was at the LS table through his client, Judas, "looking for an opportune time to hand over Jesus" (22:4). This raises the issue of who Jesus wishes be cursed (22:22), Judas or Satan?

Apart from the direct reference in verse 3 there is also a direct reference to Satan in verse 31 when Jesus reveals that Satan, who has taken possession of Judas, has also demanded to sift the other members of the twelve. This revelation presupposes a prior encounter between Jesus and Satan or knowledge on Jesus' part of Satan's intent. Jesus never states explicitly that Satan's demand to sift the apostles has been granted. But his prayer for Peter is not to prevent the "sifting" but that Peter may recover (turn back) and be in a position to strengthen his brothers (v. 32). Additionally, Jesus' prediction of Peter's imminent denial in spite of Peter's protestation (vv. 33, 34) indicates that Satan will indeed

test the faith of the apostles. This situation suggests that the apostles will not be around to stand by Jesus when he faces the trials of his passion. Satan, not Jesus, is clearly in charge of Jesus' passion in Luke's gospel because the drama is carried out entirely by Satan's clients. Jesus' agony and appeal to his Father on the Mount of Olives (22:40-46) is a dramatic enactment of this holy person's apparent loss of social power and influence. And the silence of his Father, his patron, seals Jesus' hope of overturning Satan's plan.

Lastly, Satan is implicitly mentioned in 22:37 (cf. 13:32-33). This verse suggests that Jesus' time has been haunted by evil spirit beings, so also will the time of the church. The troubled time that Jesus predicts for his apostles includes trials by the evil one and his clients in a manner reminiscent of Jesus' own trials (cf. Luke 22: 40, 46; Acts 26:17-18).

In summary, the foregoing analysis shows that Luke's LS text is interwoven with spirit beings who are for the most part evil. Although Luke makes numerous references to good spirit beings (e.g. angels and holy spirit) in his two-volume work (e.g. angels: Luke 1: 11-38; Acts 5: 19; 6: 15; 7: 30; holy spirit: Luke 1:15, 35, 41; Acts 1: 2, 5, 8), no such reference features in the LS text. Satan did come back at the opportune time to attack Jesus directly at the LS. It is the opportune time because Satan has secured a very strong opposition against Jesus in the Israelite authority. To say that Satan enters Judas is another way of saying that Satan takes possession of Judas. This seals Jesus' fate. Up to this point in Luke's story of Jesus, Satan has attacked Jesus in various ways without any success. As a last resort Satan takes possession of Judas, one of Jesus' close friends, and also has designs on the other apostles. Thus Luke's LS indicates to the reader that Jesus will likely end up going alone to the cross at the very moment he most needs his friends to stand by

him. In the end, the Israelite authorities and Judas become clients of Satan, and the other apostles are themselves socially tested by these clients and found wanting.

IV. Human Redemption

Another dimension of sacred texture concerns how human life is transformed as a result of engagement with the divine. Our goal here is to explore how in the LS Luke signals people being transformed by their encounter with superhuman forces. Put differently, how are the human characters in the LS transformed by their encounter with the deity or with the spirit beings we have identified?

In his writings Luke provides a window into his outlook on possible transformative effects of divine-human encounter. On the positive side, for example, we have the encounter of an aged, childless couple, Zechariah and Elizabeth with a holy spirit being (angel), which resulted in their becoming parents of John the Baptist (1-2). John the Baptist's encounter with the divine resulted in his call to prepare a way for Jesus (3: 1-18). Mary, a maiden, became the mother of Jesus because of her encounter with an angel (1-2). In fact, Jesus himself is transformed because of his encounter with the divine: At his baptism, the deity confirms his fatherhood of Jesus (3: 22), and filled with the Holy Spirit, he also claims to have been called and anointed to minister to the poor (4: 14-19). Finally in Acts, the effects of Pentecost on the apostles and the conversion of Paul are certainly not hidden examples of dramatic effects of divine-human encounter.

The subsequent verses (22: 35-38) anticipate a changed state of affairs for the apostles brought about by the unfolding of the divine plan, which is manifest both in Scripture and in the life of Jesus, as well as in the life of the apostles. In both cases (v. 34

and vv. 35-38) the relationship of the apostles to Jesus as their “Lord” will change in the near future, and the state of their preparedness is now at the forefront of Jesus’ concern, specifically in light of the active presence of Satan himself now and in the future.

The second positive transformative aspect of the sacred texture of Luke’s LS involves Jesus’ sharing of the authority that his Father has imparted to him. This is achieved through the act of Jesus dining with his followers (vv. 29-30). In this way, the meal is transformed into a more sacred act than the Passover itself, while the apostles are invested with divine authority as judges over Israel in the messianic age.

A third transformative dimension of sacred texture of the LS comes by way of Jesus’ prayer for Peter. While Satan has “demanded to sift” the apostles, Jesus’ petition to the deity anticipates the deity’s positive response for a transformation that will restore Peter and his brothers assembled at the supper.

Jesus’ sharing of his divine authority with the apostles and the potential positive transformative effect of Jesus’ petition to the deity on the apostles indicates that contact with Jesus himself leads to transformation. As we have noted above, Jesus’ reward to the apostles for their commitment to him goes beyond ruling in the new social order; it includes dining with Jesus in the kingdom. Jesus reveals his own hope of dining in the kingdom when he abstains from the LS meal (22:16-18). This indicates that dining in the kingdom is the reward of commitment to Jesus, if not the ultimate reward of discipleship. It will become for them a link to Jesus as they remember him at the breaking of bread, a communal meal that will transform members of the community (Luke 24: 30-32).

The meal then assumes a higher, sacral-like value, as it becomes not a sacrificial rite but a sign of unity and cohesion. While not every disciple may need healing of some sort,

dining in the kingdom becomes a form of healing since those who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God shall be blessed (14:15). In this way an existing, culturally significant meal has been radically transformed into socio-sacred engineering.⁶⁵

The results of this profound transformation become apparent in Luke's subsequent volume. For although the disciples have no clear instruction from the earthly Jesus to hold fellowship meals,⁶⁶ the evidence in Acts indicates that the disciples not only went to the temple and prayed together, but they also were breaking bread together in their homes (Acts 2:46-47) and were praising God while eating their meals, thus inviting the divine into their midst as they ate. This dimension clearly indicates that the transformation permeated the fellowship meal, turning all common meals into sacred ones.

Furthermore, the fellowship meals in Acts become more elaborate rituals than what the earthly Jesus did at the LS. That is, besides prayer of blessing or thanksgiving over the meal, they also praised God. As they shared their meals they may also have talked about Jesus, his most remembered teachings and the kingdom.⁶⁷ Their meal ritual effectively created a new sacred territory by explicitly differentiating it from the realm of the profane no longer in terms of Israelite paschal meals but in terms of Jesus' presence and redemptive

⁶⁵ That is, the meal provides occasions for social formation that is also considered sacred. This is more or less a qualification of Burton L. Mack's theory that gathering for meals was an occasion for social formation for every Jesus-movement group. See Mack, *A Myth of Innocence*, 80-83.

⁶⁶ Let the reader remember that we are dealing with the Western text of Luke's LS.

⁶⁷ See Mack, *A Myth of Innocence*, 81.

ethics.⁶⁸ As Neyrey correctly observes, “table fellowship with Jesus signals shared faith and true membership in the circle of Jesus’ followers,”⁶⁹ which is why those who eat bread in the kingdom of Jesus are blessed. In the same way the sacred meal fellowship in Acts signals shared faith, unity and true membership of “those who were being saved” (Acts 2:47). Gathering for this sacred meal may have provided the context for the formation of their movement, for as Burton Mack observes, “the gathering for meals was the single most important ‘generative matrix’ for social formation.”⁷⁰

In the end, the transformative effect of the divine on the community Luke envisages could “turn the world upside down” (Acts 17:6-7). As Hays aptly puts it, Luke’s vision of the transformation of the “church” will turn “the world upside down not through armed revolution but through the formation of the Church as a counter-culture, an alternative witness-bearing community.”⁷¹

V. Discipleship

In the previous section, we saw the transformative result of divine-human encounter. We have shown how the deity relates to humans through his son Jesus. Because of the transformative effects Jesus has on his apostles he expects them to be fully committed to

⁶⁸ See Catherine Bell, *Ritual Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 157.

⁶⁹ Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke*, 25.

⁷⁰ See Mack, *A Myth of Innocence*, 83.

⁷¹ Hays, *Moral Vision*, 128.

him. That means Jesus expects the disciples to follow his call. This is evident from his speech on the cost of discipleship (Luke 9:23-27; Mark 8:34-9:1; Matt 16:24-28). Our aim here then is to explore Luke's outlook on discipleship within the framework of the LS.

Luke provides a yardstick in 14:26-27, 33 (cf. Matt 10:37-38), which emphasises “coming” to Jesus, “following after” him, and imitating him through a loyal commitment to him and his mission, actions that supersede even familial bonds. Furthermore, these actions, which we term discipleship, lead a follower to endure the most extreme individual sorrow and bear any material cost. For Luke, then, discipleship is functional and not ontological (c.f. 6:46-49; 7: 18-22), and it is in terms of imitating Jesus as the broker of divine benefactions.

As we have shown in chapter four, the Lukan LS evidences this relationship. For example, in 22:11 Luke shows a teacher-disciple relation between Jesus and the apostles in which they obey and carry out his instruction to the best of their ability. In preparation for the sacred Passover feast, Jesus sent Peter and John to go and prepare for them to eat the meal, and they did (22:6-13). In 22: 25-27, when the apostles have lost their focus by disputing about greatness—probably because they think of themselves more as ἀπόστολοι (messengers, those who are sent) rather than as μαθηταὶ (followers)—the response of Jesus is unmistakeable: follow your teacher rather than the world. Luke successfully brings this lesson to a close in verse 38 as the disciples show their readiness to follow the instructions of their master. Thus although the disciples are portrayed as lacking sufficient knowledge of true greatness, the dispute about greatness and the lesson that ensues serve to anchor

Luke' view on leadership as slave service in the action of the earthly Jesus, a primary hypothesis of this dissertation.

In addition to following and imitating the teacher, the apostles are portrayed in the LS as fully loyal to Jesus through the transformative power of the new meal. Thus, though it was a family feast, they and the followers of Jesus should have been with their respective families to celebrate the sacred Passover. They were with Jesus, and gathered into a new culture, the kingdom-of-God culture.

VI. The Apostles as Brothers

In chapter four we saw that application of the title brother to group members creates a fictive kinship. Communal meal helps to sustain such a fictive kinship. One of the consequences of the new table fellowship among the apostles, then, is the nurturing of fictive family ties. Among the apostles there are two pairs of biological brothers, namely, Peter and Andrew, John and James. The other eight apparently come from different families. Now, however, the disciples are related not only to Jesus the teacher; there is also a brotherhood relationship among them. They become a kind of surrogate family, even as Jesus had suggested when in 8:21 Jesus says that his mother and his brothers "are those who hear the word of God and do it." For Jesus hearing the word of God and doing it creates a brotherly bond that is maintained through familial meals together, which then becomes both transformative and affirming of a new social identity.⁷² Luke's later

⁷² Now it is possible that the brotherhood here is the brotherhood of all Israelites, since all the apostles are Israelites. For instance, Luke calls the disciples in the upper room brothers (see Acts 1:15-16) in the same way that he addresses the Israelites in general (see

extension of the address to non-Israelite disciples (for example, Acts 9:30; 10:23) evidences a re-mapping of group patterns along Jesus-centred lines.⁷³

The charge to Peter to strengthen his brothers once he recovers indicates that the Lukan Jesus expects the apostles to continue this newly created family fellowship after his (Jesus) departure. In other words, the Lukan Jesus does not expect the rapport he has established among the apostles to end with his departure, rather, the new familial identity would continue. This scenario forges a connection between the kingship Jesus bequeathes to the apostles (22:28-30) and to the restoration of the kingdom to Israel for which the apostles crave (Acts 1:6) as a transformed leadership.

VII. Religious Community

In the previous section we saw how the activity and identity of the disciples as a fictive family is evidenced in the LS. Here, we will explore more fully the dynamics of the disciples as a group.

In the LS, Luke refers to the disciples as a group in reference. He does so obliquely by reference to Judas as a member of “the twelve”(22:3). Judas’ encounter with Satan, however, has the potential effect of costing Judas membership of this group (cf. Acts 1:15-26). It appears, then, that membership of “the twelve” requires a commitment of loyalty to

Acts 2:29,37; 3:17,22; 22:1,5; 23:1,5,6). In short Luke’s use of this form of address for various groups in Acts makes it difficult to read too much into the use of it in the LS text.

⁷³ It is in this figurative sense that the Qumran community also understood relationship among its members. See Josephus, *Wars* 2.8.3.

“the teacher,” as we have seen above under discipleship, and that the group is identified, first of all, by association with the teacher.

A second instance of group activity relating to the disciples occurs in 22:11 where Luke makes a collective reference to “the teacher’s” intention to eat the Passover meal “with my disciples.” Coupled with 22:14, the group with their master is now ready for a sacred, dramatic, re-enactment of foundation events in Israelite covenant relationship with their God. The celebration of this sacred feast not only reminds the disciples of their new familial identity but is also a symbolic representation of the twelve tribes of Israel re-enacting who they are and how they have come to be. This symbolic representation is reaffirmed with the unambiguous allusion to the twelve tribes of Israel in 22:28-30 as the foundation for Jesus’ anticipated messianic community. Their familial identity is, in this way, further linked to the wider notion of clan or nation, that is, ethnically extended family.

Furthermore, there is Jesus’ instruction in 22:24-27 about the least and the greatest among those who take him as their model. This instruction on leadership as service not only evidences social grouping but also envisages an egalitarian community, expressed in terms of service at table. It is instructive to recall that the Therapeutae would not permit slave ministration at table, because of their concern for equality of members. As we have argued in our section on social rhetoric, even the presence of Judas, who would soon hand over Jesus at the LS confirms Jesus’ inclusiveness, just as the act of eating at the same table with his apostles also indicates equality.

The closing commission to Peter in 22:31-32 anticipates Peter’s leadership role in the early part of Acts. In other words, Jesus looks beyond Peter’s denial, brought about by an

evil spirit being, to his future leadership role.⁷⁴ Peter's future is taken in the narrative stride and a creative future is promised for him and enacted in the early part of Acts.⁷⁵

In summary, these examples, coupled with the prediction of a dramatically changed, coming situation of the disciples after Jesus goes the way of the deity's will and word as revealed in Scripture, show that the germ of the community in Acts is presented in Luke's LS account with the aura of divinely-appointed destiny.

VIII. Summary

This chapter has explored the sacred texture of Luke's LS. We analysed above six aspects of the sacred texture of Luke's LS: the deity, spirit beings, holy persons, human redemption, discipleship, and religious community. Some of the sacred dimensions of the text emerge through explicit references in the text; others are only implied.

We saw that the deity of Israel whom Jesus calls father is silent throughout the LS discourse, just as he is in the rest of Luke's writings. The Satan is present throughout the LS and the passion discourse, especially in his clients, that is, Judas and the Israelite

⁷⁴ For arguments against Peter as successor to Jesus, see Eisenman, *James the Brother of the Lord*.

⁷⁵ By Acts 21: 18 James and the elders lead the Church in Jerusalem; the apostles have disappeared. Fitzmyer considers the disappearance of the twelve as an authoritative and administrative group within a relatively short period a real problem. See John Drury, "Luke," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode (Cambridge, MA Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987): 427. See also Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997): 292.

authorities. In fact because of the silence of the deity Satan appears to be in control of Jesus' passion.

Jesus, the holy person, is prominent at the LS and through encounter with him the disciples are transformed, suggesting that humans who encounter him could also be transformed. The meal becomes not a sacrificial rite but a sign of unity and cohesion and also forms the context for social engineering. Finally, the disciples are transformed into a fictive familial bond that forms the nucleus of a religious community.

Chapter Seven

CONCLUSION

The aim of this dissertation was to demonstrate the hypothesis that Luke has crafted his LS (WT) to change the attitude of those who have followed him into an inclusive Jesus-movement community where leadership is for the service of others. Furthermore, I contend that Luke has sought to anchor this approach on the authority of the earthly Jesus. This we have done through analyses of innertexture, intertexture, social cultural texture, and sacred texture. We need now to summarise the course of this investigation, but before we do so I would like to take a look at how Luke's ideology shapes the text.

We are using ideology here in the sense of "an integrated system of beliefs, assumptions and values, not necessarily true or false, which reflects the needs and interests of a group or class at a particular time in history."¹ This definition also agrees with Clifford Geertz's understanding of "ideology as a cultural system." In this value-free or neutral sense of the term, there can be many shades of ideology: e.g. political, religious, theological, economic, or social.² While Peter Scott thinks a non-ideological theology is possible, Gareth Jones argues correctly that no system of thought, including theological,

¹ David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution 1770-1823* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1975): 14; cited in Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless*, 268. See also Wachob, *The Social Rhetoric of James*, 194 and Robbins, *Tapestry*, 193.

² See Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, 193-233.

could be non-ideological: “even the proclamation of Christ crucified and risen, is ideological when uttered. Any one who doubts this should discuss the matter with an atheist.”³

The ideology in the text is embedded in the other textures we have already examined. The beginning movement for Luke’s personal agenda within the context of the LS narrative discourse is indicated in its innertexture and intertexture. This can be seen especially in his reconfiguration and recontextualisation of received material. Our analysis of social and cultural texture in chapter four revealed the social and cultural location of the implied author. In our chapter on the social-cultural texture we concluded that the Lukan LS narrative discourse exhibits a communitarian social rhetoric while enacting a subcultural rhetoric vis-à-vis the Israelite culture and a countercultural rhetoric vis-à-vis the dominant Greco-Roman culture. This implies that Luke is in some kind of conflict with Israelite subculture as well as with Greco-Roman dominant culture.⁴ The reason is quite clear from our analysis: Luke’s social rhetoric seeks to legitimate his agenda of the creation of a subculture within Israelite and Greco-Roman culture. Our analysis of the sacred texture has permitted us to flesh out that subculture as an inclusivist, egalitarian one centred on Jesus. The LS promotes a view that moves the definition of homogeneous Israel to a heterogeneous Israel, comprised of Israelites and Gentiles. It is an ideology that is informed

³ Gareth Jones, review of *Theology, Ideology and Liberation: Towards a Liberative Theology*, by Peter Scott, *JTS* 48.1: 369-71.

⁴ See L. Gregory Bloomquist, “Ideological Texture,” lecture (Saint Paul University Ottawa, 1999).

by Luke's view of humans as equals without regard to social standing (rich or poor, sinful or saintly), ethnic background (Israelite or Gentile), or gender.

It is in light of this particular inclusive-community ideology that we can better understand other views expressed in the discourse, for instance, inclusive table fellowship, leadership as *διακονία* of others, brotherhood of the disciples, and patronage as *διακονία* rather than as a source of status. Luke has in view the contrasting environment where leaders do not characterise themselves in terms of slave *διακονία*, and Israelites do not associate with non-Israelites and others who are considered ritually impure. In this way, Luke seeks to redefine and reconfigure what is honourable by presenting his ideology of "open-egalitarian commensality"⁵ as the only honourable social practice. But because when viewed within the old order Jesus' lack of distinctions and discriminations at table would be dishonourable (e.g. Luke 14: 7-14), the Lukan Jesus' attitude at table negates a particular, cultural practice of table, which is "to establish social ranking by what one eats, how one eats, and with whom one eats"⁶; then it is clear that Luke is operating from a countercultural ideology that seeks to reconfigure the Israelite concept of table companions.

Not surprisingly, there are discernible conflicts between the Lukan Jesus—who is the focus of the movement around him—and the Israelite authorities on the social functions of table fellowship and the temple. This is especially so where the countercultural critique

⁵ For this use of this term, see John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Israelite Peasant*. (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991): 261–64. Crossan seems to use "open commensality" and "egalitarian commensality" interchangeably.

⁶ Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 262.

of the Graeco-Roman world intersects with the antique atmosphere of Israelite culture. In this new cultural context focused on Jesus, over against either the Israelite subculture which is founded, at least in part, on exclusive meal practice or the dominant Graeco-Roman dominant culture that is founded, at least in part, on gentile kingship, διακονία is the proper social function of Jesus-centred leadership and kingship. In the end Luke's LS discourse emerges as a political act, in large part because Luke's writing is a rhetorical-political act itself.⁷

Such a view accords with Esler's hypothesis, namely, that Luke-Acts exhibits not only theological dimensions, but social, cultural and political dimensions as well. Esler's arguments are based on his thesis that socio-political factors have been highly significant in motivating Luke's theology. For him, "Luke has shaped the gospel traditions at his disposal in response to social and political pressures experienced by his community."⁸ Although Esler does not claim that social and political factors totally explain the aim of Luke-Acts, he argues, "it is entirely unrealistic to expect to be able to appreciate the purely religious dimension of Luke-Acts apart from an understanding of the social and political realities of the community for which it was composed."⁹

Thus, as one example, we note that the Jesus-movement as an inclusive community of equals and leadership as service, his concept of equality needs qualification. Why, for example, does he seemingly exclude women-disciples from functioning as apostles? Why

⁷ See Robinson, *Acts*, 477.

⁸ Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 2.

⁹ Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 2.

did Luke choose only men to serve at table in Acts 6? As has been convincingly shown, the notion of apostleship comes from the pen of Luke.¹⁰ Accordingly, Luke's view is clearly sub-cultural, that is, Jesus and his movement enact Israelite ideology more fully but do not overturn it. As such Luke accepted aspects of the contemporary position of women in Hellenistic Israelite society, even as he sought a reconfiguration of that dominant cultural position.

Esler's work, however, lacks the integrating features of socio-rhetorical analysis, features that would allow him to see the interplay among the theological, the literary, the social, and the ideological realities. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza reminds us of this function of rhetoric:

Whereas the poetic work attempts to create and organize imaginative experience, rhetoric seeks to persuade and to motivate people to **act right**. Rhetoric seeks to instigate a change of attitudes and motivations; it strives to persuade, to teach and to engage the hearer/reader by eliciting reactions, emotions, convictions, and identifications. The evaluative criterion for rhetoric is not aesthetics, but praxis.¹¹

Thus, to the features of ideology noted by Esler, we need to add analysis of the rhetorical situation, for ideological investigation is best explored with an eye on the rhetorical question or exigency to which Luke 22:7-38 (WT) can be construed as a fitting response. The work of this thesis may be construed, then, as an extensive attempt to do just that. Our analysis indicates that Luke's open concern for table fellowship between Israelite

¹⁰ See John P. Meier, "The Circle of the Twelve," 635-72.

¹¹ "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," NTS 33 (1987): 387.

and gentile members of his community in Acts colours his telling the story of the LS.¹² This conclusion suggests that a legitimization of table-fellowship between Israelite and Gentile members of Luke's Jesus-movement group "formed a vital arch in the symbolic universe which Luke created for his community."¹³

In Chapter One, I suggested that Luke achieves this by constructing his LS as a rhetorical elaboration of theme. Treating Luke's LS as a rhetorical elaboration reveals that Luke 22:7-38 (WT) is a unified text. This helps to avoid disciplinary fragmentation of previous studies of this text, and to bring together different dimensions of the text for analysis. In this way, Jesus' instruction on true leadership (vv.25-28) assumes a central position in the rhetoric of Luke's supper text. This clearly contrasts with previous studies that have centralised the so-called "institution text" (vv. 19-20).

In Chapter Two, I showed how this elaboration was constructed by looking at the narrative material, argumentation, and repetition. This analysis shows that Jesus is the main subject of the narrative text, and that the apostles are Jesus' rhetorical audience, those for whom the elaboration is intended.

Chapter Three shows that from the perspective of socio-rhetorical analysis there are four ways a text may use antecedent texts, oral or written, namely, recitation,

¹² We underlined this in our analysis of thematic elaboration of a theme in chapter two. There we concluded that inclusiveness and servant leadership formed the rhetorical situation of the discourse, that is, the exigency to which the Lukan LS discourse can be understood as a fitting response.

¹³ Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 109.

reconfiguration, recontextualisation, and oral-scribal echo.¹⁴ Luke in composing his LS has reworked specific oral as well as written traditions available to him. Our analysis indicates that Luke 22:7-38 (WT) refers to Mark directly. But there are reconfigurations and recontextualisations of certain traditions that are not found in Mark, for instance, the *Didache* and John. Luke's agreement with 1 Cor, John, and the *Didache*, then, allows us to conclude that all four must have drawn on and reconfigured similar traditions. The rhetorical elaboration pattern within the LS narrative discourse in Luke 22:14-38 (WT) further suggests that Luke may have drawn on Graeco-Roman textual traditions, e.g. rhetorical handbooks and exercises, novels and commentaries.

In Chapter Four we explored Luke's dependence on the cultural systems and social structure in the first-century Mediterranean society. This analysis demonstrated that Luke is dependent, not only on certain external texts, as we saw in chapter three, but on certain cultural tradition and social institutions in the first-century Mediterranean environment.

This interaction with certain social codes and cultural scripts in the first-century Mediterranean led me to conclude in Chapter Five that the language in the text can be social-culturally located as a first-century Mediterranean revolutionist response, with a conversionist tendency, that seeks to reconstruct the old social order for the purposes of establishing a new social order, the kingdom of God, the kind of primitive Christian community Luke describes in the first chapters of Acts. I have characterised this as a communitarian social response, for "it sets out through its activities to construct the world

¹⁴ Traditional interpreters have long recognised the composite nature of Luke's LS in their quest for the sources Luke may have used.

on a communitarian basis."¹⁵ Jesus' subversion of cultural meal habits is, as I have noted, directed to the rhetorical audience constituted by his disciples and serves to reverse relationships and roles among them at meals, a mainstay of Israelite purity system, and to indicate to them that the honoured one is the one who serves. The cultural function of Luke's LS is, then, the creation of an inclusive community in which such a social response endures. This inclusivity suggests that in the new social order, God, not gentile kings, will be the patron, while Jesus will continue to broker God's benefactions. When the apostles become rulers in the new dispensation they will begin to act as brokers of God's benefactions and will thus socially and culturally mirror the actions of Jesus as broker.

The final chapter explores how this social and cultural program reflects sacred interests. Here my analysis led me to suggest that Jesus' sharing of his divine authority with the apostles and the potential positive transformative effect of Jesus' petition to the deity on the apostles indicates that contact with Jesus himself leads to transformation. The meal Jesus promises his disciples will become for them a link to Jesus as they remember him at the breaking of bread, a communal meal that will transform members of the community (Luke 24: 30-32). The meal then assumes a higher, sacral-like value, as it becomes not a sacrificial rite but a sign of unity and cohesion. This unity and cohesion is further strengthened as the disciples are transformed into a fictive familial bond.

Socio-rhetorical analysis as we have engaged it here shows how a text's social-cultural environment helps to shape it. Socio-rhetorical analysis shows that a good knowledge of the social-cultural background of a text such as the NT is a desideratum for a

¹⁵ Wilson, "Typology of Sects," 370.

better interpretation of it because of the fuller rhetorical and social considerations. Socio-rhetorical analysis also allows me to pose new questions to Luke's LS (WT), and to incorporate elements drawn from my own culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I have organised the following bibliography into twelve subject areas:

- I. Primary Texts, Translations, and Philological Tools (321-330).
- II. Reference Works (330-334)
- III. Studies on Luke 22 (334-340)
- IV. Rhetorical Studies on Luke-Acts (340-344)
- V. Other Studies on Luke-Acts (345-363)
- VI. Other NT Studies (363-369)
- VII. Literary Analysis (369-374)
- VIII. Rhetorical Analysis (374-392)
- IX. Sociological and Cultural Anthropological Studies (392-414)
- X. Other Methods (414-425)
- XI. African Studies (425-426)
- XII. Computer Software (426)

I. PRIMARY TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND PHILOLOGICAL TOOLS

Aland, Barbara, et al. *Nestle-Aland Greek-English New Testament*. Stuttgart, Germany:

Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1981; 8th rev. ed. 1994.

Aland, Barbara, et al. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: United Bible Societies, 1993.

Aland, Kurt, ed. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition*. 9th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: German Bible Society, 1989.

- Aland, Kurt. and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: Revised and Enlarged*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Aristotle. *Athenian Constitution, Eudemian Ethics, Vices and Virtues*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- , *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- , *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by David Ross, revised by J. L. Ackrill & J. O. Urmson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- , *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Translated by J. H. Freeze and William Heinemann. LCL. London: Cambridge University Press, 1926.
- , *Problems, Books XXII-XXXVIII*. Translated by W. S. Hett. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937, 1994 reprint.
- , *Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937, 1994 reprint.
- Augustine. *De Doctrina Christiana (On Christian Doctrine)*. Translated by D.W. Robertson. The Library of the Liberal Arts. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958.
- Augustus, Caesar. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Translated by P. A. Brunt and John Michael Moore. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Barclay M. Newman, comp & ed. *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

- Barnes, Jonathan, ed. *The Complete Works of Aristotle*. The Revised Oxford Translation. Princeton/Bollingen Series LXXI.2. 2 Volumes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Bevington, David, ed. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- La Bible de Jérusalem*. 12e ed. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1988.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Trans & ed. Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Brenton, C. L. Lancelot. *The Septuagint With Apocrypha: Greek and English*. 4th ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Brown, Francis. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew-English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979.
- Cagnat, Rene L. Victor, Pierre Jouguet, G. Lafaye, and Jules Francois, eds. *Inscriptiones Graecae Ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1964.
- Cassius, Dio. *Roman History: Books 51-55*. Translated by Earnest Cary. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- , *Roman History: Books 61-70*. Translated by Earnest Cary. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Cicero. *Oratore*. Translated by Harry M. Hubbell. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

-----, *De Oratore. Book III and De Partitione Oratoria*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

-----, *De Oratore. Books I-II*. Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

-----, *De Inventione*. Translated by Harry M. Hubbell and William Heinemann. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

-----, *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Ed. G. P. Goold. Translated by Harry Caplan. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Colson, F. H., trans. *Philo*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Comfort, Philip W. *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1990.

Cooper John M., ed. *Plato: Complete Works* [English]. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett, 1997.

Cruse, C. F., trans. *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998.

Danby, H. *The Mishnah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Demosthenes. *Orations*. Translated by J. H. Vince and M. A. Vince. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Denzinger, Henricus, and Adolfus Schönmetzer. *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*. 32nd ed. Rome, Italy: Herder, 1963.

- Dittenberger, Wilhelm. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Ed. Hiller von Gartringen Friedrich. Hildesheim: Olms. 1960.
- Dobson, John H. *Learn New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. 1992, 1993. England: Bible Society. 1988.
- Edmonds, J. M., trans. *The Greek Bucolic Poets*. Vol 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1912.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament and Other Early Christian Writings: A Reader*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1998.
- Elliott, John K., ed. *The Apocryphal Jesus: Legends of the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1996.
- Elliott, Keith, and Ian Moir. *Manuscripts and the Text of the New Testament: An Introduction for English Readers*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T & T Clark. 1995.
- Epictetus. *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. Cambridge, MA/ London: Harvard University Press. 1925.
- Epstein, Israel, ed. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*. 24 vols. London/Jerusalem/New York: The Second Press. 1972.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. LC L. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1980.
- Greene, D., and R. Lattimore, eds. *The Complete Greek Tragedies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1992.
- Herodotus. *Histories*. Translated by A. D. Godley. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1920.

- Hicks, R. D., trans. *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Hock, Ronald F., and Edward N. O'Neil. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*. Vol 1. *The Progymnasmata*. SBLTT 27, Greco-Roman Religion Series 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph, trans. *Celsus on the True Doctrine: A Discourse Against the Christians*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Isocrates. *[Works.]*. Translated by G. Norlin and L. Van Hook. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Jackson, John, trans. *Tacitus: Annals 13-16*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Lake, Kirsopp, trans. *The Apostolic Fathers I*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.
- Liddel, Henry George, and Robbert Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon With Supplement*. 9th. ed. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones & Roderick McKenzie. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968/1992.
- Louw, J. P. *Semantics of New Testament Greek*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Lysias. *The Oratory of Classical Greece*. Translated by W. R. Lamb. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

- Marshall, Alfred. *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1967.
- Matthews, Victor H., and Don C. Benjamin. *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*. New York: Paulist, 1991.
- Miller, F. J. *The Tragedies of Seneca*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907.
- Miller, Robert J., ed. *The Complete Gospels: Annotated Scholars Version*. Foreword by Robert W. Funk. San Francisco: Polebridge, 1992/94.
- Moulton, F. W., and A. S. Gede. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. T & T Clark: Edinburgh, 1978.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Talmud of the Land of Israel*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984-93.
- , *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- New English Bible*. Cambridge: Oxford and Cambridge Universities Presses, 1970.
- The New Jerusalem Bible*. Standard ed. Kinshasa: Verbum Bible, 1985.
- The New Revised Standard Version with Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal Imprimatur Edition*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1989.
- Origen, Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Gospels*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Perschbacher, Wesley J. *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.

Philostratus, Falvius, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.

Plato. *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*. Translated by H. N. Fowler. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

-----, *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias*. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

-----, *Epistles*. Translated by R. G. Bury. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.

-----, *The Dialogues of Plato*. Translated by Benjamin Jowell and with "The Seventh Letter", by J. Harvard. Chicago: William Benton, 1952.

Plutarch. *Alexander*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. 7. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.

-----, *Moralia*. 16 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by H. E. Butler. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920-02.

Race, William H., ed. *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Robinson, Neal, trans. *The Sayings of Muhammad*. New York: The ECCO Press, 1998.

Rolfe, J. C., trans. *Suetonius*. Revised by K. R. Bradley. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Seneca. *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. Translated by R. M. Gummere. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917-25.

-----, *Four Tragedies and Octavia*. Translated with an Introduction by E. F. Watling.

Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.

-----, *Moral Essays*. Translated by J. W. Basore. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University

Press, 1928-35.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing, 1984. Boston:

Harvard University Press, 1920; renewed 1984.

Stevenson, J., ed. *A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to*

AD 337. Revised by W. H. C. Frend. London: SPCK, 1987.

Storr, F., trans. *Sophocles*. Vol 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.

Throckmorton, Burton H., ed. *Gospel Parallels: A Synopsis of the Three Gospels*. 4th. Ed.

New York: Thomas Nelson, 1979.

Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 3rd ed. London: JSOT Press, 1987.

-----, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin, 1997.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan,

1996.

Wells, Robert, trans. *The Idylls of Theocritus*. New York: Carcanet, 1988.

Westcott, Brooke F. and Fenton J. A. Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*.

New York/London: Harpers and Macmillan, 1881.

Whiston, William, trans. *The Primitive New Testament Restor'd* (English Translation from

Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus [D]). London, 1745.

-----, *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged New Updated Edition*. Peabody:

Hendrickson, 1999.

Wikgren, Allen. *Hellenistic Greek Texts*. Asst by Ernest Cadman Colwell & Ralph Marcus.
Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Yonge, D. C., trans. *The Works of Philo: Complete, Unabridged, and Updated*. Peabody,
MA: Hendrickson, 1993.

Zerwick, Max. and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*.
4th rev ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio, 1993.

II. REFERENCE WORKS

The Bible Through the Ages. Pleasantville/New York/Montreal: The Reader's Digest
Association Inc., 1996.

Black, D. A. *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts
and Applications*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988.

Brown, Raymond E., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, eds. *The New Jerome
Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

-----, *The New Jerome Bible Handbook: Based on the New Jerome Biblical Commentary*.
Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1992.

-----, *An Introduction to New Testament*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Bruce, F. F. *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* Grand Rapids, MI:
Eerdmans, 1943.

Bullinger, W. E. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Expanded and Illustrated*. Grand
Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1898.

- Coggins, R. J., and J. L. Houlden. *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990.
- Cross, Frank Moore, and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1982.
- Earhart, H. Byron. *Religious Traditions of the World: A Journey Through Africa, North America, Mesoamerica, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, China, and Japan*. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- , *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Ehrman, Bart D., and Michael W. Holmes, eds. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Questionis*. Studies and Documents. Volume 46. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Eisenman, Robert. *James the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
- Elliott, John K., ed. *The Apocryphal Jesus: Legends of the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

- Elliott, Keith, and Ian Moir. *Manuscripts and the Text of the New Testament: An Introduction for English Readers*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T & T Clark, 1995.
- Encyclopedia Britannica*. Vol 16. 15th ed. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc. 1992.
- Fishwick, Duncan. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*. Etudes Preliminaires Aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 108. Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990.
- , *The Semitic Background of the New Testament (A Combination of Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament [1971] and A Wandering Aramean: Collected Essays [1979])*. Ed. Astrid B. Beck and David Noel Freedman. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Ingold, Tim, ed. *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Human Culture and Social Life*. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol. 1, *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- , *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1992.

- Komonchak, Joseph A., Mary Collins and Dermot A. Lane. eds. *The New Dictionary of Theology*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1990.
- McDonald, Martin Lee. *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1988.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1991/1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M., ed. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- , *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.
- , *A Textual Commentary on The Greek New Testament*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- , *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origins, Development, and Significance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Introduction to Rabbinic Literature*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Newsom, Carol A., and Sharon H. Ringe. *The Women's Bible Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- Porter, Stanley E., ed. *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Rahner, Karl, ed. *Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise Sacramentum Mundi*. New York: Crossroad, 1975.

Scheindlin, Raymond P. *The Chronicles of the Jewish People*. New York: Smithmark Publishers, 1996.

Schürer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 5 vols.

Translated by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995
(original publication, T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1890).

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth, ed. *Searching the Scriptures*. Vol. 1. *A Feminist Introduction*. New York: Crossroads, 1993.

-----, ed. *Searching the Scriptures*. Vol. 2, *A Feminist Commentary*. New York: Crossroads, 1994.

Shaw, Ian, ed. *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Soulen, Richard N. *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox, 1976.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.

Westcott, Brooke F., and Frenton J. A. *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek Limitations*. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1882; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

III. STUDIES ON LUKE 22

Bacon, B. W. "The Lukan Tradition of the Lord's Supper." *HTR* 5 (1912): 322-48.

Bate, H. N. "The 'Shorter Text' of St. Luke Xxii 15-20." *JTS* 28 (1927): 362-68.

Benoît, P. "Le récit de la cène dans Lc 22, 15-20." *Revue Biblique* XLVIII (1939): 357-93.

-----, "Luc Xxii, 19b-20." *JTS* 49 (1948): 145-47.

Bock, Darrell L. "Response to David Dungan's Section on Luke 22:1-46 in 'Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis'." Paper presented at SBL Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA, 1995.

Bösen, Willibald. *Das Mahlmotiv bei Lukas. Studien Zum Lukanischen Mahlverständnis Unter Besondere Berücksichtigung Lk 22:14-20*. Dissertation Universität des Saarlandes Saarbrücken, 1976.

Brown, Raymond E. "The Lukan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 154-64. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Burkitt, F. C. "St. Luke 22:15,16: What is the General Meaning?" *JTS* 9 (1907-08): 569-72.

-----, "On Luke Xxii 17-20." *JTS* 28 (1926-27): 178-81.

Canoy, Robert William. *Perspectives on Eucharistic Theology. Luke as Paradigm for an Inclusive Invitation to Communion*. PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987.

Carpinelli, Francis Giordano. "'Do This as My Memorial' (Luke 22:19)." *CBQ* 61, no. 1 (1999): 74-91.

Chadwick, H. "The Shorter Text of Luke Xxii 15-20." *HTR* 50 (1957): 249-58.

Chilton, Bruce. "The Purity of the Kingdom as Conveyed in Jesus' Meals." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 473-88. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Du Plessis, I. J. "The Saving Significance of Jesus and His Death on the Cross in Luke's Gospel: Focusing on Luke 22:19b-20." *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 2 (1994): 523-40.

- Dupont, Jacques. "Le logion des douze trônes (Mt 19.28: Lc 22.28-30)." *Biblica* 45 (1964): 355-92.
- , "The Meal at Emmaus." In *The Eucharist in the New Testament: A Symposium*. Ed. P. Benoit, Jean Delorme, Jacques Dupont. Translated by E. M. Steward. 105-15. Baltimore/Dublin: Helicon, 1965.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts." In SBLSP. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 576-91. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Finlayson, S. K. "'The Enigma of the Swords'." *ExpTim* 50 (1938-39): 563.
- Foster, J. "'Go and Make Ready' (Luke Xxii.8: John Xiv.2)." *ExpTim* 63 (1951-52): 193.
- Green, Joel B. "Preparation for Passover (Luke 22:7-13: A Question of Redactional Technique." *NovT* XXIX, no. 4 (1987): 305-19.
- Hamm, Dennis. Review of *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24-30*, by Peter K. Nelson. *CBQ* 57 (1995): 819-20.
- Hanges, James C. Review of "*E Fu Annoverato Fra Iniqui*": *Prospettive Di Lettera Della Passione Secondo Luca Alla Luce Di Lc 22: 37 (Is 53: 12d*, by Pierantonio Tremolada. *RBL* 2 (2000): 385-87.
- Hobhouse, S. "'And He That Hath No Sword, Let Him Buy One" (Luke Xxii.35-38)." *ExpTim* 30 (1918-19): 278-80.
- Jeremias, Joachim, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by Norman Perrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1996.
- Just, Arthur A. *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1993.

- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Luke Xxii 19b-20." *JTS* 47 (1946): 49-56.
- Kobayashi, Nobuo. "The Meaning of Jesus' Death in the "Last Supper" Traditions." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8, no. 1 (1992): 95-105.
- Kodell, Jerome. *The Eucharist in the New Testament*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1998.
- Kraus, Jonathan D. Brumberg. *Symposium Scenes in Luke's Gospel with Special Attention to the Last Supper*. PhD Diss.. Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tennessee, 1991.
- Kurz, William S. "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses." *JBL* 104 (1985): 251-68.
- LaVerdiere, Eugene A. "The Eucharist in Luke's Gospel." *Emmanuel* 89 (1983): 445-49, 452-53.
- , *Dining in the Kingdom of God: The Origin of the Eucharist According to Luke*. Chicago, IL: Archdiocese of Chicago Liturgy Training Publications, 1994.
- Leclercq, J. "L'argument des deux glaives (Luc Xxii,38) dans les controverses politiques au Moyen Age." *RSR* 21 (1931): 299-339.
- Linskens, John. *Eucharist in St. Luke*. San Antonio, TX: Mexican American Culture Center, 1976.
- Lull, D. J. "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness (Luke 22.24-30)." *NovT* 28 (1986): 289-305.
- Léon-Dufour, Xavier. "'Faites ceci en Mémoire de Moi': Luc 22, 19- 1 Corinthiens 11, 25." *Christus* 24 (1977): 200-08.

- , "‘Prenez ceci est mon Corps pour vous’." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 104 (1982): 223-40.
- , *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread : The Witness of the New Testament*. Translated by M. J. O’Connell. New York : Paulist, 1982.
- MacMillan, H. "The Man Bearing a Pitcher of Water: Luke Xxii. 10." *ExpTim* 3 (1891-92): 58-60.
- McMahan, Craig Thomas. *Meals as Type-Scenes in the Gospel of Luke*. PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987.
- Megbelayin, Olu Jerome. *The Eucharist According to Luke (22:19-20): A Redactional Consideration*. Master’s thesis, St. John’s University, New York, 1994.
- Miner, Paul S. "A Note on Luke Xxii 36." *NovT* 7 (1964-65): 128-34.
- Monks, G. G. "The Lukan Account of the Last Supper." *JBL* 44 (1925): 228-60.
- Moxnes, Halvor. "Meals and the New Community in Luke." *Svesk Exegetisk Årsbok* 51-52 (1986/87): 158-67.
- Napier, T. M. "The Enigma of the Swords." *ExpTim* 49 (1937-38): 467-70.
- , "‘The Enigma of the Two Swords’ (Luke Xxii.35-38)." *ExpTim* 51 (1939-40): 204.
- Nelson, Peter K. *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24-30*. Ed. PHEME Perkins. SBLDS 138. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Absence of Jesus’ Emotions: The Lukan Redaction of Lk 22: 39-46." *Biblica* 61 (1980): 153-71.

- , "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 361-87. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Petzer, J. H. "Luke 22:19b-20 and the Structure of the Passage." *NTS* 26 (1984): 249-52.
- Petzer, Kobus. "Style and Text in the Lukan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:19b-20)." *NTS* 37 (1991): 113-29.
- Quesnell, Quentin. "The Women at Luke's Supper." In *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper, 59-79. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Reinach, S. "Les deux épées." *Revue Archéologique* 4, no. 19 (1912): 435.
- , "Encore les deux épées." *Revue Archéologique* 5, no. 10 (1919): 370-71.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Le récit de la dernière cène: Luc 22: 7-38*. Translated by R. H. Hoizer. Lumières Bibliques. Le Puy/Lyon: Editions Xavier Mappus, 1966.
- Sellew, P. H. "The Last Supper Discourse in Luke 22:21-38." *Forum* 3 (1987): 70-95.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 106, no. 4 (1987): 613-38.
- Smith, M. A. "The Lukan Last Supper Narrative." *Studia Evangelica* 6, no. 112 (TU 1973): 502-09.
- Soards, Marion. *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. JSNTSup, 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "St. Luke's Transpositions." *NTS* 3 (1956-57): 219-23.
- Sweetland, Dennis M. "The Lord's Supper and the Lukan Community." *BTB* 13 (January 1983): 23-27.

Sykes, M. H. "The Eucharist as 'Anamnesis'." *ExpTim* 71 (1959-60): 115-18.

Throckmorton, B. H. "The Longer Reading of Lk 22, 19b-20." *Anglican Theological Review* XXX (1948): 55-56.

Vööbus, Arthur. "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter Text in Luke." *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 457-63.

Wanke, J. *Beobachtungen Zum Eucharistieverständnis Des Lukas auf Grund der Lukanischen Mahlberichte*. Erfurter Theologische Schriften 8. Leipzig: St. Benno Verlag, 1973.

Western W. "The Enigma of the Swords." *ExpTim* 50 (1938-39): 377.

-----, "The Enigma of the Swords, St. Luke Xxii.38." *ExpTim* 52 (1940-41): 357.

IV. RHETORICAL STUDIES ON LUKE-ACTS

Bloomquist, L. Gregory. "Patristic Reception of Lukan Rhetoric: A Response to Willi Braun's Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14." Paper presented at SBL 1995 Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, PA, 1995.

-----, "Rhetorical Argumentation and the Culture of Apocalyptic: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of Lk. 21." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 180, 173-209. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Braun, Willi. *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*. SNTSMS, 85. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

- Brawley, Robert L. "Canon and Community: Intertextuality, Canon, Interpretation, Christianity, Theology, and Perspective Rhetoric in Luke 4:1-13." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering. 419-34. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Brodie, Thomas Louis. "Luke 7:36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kgs 4:1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation." *Bib* 64 (1983): 457-85.
- Darr, John A. *On Character Building: The Reader and Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- Hughes, Frank W. "The Parable of the Rich and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90, 29-41. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Jolivet, Ira J. "The Lukan Account of Paul's Conversion and Hermagorean Stasis Theory." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup. 180, 210-20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Kolasny, Judette M. "An Example of Rhetorical Criticism: Luke 4:16-30." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard, 67-77. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.
- Kurz, William S. "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 42 (1980): 171-95.
- Mack, Burton L. "The Anointing of Jesus: Elaboration Within a Chreia." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 85-106. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.

- Marguerat, Daniel. "The End of Acts (28:16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90, 75-89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- McDonald, J. Ian H. "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy in Luke 10:25-37." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90, 59-73. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Murphy, James J. "Early Christianity as a "Persuasive Campaign": Evidence from The Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of Paul." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90, 90-99. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Forensic Defense Speech and Paul's Trial Speeches in Acts 22-26: Form and Function." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Ed. Charles H. Talbert, 210-24. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- O'Toole, Robert F. Review of *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*, by Willi Braun. *CBQ* 59, no. 1 (1997): 149-50.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "The Woman Who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts." *NTS* 33 (1987): 502-15.
- , "Foxes, Birds, Burials and Furrows." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 69-84. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.

- , "Plucking Grain on the Sabbath." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 107-41. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.
- , "Rhetorical Composition and the Beelzebul Controversy." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 161-94. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.
- , "Using a Socio-Rhetorical Poetics to Develop a Unified Method: The Woman Who Anointed Jesus as a Test Case." In SBLSP. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 302-19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- , "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case." In *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. JSNTSup, 109, 164-209. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- , "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Philips, 191-214. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E. "Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1: *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 337-79. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Shuler, Philip L. "The Rhetorical Character of Luke 1-2." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Philip, 173-89. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.

- Siebert, Folker. "Mass Communication and Prose Rhythm in Luke-Acts." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90, 42-58. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Thibeaux, Evelyn R. "Known to Be a Sinner: The Narrative Rhetoric of Luke 7:36-50." *BTB* 23, no. 4 (1993): 152-60.
- Webber, Randall C. "'Why Were the Heathen So Arrogant?' The Socio-Rhetorical Strategy of Acts 3-4." *BTB* 22, no. 1 (1992): 19-25.
- Winter, Bruce W. "Official Proceeding and the Forensic Speeches in Acts 24-26." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1: *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. 305-36. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Witherington, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm H. "The Rhetorical Structure of Luke 12 in Its Wider Context." *Neot* 22 (1988): 283-310.
- Yamada, Kota. "The Preface to Lukan Writings and Rhetorical Historiography." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup, 180, 154-72. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

V. OTHER STUDIES ON LUKE-ACTS

Alexander, Loveday. "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing." *NovT* 18 (1986): 48-74.

-----, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*. SNTSMS, 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Barrett, C. K. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. In *Facet Books Biblical Series*, 24. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1961.

-----, "Is There a Theological Tendency in Codex Bezae?" In *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Ed. E. Best and R. M. Wilson, 15-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Bartchy, S. S. "Community of Goods in Acts: Idealization or Social Reality?" In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Ed. B. A. Pearson, A. T. Kraabel, G. W. E. Nickelsburg, and N. R. Petersen, 309-18. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Bernadicou, P. J. "Christian Community According to Luke." *Worship* 44 (1970): 205-19.

Blue, Bradley. "Acts and the House Church." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 2: *Greco-Roman Setting*. Ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf, 119-222. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.

-----, "The Influence of Jewish Worship on Luke's Presentation of the Early Church." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 473-47. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Boismard, M. E. *En quête du proto-Luc*. Etudes bibliques, 37. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1997.

- Bösen, Willibald. *Jesusmahl, Eucharistisches Mahl, Endzeitmahl: Ein Beitrag Zur Theologie Des Lukas*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH. 1980.
- Bovon, François. "Le salut dans les écrits de Luc." *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 23, no. 3 (1973): 296-307.
- , *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-1983)*. Translated by Ken McKinney. Alison Park, PA: Pickwick Publication, 1987.
- Braun, Willi. "Symposium or Anti-Symposium? Reflections on Luke 14:1-24." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8, no. 1 (1992): 70-84.
- Brodie, Thomas Louis. "A New Temple and a New Law: The Unity and Chronicler-Based Nature of Luke 1:1-4:22a." *JSNT* 5 (1979): 21-45.
- , "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Ed. Charles H. Talbert. 78-85. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- , "Towards Unraveling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an Imitation of 1 Kings 17:17-24." *NTS* 32 (1986): 247-67.
- , "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard. 78-85. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.
- Brown, Raymond E. Review of *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2*, by Mark Coleridge. *JBL* 114, no. 3 (1995): 524-26.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text With Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd. rev. and enlarged ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.

- Buckwalter, H. Douglas. "The Divine Savior." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 107-23. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Cancik, Hubert. "The History of Culture, Religion, and Institutions in Ancient Historiography: Philological Observations Concerning Luke's History." *JBL* 116, no. 4 (1997): 673-95.
- Capper, Brian. "Reciprocity and the Ethic of Acts." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 499-518. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1978.
- Cassidy, Richard J., and Philip J. Scharper. *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Clark, Andrew. "The Role of the Apostles." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 169-90. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Coleridge, Mark. *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2*. JSNTSup, 88. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke (Die Mitte der Zeit = The Middle of Time)*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1961.

- , *Acts of the Apostles* (Die Apostelgeschichte, 1972). Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Christopher R. Matthews. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Cope, Lamar, David L. Dungan. "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering. 82-120. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- , "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 303-33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- , "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 516-73. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- , "Narrative Outline of the Composition of Luke According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 636-87. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "The Divine $\Delta\epsilon\iota$ in Luke-Acts: Investigations Into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence." *NovT* XXVI, no. 2 (1984): 168-90.
- Craddock, Fred B. *Luke*. Louisville: John Knox, 1990.
- Cribbs, F. Lamar. "St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition." *JBL* 90 (1971): 422-50.
- , "A Study of the Contacts That Exist Between St. Luke and St. John." *SBLSP* (1973): 1-93.

Danker, Frederick W. *Jesus and the New Age According to St. Luke*. St. Louis: Clayton. 1972.

-----, "Graeco-Roman Cultural Accommodation in the Christology of Luke-Acts." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Kent Harold Richard, 391-414. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983.

-----, *Luke*. 2nd. ed. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Darr, John A. "Discerning the Lukan Voice: The Narrator as Character in Luke-Acts." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 255-65. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Daube, D. "Shame Culture in Luke." In *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barratt*. Ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982.

Dawsey, J. M. *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Deterding, P. E. "Eschatological and Eucharistic Motifs in Luke 12:35-40." *Concordia Journal* 5, no. 3 (1979): 85-94.

Dibelius, Martin. "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography." In *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. H. Greeven, Translated by M. Ling, 138-85. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. *Analecta Biblica* 82. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

Drury, John, "Luke," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*. Ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode, 418-439. Cambridge, MA Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.

- Du Plessis, J. G. "Why Did Peter Ask His Question and How Did Jesus Answer Him? Or: Implicature in Luke 12:35-48." *Neotestamentica* 22 (1988): 311-24.
- Dupont, Jacques. "Les disciples d'Emmaus (Luc 24, 13-35)." In *La Pâque du Christ. Mystère du Salut: Mélanges F.-X Durrwell*. LD 112. 167-95. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf. 1982.
- Edward, O. C. *Luke's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Elliott, John Hall. "Household Meals Vs Temple Purity: Replication Patterns in Luke-Acts." *BTB* 21, no. 3 (1991): 102-08.
- Ellis, E. E. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology*. SNTSMS. 57. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Functions of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Evans, C. F. *Saint Luke*. Philadelphia: SCM, 1990.
- Farmer, William R. "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke." *NTS* 8 (1962): 301-16.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke*. 2 vols. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1981/1995.
- , *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1989.

- , "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering. 524-38. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press. 1992.
- , *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- , "The Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Ed. J. Verheyden. 165-83. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. CXLII. Leuven: Leuven University Press. 1999.
- Flanagan, Neal. "The What and How of Salvation in Luke-Acts." In *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit*. Ed. D. Durken, 203-20. Collegeville: The Liturgical, 1979.
- Gasque, Ward W. *A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 1989.
- Gempf, Conrad. "Public Speaking and Published Accounts." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Vol.1, Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 259-303. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 1993.
- George, A. "Le sens de la mort de Jésus pour Luc." *RB* 80 (1973): 186-217.
- Goulder, Michael D. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. JSNTSup, 20. Sheffield: JSOP Press. 1989.
- Gowler, David B. "Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach." *BTB* 19, no. 2 (1989): 54-62.
- , *Host, Guest, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*. New York: Peter Lang. 1991.
- , "Hospitality and Characterization in Luke 11:37-54: A Socio-Narratological Approach." *Semeia* 64 (1994): 213-51.

- Green, Joel B. "Salvation to the End of the Earth: God as the Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall, and David Peterson. 83-106. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- , *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Guillaume, Jean-Marie. *Luc interprète des anciennes traditions sur la résurrection de Jésus*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1979.
- Haenchen, E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Hanson, R. P. C. "The Ideology of Codex Bezae in Acts." *NTS* 14 (1968): 282-86.
- Head, Peter. "Acts and the Problem of Its Texts." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1, Ancient Literary Setting. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. 415-44. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach*. SBL Monograph Series, 52. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1999.
- Hemer, Colin J. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Hiers, R. H. "The Problem of the Delay in the Parousia in Luke-Acts." *NTS* 20 (1974): 145-55.
- Higgins, A. J. B. *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- , "The Origins of the Eucharist." *NTS* 1 (1954-55): 200-09.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.

Johnson, Luke T. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Missoula, MT:

Scholars Press, 1977.

-----, "On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay." In SBLSP. Ed.

Paul J. Achtemeier, 87-100. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979.

-----, *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1991.

-----, *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1992.

Johnson, Sherman E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of

Acts." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Ed. Krister Stendahl and James H.

Charlesworth, 129-42. New York: Crossroad, 1992; originally published by Harper.

New York, 1957.

Jones, D. L. "The Title 'Servant' in Luke-Acts." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the*

Society of Biblical Literature Seminar. Ed. C. H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad,

1984.

Jones, F. Stanley. "An Ancient Jewish Christian Rejoinder to Luke's Acts of the Apostles:

Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 223-45.

Juel, Donald. *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1983.

Karris, Robert J. *Invitation to Luke*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1977.

-----, *Invitation to Acts*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.

-----, "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 41

(1979): 80-97.

- , *Luke: Artist and Theologian. Luke's Passion Account as Literature*. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985.
- , "Luke 23:47 and the Lucan View of Jesus' Death." *JBL* 105 (1986): 65-74.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Exitus Clari Viri: The Death of Jesus in Luke." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8, no. 1 (1992): 106-20.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Luke's Gospel*. New Testament Readings. London/New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Kodell, Jerome. "Luke's Theology of the Death of Jesus." In *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit*. Ed. D. Durken, 221-39. Collegeville: The Liturgical, 1979.
- , "Luke's Gospel in a Nutshell (Lk 4:16-30)." *BTB* 13, no. 1 (1983): 16-18.
- Krodel, Gerhard. *Acts*. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Kurz, William S. "Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible." In *SBLSP*. Ed. P. J. Achtemeier, 283-300. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- , *Following Jesus: A Discipleship's Guide to Luke and Acts*. Ann Arbor: Servant Publications, 1984.
- , "Luke 3:23-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Ed. Charles H. Talbert, 169-87. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- , *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.

- Lake, Kirsopp. "The Twelve and the Apostles." In *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol.5, 37-59. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker. 1933; reprint 1979.
- LaVerdiere, Eugene A. *The Breaking of the Bread: The Development of the Eucharist According to Acts*. Chicago, IL: Archdiocese of Chicago Liturgy Training Publications. 1998.
- , *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1996.
- Levinskaya, Irina. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 5, *Diaspora Setting*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter: Pater Noster. 1970.
- , *Commentary on Luke*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- , "Luke as Theologian." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 4, 402-03. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- , "Acts and the 'Former Treatise'." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1, *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 163-82. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Marshall, I. Howard, and David Peterson, eds. *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Martin, Clarice J. "A Chamberlain's Journey and the Challenge of Interpretation for Liberation." *Semeia* 47 (1989): 105-35.

-----, "The Acts of the Apostles." In *Searching the Scriptures*. Vol 2. *A Feminist Commentary*. Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. 763-99. New York: Crossroads. 1994.

Matera, Frank J. "The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources." *CBQ* 47 (1985): 469-85.

Matthews, Christopher R. "Philip and Simon, Luke and Peter: A Lukan Sequel and Its Intertextual Success." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering. 133-46. Atlanta. GA: Scholars Press. 1992.

-----, "The Acts of Peter and Luke's Intertextual Heritage." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 207-22.

Minear, Paul S. "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology." *Worship* 44 (1970): 322-31.

Moessner, David P. *The Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress. 1989.

Moscato, M. A. "Current Theories Regarding the Audience of Luke-Acts." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 3 (1976): 355-61.

Moxnes, Halvor. "The Social Context of Luke's Community." *Int* 48 (1994): 379-89.

Munck, Johannes. *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday. 1967.

Neyrey, Jerome H., ed. *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

-----, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology*.

Theological Inquiries. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1985.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Riches, the Rich and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke." *NTS* 25 (1979): 324-44.

-----, "Riches, the Rich and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke." *NTS* 25 (1979): 324-44.

O'Toole, Robert F. *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*. Good News Studies 9. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1984.

-----, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses." *BTB* 20, no. 1 (1990): 22-29.

-----, "Poverty and Wealth in Luke-Acts." *Chicago Studies* 30, no. 1 (1991): 29-41.

Palmer, D. W. "The Literary Background of Acts 1:1-14." *NTS* 33 (1987): 427-38.

Palmer, Darryl W. "Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1, *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 1-29. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.

Parsons, Mikeal C. "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53." In *SBLSP*, 201-23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

-----, "What is 'Literary About Literary Aspects of the Gospels and Acts?'" In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 14-39. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

- Peterson, David. "The Motif of Fulfillment and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1, *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. 1, 83-104. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- , "The Worship of the New Community." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 373-95. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Plümacher, Eckhard. "Luke (Person)." Translated by Dennis Martin. In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 4, 397-402. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What Are They Saying About Luke?* New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1989.
- , *What Are They Saying About Acts?* New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1991.
- Rapske, Brian. "Opposition to the Plan of God and Persecution." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall, and David Peterson, 235-56. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Reumann, J. "The Last and the Lord's Supper." *Lutheran Theological Seminary Bulletin* 62 (1982): 17-39.
- , *The Supper of the Lord: The New Testament, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Rice, George. "Western Non-Interpolation: A Defense of the Apostolate." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Ed. Charles H. Talbert. 1-16. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

- Richard, Earl. "Luke- Writer, Theologian. Historian: Research and Orientation of the 1970'S." *BTB* 13 (January 1983): 3-15.
- , "Luke: Author and Thinker." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard, 15-32. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.
- Rosner, Brian S. "Acts and Biblical History." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1, *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 65-82. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- , "Who is a Jew and Who is a Gentile in the Book of Acts?" *NTS* 37 (1991): 434-55.
- Schmeichel, Waldemar. "Does Luke Make a Soteriological Statement in Acts 20:28?" In *SBLSP*, 501-14. Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Seim, Turid Karlsen. "The Gospel of Luke." In *Searching the Scriptures*. Vol 2, *A Feminist Commentary*. Ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 729-62. New York: Crossroads, 1994.
- Shuler, Philip L. "Luke 1-2." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 82-97. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Sieber, John H. "The Spirit as the "Promise of My Father" in Luke 24:49." In *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit*. Ed. D. Durken, 271-78. Collegeville: The Liturgical, 1979.
- Soards, Marion L. "The Historical and Cultural Setting of Luke-Acts." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard, 33-47. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.

- , *The Speeches in Acts: The Content, Context and Concerns*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.
- Spencer, F. Scott. "Acts and Modern Literary Approaches." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 1, *Ancient Literary Setting*. Ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 381-414. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- , "Neglected Widows in Acts 6:1-7." *CBQ* 56, no. 4 (1994): 715-33.
- Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. SNTSMS, 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Steele, E. Springs. "Luke 11:37-54--A Modified Hellenistic Symposium?" *JBL* 103, no. 3 (1984): 379-94.
- Stenschke, Christopher. "The Need for Salvation." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 125-44. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Strange, W. A. *The Problem of the Text of Acts*. SNTSM, 71. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Sweetland, Dennis M. "Following Jesus: Discipleship in Luke-Acts." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard, 109-23. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.
- , "Luke the Christian." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard, 48-63. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.
- Talbert, Charles H., ed. *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Seminar*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

- , *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBLMS. 20. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- , *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- , "Promise and Fulfillment in Lukan Theology." In *New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Ed. C. H. Talbert, 91-103. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- , "Discipleship in Luke-Acts." In *Discipleship in the New Testament*. Ed. F. F. Segovia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Vol. 1, *The Gospel According to Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- , *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Vol. 2, *The Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- , *Luke*. Abingdom New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdom, 1996.
- Taylor, Justin. "La fraction du pain en Luc-Actes." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Ed. J. Verheyden. 281-95. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, CXLII. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Thompson, Richard P., and Thomas E. Philip, eds. *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Tiede, D. L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Luke*. New Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

- , "The Christology of Luke-Acts." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Ed. J. Verheyden, 133-64. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CXLII. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "Conflict as a Literary Theme in the Gospel of Luke." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*. Ed. William R. Farmer, 303-27. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- , *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- , *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- Weinert, Francis D. "The Multiple Meanings of Luke 2:49 and Their Significance." *BTB* 13, no. 1 (1983): 19-22.
- Weren, W. J. C. "Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Study." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Ed. Sipke Draisma, 189-203. Kampen: KOK, 1989.
- Wilson, Stephen G. "Lukan Eschatology." *NTS* 16 (1970): 330-47.
- , *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. SNTSMS 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Witherington, Ben. "Salvation and Health in Christian Antiquity." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 145-66. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

York, John O. *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*. JSNTSup. 46.

Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Zehnle, R. "The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology." *TS* 30 (1969):

420-44.

VI. OTHER NT STUDIES

Agnew, Francis H. "On the Origin of the Term Apostolos." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 49-53.

-----, "The Origin of the NT Apostle-Concept: A Review of Research." *JBL* 105 (1986):

75-96.

Allison, Dale C. Review of *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*, by Delbert

Burkett. *SBL* 119 (2000): 766-8.

Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*.

Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.

Bailey, L. James, and Lyle D. Vander Broek. *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A*

Handbook. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Barr, James. *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective*.

Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Boccaccini, Gabrieli. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between*

Qumran and Enochic Judaism. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Boers, Hendrikus. *What is New Testament Theology?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bradshaw, Paul F. "The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship." In *The Search for the*

Origins of Christian Worship. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Brown, Raymond E. *New Testament Essays*. New York/Ramsey: Paulist, 1965.
- , *Biblical Reflections on the Crises Facing the Church*. New York/Ramsey: Paulist, 1975.
- , *Biblical Exegesis and Church Doctrine*. New York/Ramsey: 1981.
- , *The Critical Meaning of the Bible*. New York/Ramsey: Paulist, 1981.
- , "Church in the New Testament." In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, 1339-46. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- , *An Introduction to New Testament Christology*. New York/Mahwah: Paulist, 1994.
- Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. SNTSMS 107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Carney, Thomas F. *The Shape of the Past: Models and Antiquity*. Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado, 1975.
- Carson, A. D., and H. G. M. Williamson, eds. *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture-Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Cambridge/London: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Collins, John N. *Diakonia: Re-Interpreting the Ancient Sources*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.
- , *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1993.
- , *The Essential Jesus: What Jesus Really Taught*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1994.

- , *Who Killed Jesus?* San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1995.
- Dimont, Max I. *Jews, God and History*. Toronto: The New American Library, 1962.
- Downing F. Gerald. *Christ and the Cynics: Jesus and Other Radical Preachers in First-Century Tradition*. JSOT Manuals 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "Christian Self-Definition Against the 'Hypocrites' in Didache 8." In SBLSP. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 362-77. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Foerster, W., and G. Fohrer. "Σώζω" *TDNT* 7 (1971): 965-1024.
- Fowler, A. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Fuks, A. "The Sharing of Property by the Rich with the Poor in Greek Theory and Practice." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 5 (1979/80): 46-63.
- Giblet, Jean. "Les douze: Histoire et théologie." In *Aux origines de l'église*. RechBib. 7. 51-64. Bruges: Desclée, 1965.
- Grimm, W. "Ἐπιστάτης." In *EDNT*. Ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Vol 2. 37. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*. San Francisco: Haper Collins, 1996.
- Hill, Edmund. "Church." In *The New Dictionary of Theology*. Ed. Joseph A. Komonchak, Mary Collins, and Dermot A. Lane, 185-201. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical, 1990.
- Horbury, William. "The Cult of Christ and the Cult of the Saints." *NTS* 44, no. 3 (July 1998): 444-69.

- Horsley, Richard A. "The Imperial Situation of Palestinian Jewish Society." In *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*. Ed. Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley, 395-407. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993.
- , "The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel." In *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*. Ed. Norman K. Gottwald and Richard A. Horsley, 408-27. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993.
- John Paul II. "Discourse to the Representatives of the World of Culture at the Catholic University of Santiago, Chile (3 April 1987)." *Acta Apostolicae Sedis (AAS)* 80 (1988).
- Johnson, Elizabeth A. *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- Johnson, Luke T. *Sharing Possessions: Mandate and Symbol of Faith*. London: SCM, 1986.
- , *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
- Keener, C. S., "Man and Woman." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Ed. Hawthorne, Gerald F., Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, 584-592. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Keller, Werner. *The Bible as History: Archaeology and Science Adventure 4000 Years Into the Past to Document*. Translated by William Neil. New York: William Morrow, 1956.

- Kloppenborg, John S. "The Function of Apocalyptic Language in Q." In *SBLSP*. 224-35. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1986.
- Kurz, William S. *Farewell Addresses in the New Testament*. Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical. 1990.
- Levie, Jean. *The Bible: Word of God in Words of Men* (= *Parole humaine et message de Dieu*; Parish: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959). New York: P. J. Kennedy. 1962.
- Lightfoot, J. B. "The Name and Office of an Apostle." In *Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians*, 92-101. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan. 1865; reprint, 1957.
- Lockhart, Douglas. *Jesus the Heretic: Freedom and Bondage in a Religious World*. Rockport, MA: Element Books, 1997.
- Luter, A. B. "Savior." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, 867-69. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity. 1993.
- Marxsen, Willi. *The Lord's Supper as a Christological Problem*. Translated by Lorenz Nieting. Facet Books Biblical Series 25. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
- McCready, Wayne O. "The Historical Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Whose Historical Jesus?* Ed. William E. Arnal and Michael Desjardins. Studies in Christianity and Judaism, 7, 190-211. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier. 1997.
- Moles, J. "'Honestus Quam Ambitiosius'?" An Exploration of the Cynic's Attitude to Moral Corruption in His Fellow Men." *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 103 (1983): 103-23.
- Niermann, Ernst. "Priest." In *Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise Sacramentum Mundi*. Ed. Karl Rahner. 1281-85. New York: Crossroad. 1975/91.

- Osiek, Carolyn. *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*. CBQMS, 15. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.
- O'Collins, Gerald G. "Salvation." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 5. 907-14. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Pagels, Elaine. "The Social History of Satan, the 'Intimate Enemy': Preliminary Sketch." *HTR* 84, no. 2 (1991): 105-28.
- , *The Origin of Satan*. New York: Vintage Books, 1996.
- Reicke, Bo Ivar. *The New Testament Era: The World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to A.D. 100*. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Reid, D. G. "Satan, Devil." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, 862-67. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Roloff, J. "Ἐκκλησία" In *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Vol I, 410-15. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990/93.
- Schmidt, K. L. "Ἐκκλησία." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. III, 501-36. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Schmithals, Walter. *The Office of the Apostle in the Early Church*. Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1969.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "'Waiting at Table': A Critical Feminist Theological Reflection on Diakonia." *Concilium* 198 (1988): 84-94.

Segal, B. J. *The Hebrew Passover: From the Earliest Times to A.D. 70*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Stearns, Peter N., Donald R. Schwartz, and Barry K. Beyer. *World History: Traditions and New Directions*. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1989.

Stendahl, Krister, and James H. Charlesworth, eds. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Christian Origins Library. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Wilkins, Michael J. "Christian." In *ABD*. Ed. Noel David Freedman. Vol. 1, 925-26. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

VII. LITERARY ANALYSIS

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Alter, Robert, and Frank Kermode, eds. *Literary Guide to the Bible*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.

Attridge, Harold W. "Intertextuality in the Acts of Thomas." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 87-124.

Barr, James. "Reading the Bible as Literature." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 56 (1973): 10-33.

Binder, Guyora, and Robert Weisberg. *Literary Criticisms of Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2d ed. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Texts Under Negotiation: The Bible and Postmodern Imagination*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

- Butts, James R. "The Voyage of Discipleship: Narrative, Chreia, and Call Story." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Ed. William Steinspring and Craig A. Evans. 199-219. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Dalton, J. F. *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- Dibelius, Martin. "The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels." *HTR* 20 (1927): 151-70.
- Draisma, Sipke, ed. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Kampen: Kok, 1989.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- , "Literature and History." In *Contexts for Criticism*. Ed. Donald Keeseey, 41. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, 1987.
- Fewell, Danna Noland, ed. *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1992.
- Forster, Edward Morgan. *Aspects of the Novel*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1927.
- Fowler, Robert. *Let the Reader Understand: Reader Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

- Funk, Robert W. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988.
- Gabel, John B., and Charles B. Wheeler. *The Bible as Literature: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hicks, Malcolm, and Bill Hutchings. *Literary Criticism: A Practical Guide for Students*. London/New York: Edward Arnold, 1989.
- Hill, Knox C. *Interpreting Literature: History, Drama and Fiction, Philosophy, Rhetoric*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Lategan, Bernard C. "Intertextuality and Social Transformation: Some Implications of the Family Concept in New Testament Texts." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Ed. Sipke Draisma, 105-16. Kampen: KOK, 1989.
- Lodge, David. *The Art of Fiction*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1993.
- Longacre, Robert E. "A Top-Down, Template-Driven Narrative Analysis Illustrated by Application to Mark's Gospel." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup, 170, 140-68. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Longman, Tremper. *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers, and Edgar K. McKnight, eds. *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. JSNTSup, 109. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

- McEvenue, Sean. *Interpretation and Bible: Essay on Truth in Literature*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1994.
- McKnight, V. Edgar. *The Bible and the Reader: An Introduction to Literary Criticism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship." *JBL* 91 (1972): 73-89.
- , "The Role of Context in the Understanding of Discourse." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup, 170, 20-27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Poland, L. M. *Literary Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics: A Critique of Formalist Approaches*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Powell, Mark Allen. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Ralph, Margaret Nutting. *And God Said What? An Introduction to Biblical Literary Forms for Bible Lovers*. New York: Paulist, 1986.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup, 170, 28-46. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- , "Discourse Analysis." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 189-217. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Reed, Walter L. *Dialogues of the World: The Bible as Literature According to Bakhtin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Forth Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

Robbins, Vernon K. "Historical, Rhetorical, Literary, Linguistic, Cultural and Artistic Intertextuality: A Response." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 291-303.

Ryan, Marie-Laure, and Ernest van Alphen. "Narratology." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, comp & ed. Irena R. Makaryk, 110-16. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Sanders James A. *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Schneiders, Sandra M. *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Segovia, Fernando F. "Introduction: Cultural Studies and Contemporary Biblical Criticism: Ideological Criticism as Mode of Discourse." In *Reading From This Place*. Vol. 2. *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective*, 1-17. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Segovia, Fernando F., and Mary Ann Tolbert, eds. *Reading From This Place*. Vol. 1. *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

-----, eds. *Reading From This Place*. Vol. 2. *Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Stoops, Robert F., ed. *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives*.

Semeia 80. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997.

-----, "Introduction: Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 1-10.

-----, "The Acts of Peter in Intertextual Context." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 57-86.

Sugirtharajah, R. S., ed. *Voices From the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.

Thomas, Christine M. "Canon and Antitype: The Relationship Between the Acts of Peter and the New Testament." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 185-205.

Valantasis, Richard. "The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The Acts of Thomas and Cultural Intertextuality." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 261-76.

Voelz, James W. "Multiple Signs and Double Texts: Elements of Intertextuality." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Ed. Sipke Draisma, 27-34. Kampen: Kok, 1989.

VIII. RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

Anderson, Bernhard W. "The New Frontier of Rhetorical Criticism." In *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Ed. Jared J. Jackson and Martin Kessler. PTMS, 1, ix-xviii. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick, 1974.

Baldwin, C. S. *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

-----, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400) Interpreted from Representative Works*. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

- Berger, Klaus. "Rhetorical Criticism, New Form Criticism, and New Testament Hermeneutics." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90, 390-96. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Problem of Rhetoric and Theology According to the Apostle Paul." In *L'apôtre Paul: Personnalité, style et conception du ministère*. Ed. A. Vanhoye. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 73, 6-48. Leuven: Peeters, 1987.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Boston: Bedford, 1990.
- Black, C. "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon." *HTR* 81 (1988): 1-18.
- Black, C. Clifton. "Keeping up with Recent Studies XVI: Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation." *ExpTim* 100 (1988 September): 252-58.
- , "Rhetorical Criticism." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Ed. Joel B. Green, 256-77. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1995.
- Bloomquist, L. Gregory. "Methodological Considerations in the Determination of the Social Context of Cynic Rhetorical Practice: Implications for Our Present Studies of the Jesus Traditions." In *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 146, 200-31. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996.

- , "The Rhetoric of the Historical Jesus." In *Whose Historical Jesus?* Ed. William E. Arnal and Michael Desjardins. *Studies in Christianity and Judaism*, 7, 98-117. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier, 1997.
- , "Ideological Texture." Lecture. Saint Paul University Ottawa, 1999.
- , "Methodological Criteria for the Determination of Apocalyptic Rhetoric: A Suggestion for the Expanded Use of Socio-Rhetoric Analysis." In *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetoric Dimensions of Early Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Discourse*. Ed. Greg Carey and L. Gregory Bloomquist, 181-203. St. Louis: Chalice, 1999.
- Botha, Jan. "How Do We 'Read the Context'?" *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 2 (1994): 291-307.
- Botha, Pieter J. J. "Greco-Roman Literacy as Setting for New Testament Writings." *Neotestamentica* 26, no. 1 (1992): 195-215.
- , "Moral Possibility and Narrative Rhetoric." *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 2 (1994): 495-510.
- Braet, A. C. "The Classical Doctrine of Status and the Rhetorical Theory of Argumentation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 20 (1987): 79-93.
- Braun, Willi. "Argumentation and the Problem of Authority: Synoptic Rhetoric of Pronouncement in Cultural Context." In *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. *JSNTSup*, 146, 185-99. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996.

- , "Socio-Rhetorical Interest: Context." In *Whose Historical Jesus?* Ed. William E. Arnal and Michael Desjardins. *Studies in Christianity and Judaism*. 7. 92-97. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier. 1997.
- , Review of *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*, by Vernon K. Robbins. *CBQ* 60, no. 2 (April 1998): 381-83.
- Brinton, A. "Situation in the Theory of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 14 (1981): 234-48.
- Brown P. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Curti Lectures. 1988. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1992.
- Bryant, D. C. "Rhetoric: Its Function and Its Scope." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 39 (1953): 401-24.
- Buchanan, G. W. "Chreias in the New Testament." In *Logia. Les paroles de Jésus--the Sayings of Jesus. Méorial Joseph Coppens*. Ed. J. Delobel. *BETL* 59. 501-05. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters and Leuven University Press. 1982.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Counter-Statement*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press. 1931.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1991.
- Carey, Greg, and L. Gregory Bloomquist, eds. *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetoric Dimensions of Early Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Discourse*. St. Louis: Chalice. 1999.

- Carter, M. F. "The Ritual Functions of Epideictic Rhetoric: The Case of Socrates' Funeral Oration." *Rhetorica* 9 (1991): 209-32.
- Combrink, H. J. B. "Multiple Meaning and/or Multiple Interpretation of a Text." *Neotestamentica* 18 (1984): 18-25.
- , "Readings, Readers and Authors: An Orientation." *Neotestamentica* 22 (1988): 189-204.
- Conley, Thomas M. "The Enthymeme in Perspective." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 168-87.
- Consigny, S. "Rhetoric and Its Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 7 (1974): 175-86.
- Cornelius, Elma M. "The Relevance of Ancient Rhetoric to Rhetorical Criticism." *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 2 (1994): 457-67.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. "Mapping the Textures of New Testament Criticism: A Response to Socio-Rhetorical Criticism." *JSNT* 70 (1998): 71-77.
- Dean, Margaret E. "Textured Criticism." Review of Vernon Robbins's Socio-Rhetorical Criticism. *JSNT* 70 (1998): 79-91.
- DeSilva, David Arthur. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SBLDS, 152. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- , "The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Honor, Shame, and the Maintenance of the Values of a Minority Culture." *CBQ* 58 (1996): 433-55.
- , "Worthy of His Kingdom: Honor Discourse and Social Engineering in 1 Thessalonians." *JSNT* 64 (1996): 49-79.

- , "Investigating Honor Discourse: Guidelines from Classical Rhetoricians." In *SBLSP*. 491-525. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997.
- , "Honor Discourse and the Rhetorical Strategy of the Apocalypse of John." *JSNT* 71 (1998): 79-110.
- , "The Persuasive Strategy of the Apocalypse: A Socio-Rhetorical Investigation of Revelation 14:6-13." *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 785-806.
- , *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1999.
- Dewey, Joanna. "Textuality in an Oral Culture: A Survey of the Pauline Traditions." *Semeia* 65 (1995): 37-65.
- Di Marco, Angelico-Salvatore. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic--On a Rhetorical Patterns: Chiasmus and Circularity." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. *JSNTSup*, 90, 479-91. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Du Toit, H. C. "What is a Colon?" *Neotestamentica (Addendum)* 11 (1977): 1-10.
- Eden, Kathy. *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Fiore, Benjamin. "NT Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 5, 715-19. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Fowler, Roger. *Literature as Social Discourse*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

- Gitay, Yehoshua. "Rhetorical Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticism and Their Application*. Ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. 135-49. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Goodwin, David. "Rhetorical Criticism." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Comp & ed. Irena R. Makaryk. 174-78. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Greenwood, D. "Rhetorical Criticism and Formgeschichte: Some Methodological Considerations." *JBL* 89 (1970): 418-26.
- Hansen, G. W. "Rhetorical Criticism." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid. 822-26. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Hens-Piazza, Gina. *Of Methods, Monarchs, and Meanings: A Sociorhetorical Approach to Exegesis*. Studies in Old Testament Interpretation, 3. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996.
- Jaffee, Martin S. "Figuring Early Rabbinic Literary Culture: Thoughts Occasioned by Boomershine and J. Dewey." *Semeia* 65 (1995): 67-73.
- Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- , *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition From Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- , *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1983.

- , *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- , Review of *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, by Vernon K. Robbins. *Rhetorica* 4, no. 1 (1986): 67-72.
- , *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- , *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Kessler, M. "A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism." *Semeia* 4 (1974): 22-36.
- Kolasny, Judette M. "An Example of Rhetorical Criticism: Luke 4:16-30." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Ed. Earl Richard, 67-77. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1990.
- Larson, R. L. "Lloyd Bitzer's 'Rhetorical Situation' and the Classification of Discourse: Problems and Implications." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 3 (1970): 165-68.
- Lategan, Bernard C. "Textual Space as Rhetorical Device." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90, 397-408. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Lyons, Campbell N. D. "From Persuasion to Subversion: A Review of Past and Current Trends in Defining Rhetoric." *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 2 (1994): 429-56.
- Lyons, J. *Language, Meaning and Context*. Suffolk: Fontana, 1981.
- Mack, Burton L. "Decoding the Scripture: Philo and the Rules of Rhetoric." In *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*. Ed. F.

- E. Greenspahn, E. Hilgert, and B. L. Mack. Scholars Press Homage Series 9. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.
- , "Anecdotes and Arguments: The Chreia in Antiquity and Early Christianity." *Occasional Papers* 10 (1987). Claremont, CA: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.
- , "Elaboration of the Chreia in the Hellenistic School." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 31-67. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.
- , "Teaching in Parables: Elaboration in Mark 4: 1-34." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 143-60. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.
- , *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Mack, Burton L., and E. N. O'Neil. "Hermogenes Progymnasmata." In *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*. Vol. 1, *The Progymnasmata*, by R. F. Hock and E. N. O'Neil. SBLTT 27, Greco-Roman Religion Series 9, 155-63. Atlanta: Scholar Press, 1986.
- Mack, Burton L., and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.
- Maier, Paul L. "Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark." Review of *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, by Vernon K. Robbins. *The Christian Century* 101 (1-8 August 1984): 753.
- Mailloux, Steven. *Rhetorical Power*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Majercik, Ruth. "Rhetoric and Oratory in the Greco-Roman World." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol.5, 710-12. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

- McDonald, J. I. H. "Rhetorical Criticism." In *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden. 599-600. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity. 1990.
- Melady, Margaret Badum. *The Rhetoric of Pope John Paul II: The Pastoral Visit as a New Vocabulary of the Sacred*. Westport, CN: Greenwood, 1999.
- Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *JBL* 88 (1969): 1-18.
- Newby, Gordon D. "Quranic Texture: A Review of Vernon Robbins's *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse and Exploring the Texture of Texts*." *JSNT* 70 (1998): 93-100.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Questions, Chreiai, and Challenges to Honor: The Interface of Rhetoric and Culture." *CBQ* 60, no. 4 (1998): 657-81.
- Olbricht, Erika Mae. "Acting on the Center: An Interview on Rhetoric and Hermeneutics with Thomas H. Olbricht in the Wake of *Hearing God's Voice*." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup. 180. 28-47. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 1999.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "Hebrews as Amplification." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90. 375-87. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 1993.
- , "Classical Rhetorical Criticism and Historical Reconstructions: A Critique." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*.

- Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup. 180. 108-24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Patrick, Dale, and Allen Scult. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*. Sheffield: Almond, 1990.
- , "Rhetoric and Ideology: A Debate Within Biblical Scholarship Over the Import of Persuasion." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup. 180. 63-83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Patton, J., and Vernon Robbins. "Rhetoric and Biblical Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980).
- Perelman, Chaim. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1982.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Introduction: The Heidelberg Papers in Perspective." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90, 21-26. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Thomas H. Olbricht, eds. *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. JSNTSup. 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- , eds. *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. JSNTSup. 146. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996.
- , "Introduction: The Malibu Conference and The Ongoing Debate." *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley

E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup. 180. 17-20. Sheffield, England:
Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Porter, Stanley E., and Dennis L. Stamps, eds. *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. JSNTSup. 180. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Robbins, Vernon K., ed. *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement*. *Semeia* 64. Atlanta, GA:
Scholars Press, 1993.

-----, "Last Meal: Preparation, Betrayal, and Absence (Mark 14:12-25)." In *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16*. Ed. Werner H. Kelber. 21-40. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

-----, "Chreia and Pronouncement Story in Synoptic Studies." In *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*. 1-30. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989.

-----, "A Socio-Rhetorical Response: Contexts of Interaction and Forms of Exhortation." *Semeia* 50 (1990): 261-71.

-----, "Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Ed. Duane F. Watson. 142-68. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

-----, "A Male Reads a Feminist Reading: The Dialogical Nature of Pippin's Power." *Semeia* 59 (1992): 211-17.

-----, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetoric Interpretation of Mark*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

- , "The Reversed Contextualization of Psalm 22 in the Markan Crucifixion: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis." In *The Four Gospels*. Ed. C. M. Tuckett, F. van Segbroeck, and G. van Belle. Festschrift Frans Neijnck, 2. 1161-83. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- , "Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Ed. Camille Focant. 111-47. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.
- , "Rhetoric and Culture: Exploring Types of Culture Rhetoric in a Text." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90, 443-63. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- , *New Boundaries in Old Territory: Forms and Social Rhetoric in Mark*. Ed. David B. Gowler. Emory Studies in Early Christianity, 3. New York/Bern, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994.
- , "Oral, Rhetorical, and Cultures: A Response." *Semeia* 65 (1995): 75-91.
- , *Exploring the Textures of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetoric Interpretation*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1996.
- , "Making Christian Culture in the Epistle of James." *Scriptura* 59 (1996): 341-51.
- , "The Dialectical Nature of Early Christian Discourse." *Scriptura* 59 (1996): 353-62.

- , "The Present and Future of Rhetorical Analysis." In *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 146, 24-52. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996.
- , *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. London/New York: Routledge, 1996.
- , "Socio-Rhetorical Hermeneutics and Commentary." In *EPI TO AYTO: Essays in Honour of Petr Pokorny*. Ed. J. Mrazek, R. Dvorakova, and S. Brodsky, 284-97. Praha-Trebenice: Mlyn Publishers, 1998.
- , Response to "Vernon Robbins's Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: A Review." *JSNT* 70 (1998): 101-07.
- , "Rhetorical Ritual: Apocalyptic Discourse in Mark 13." In *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetoric Dimensions of Early Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Discourse*. Ed. Greg Carey and L. Gregory Bloomquist, 95-121. St. Louis: Chalice, 1999.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure, and Ernest van Alphen. "Narratology." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*. Comp & ed. Irena R. Makaryk, 110-16. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in I Corinthians." *NTS* 33 (1987): 386-403.
- , *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Sisson, Russell B. *The Apostle as Athlete: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of I Corinthians 9*. PhD diss., Atlanta Emory University, 1994.

- Sloane, T. O. "Rhetoric: Rhetoric in Literature." In *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. 15th ed. 802-10. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 1975.
- Smit, D. J. "The Bible and Ethos in a New South Africa." *Scriptura* 37 (1991): 51-67.
- Snyman, A. H. "Style and the Rhetorical Situation of Romans 8:31-39." *NTS* 34 (1988): 218-231.
- , "Persuasion in Philippians 4:1-20." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90, 325-37. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Stamps, Dennis L. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualization of the Situation in the New Testament Epistles." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90, 193-210. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- , "Rhetorical and Narratological Criticism." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies. 219-39. New York: Brill, 1997.
- , "The Theological Rhetoric of the Pauline Epistles: Prolegomenon." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup. 180, 249-59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Swetnam, James. "Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*." Review of *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, by Vernon K. Robbins. *Biblica* 66 (1985): 136-39.

- Thuren, Lauri. "On Studying Ethical Argumentation and Persuasion in the New Testament." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90. 464-78. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Trible, Phyllis. *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- , *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Tyler, Stephen A. *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
- Vatz, R. E. "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973): 154-61.
- Vinson, Richard B. "A Comparative Study of the Use of Enthymemes in the Synoptic Gospels." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honour of George A. Kennedy*. Ed. Duane Frederick Watson. JSNTSup. 50. 119-41. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Vorster, Johannes N. "Strategies of Persuasion in Romans 1:16-17." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90. 152-70. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- , "The Epistemic Status of Rhetoric." *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 2 (1994): 469-93.
- Wachob, Wesley Hiram. *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetorical of James* [= "The Rich in Faith" and "the Poor in Spirit": The Socio-Rhetorical Function of a Saying of

Jesus in the Epistle of James. Phd. diss., Atlanta Emory University. 1993].

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Warner, Martin, ed. *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility.*

London/New York: Routledge, 1990.

Watson, Duane Frederick, ed. *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in*

Honour of George A. Kennedy. JSNTSup, 50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

-----, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and Its Implications for the Unity Question."

NovT 39 (1988): 57-88.

-----, "The New Testament and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: A Bibliography." *Journal of the*

Evangelical Theological Society 31 (1988): 465-72.

-----, "The New Testament and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: A Bibliographic Update." *Journal*

of the Evangelical Theological Society 33 (1990): 513-24.

-----, "Paul's Rhetorical Strategy in 1 Corinthians 15." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament:*

Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H.

Olbricht. JSNTSup, 90, 231-49. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

-----, "Vernon Robbins's Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: A Review." *JSNT* 70 (1998): 69-70.

-----, "The Contributions and Limitations of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Theory for

Constructing the Rhetorical and Historical Situations of a Pauline Epistle." In *The*

Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference.

Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. JSNTSup, 180, 125-51. Sheffield:

Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

- Watson, Duane Frederick, and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*. Biblical Interpretation Series 4. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Watson, Duane Frederick, and Vernon K. Robbins, eds. "Dialogue Between Vernon Robbins and the Reviewers." *JSNT* 70 (1998): 109-15.
- Wendland, E. R. "A Comparative Study of 'Rhetorical Criticism'. Ancient and Modern-- With Special Reference to the Larger Structure and Function of the Epistle to Jude." *Neotestamentica* 28, no. 1 (1994): 193-228.
- Wilder, Amos Niven. "Scholars, Theologians and Ancient Rhetoric." *JBL* 75 (1956): 1-11.
- , *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. "Since God is One: Rhetoric as Theology and History in Paul's Romans." In *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. JSNTSup. 109. 210-27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Wisse, J. *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1989.
- Witherington, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm H. "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *CBQ* 49 (1987): 448-63.
- , "Hermeneutics and Rhetoric: From 'Truth and Method' to 'Truth and Power'." *Scriptura* 35 (1989): 1-54.

- , "Rhetorical Criticism: Rhetorical Criticism and Its Theory in Culture-Critical Perspective: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11." In *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*. Ed. P. J. Hartin and J. H. Petzer. New Testament Tools and Studies 15. 171-85. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- , "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup. 90. 492-513. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Young, Frances. "Rhetoric." In *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden, 598-99. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1990.

IX. SOCIOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES

- Aasgaard, Reidar. "Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul: Its Role and Character." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. Ed. Halvor Moxnes, 166-82. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Abou-Zeid, Ahmed. "Honour and Shame Among the Bedouins of Egypt." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Ed. Jean G. Peristiany, 243-59. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Barclay, John M. G. "The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. Ed. Halvor Moxnes, 66-80. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.

- Barnard, Alan, and Jonathan Spencer, eds. *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Barton, Stephen C. "Paul and the Cross: A Sociological Approach." *Theology* 85 (1982): 13-19.
- , "Paul and the Resurrection: A Sociological Approach." *Religion* 14 (1984): 67-75.
- , "Social-Scientific Approaches to Paul." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid, 892-900. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- , *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew*. SNTSMS 80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- , "The Relativisation of Family Ties in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman Traditions." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. Ed. Halvor Moxnes, 81-100. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- , "Social-Scientific Criticism." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 277-89. New York: Brill, 1997.
- , "Sociology and Theology." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 459-72. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price. *Religions of Rome: A History*. Vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- , *Religions of Rome: A Sourcebook*. Vol 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- , *Ritual Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Benedum, Jost. "Griechische Arztinschriften aus Kos," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 25 (1977): 265-276.
- Bergant, Dianne. "An Anthropological Approach to Biblical Interpretation: The Passover Supper in Exodus 12:1-20 as a Case Study." *Semeia* 67 (1995): 43-62.
- Berger, Peter. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism." *Social Research* 21 (1954): 467-87.
- , *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of Sociological Theory of Religion*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969.
- Berger, Peter, and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.
- Ben-Sasson, H. H., ed. *A History of the Jewish People*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976; Hebrew ed. 1968.
- Best, Thomas F. "The Sociological Study of the New Testament: Promise or Peril of a New Discipline." *SJT* 36 (1983): 181-94.
- Betz, Hans Dieter, ed. *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

- Billerbeck, Margarethe. "The Ideal Cynic from Epictetus to Julian." In *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Ed. Robert Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Caze, 205-21. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Blok, Anton. "Rams and Bill-Goats: A Key to the Mediterranean Code of Honour." *Man* 16 (1981): 427-40.
- Bloomquist, L. Gregory, Norman Bonneau, and J. Kevin Coyle. "Prolegomena to a Sociological Study of Early Christianity." *Social Compass* 39, no. 2 (1992): 221-39.
- Robert, C. A. "The Role of Patron in the Cena Dominica of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition." *JTS* 44 (1993): 170-84.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society." Translated by Philip Sherrard. In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Ed. Jean G. Peristiany, 191-241. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Branham, Robert Bracht. "Defacing the Currency: Diogenes' Rhetoric and the Invention of Cynicism." In *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Ed. Robert Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Caze, 81-104. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Branham, Robert Bracht, and Marie-Odile Goulet-Caze, eds. *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Burke, Kenneth. *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

- Burke, Peter. *Sociology and History*. Controversies in Sociology 10. London/Boston: G. Allen & Unwin, 1980.
- Callahan, Allen Dwight, Richard A. Horsley, and Abraham Smith, eds. *Slavery in Text and Interpretation*. Semeia 83/84. 1998.
- Campbell, John K. *Honour, Family, and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1964.
- Carlton, Eric. *Ideology and Social Order*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Casalis, Georges. *Correct Idea Don't Fall from the Skies*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. 1984.
- Cole, Susan Guettel. "Temples and Sanctuaries: Greco-Roman." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 6, 380-82. New York: Doubleday. 1992.
- Craffert, Pieter F. "Towards an Interdisciplinary Definition of the Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament." *Neotestamentica* 25, no. 1 (1991): 123-44.
- , "More on Models and Muddles in the Social-Scientific Interpretation of the New Testament: The Sociological Fallacy Reconsidered." *Neotestamentica* 26, no. 1 (1992): 217-39.
- , "Relationships Between Social-Scientific, Literary, and Rhetorical Interpretation of Texts." *BTB* 26, no. 1 (1996): 45-55.
- Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution 1770-1823*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Davis, J. *People of the Mediterranean: An Essay in Comparative Social Anthropology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

De Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Dever, William G. "Temples and Sanctuaries: Syria and Palestine." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6, 376-80. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

De Villiers, P. G. R. "The Interpretation of a Text in the Light of Its Socio-Cultural Setting." *Neotestamentica* 18 (1984): 66-79.

Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore/London: John Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Douglas, Mary. *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.

Downing, F. Gerald. "The Social Contexts of Jesus the Teacher: Construction or Reconstruction." *NTS* 33 (1987): 439-51.

-----, "Hellenism." In *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden, 276-79. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1990.

-----, "Hellenistic Writers." In *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden, 279-80. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1990.

-----, *Cynics and Christian Origins*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992.

Dudley, Donald Reynolds. *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century Ad*. Chicago: Aries, 1980.

Duling, Dennis C. "Insights from Sociology for New Testament Christology: A Test Case." In *SBLSP*. Ed. Kent Harold Richard, 351-68. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Rules of Sociological Method and Selected Texts on Sociology and*

Its Method. Ed. Steven Lukes. Translated by W. D. Halls. New York: The Free Press, 1982.

Eddy, Samuel Kennedy. *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to*

Hellenism, 334-31 BC. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Edwards, O. C. "Sociology as a Tool for Interpreting the New Testament." *Anglican*

Theological Review 65 (1983): 431-46.

Einstadt, S., and L. Roniger. "Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social

Exchange." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (1980): 42-77.

-----, *Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in*

Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Ellens, G. F. S. "The Ranting Ranters: Reflections on a Ranting Counter-Culture." *CH* 40

(1971): 91-107.

Elliott, John Hall. *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

-----, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter: Its Situation and*

Strategy. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

-----, "The First Urban Christians by Wayne A. Meeks." Review of *The First Urban*

Christians, by Wayne A. Meeks. *Religious Studies Review* 11 (1985): 329-35

-----, "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Methods and Models."

Semeia 35 (1986): 1-33.

-----, "Patronage and Clientism in Early Christian Society: A Short Reading Guide." *Forum*

3/4 (1987): 39-48.

-----, "The Temple Versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey. 211-40. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

-----, "Disgraced Yet Graced: The Gospel According to I Peter in the Key of Honor and Shame." *BTB* 25, no. 4 (1995): 166-78.

Esler, Philip Francis. "Family Imagery and Christian Identity in Gal 5: 13 to 6:6: 10." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. Ed. Halvor Moxnes, 121-49. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.

Feeley-Harnik, Gillian. "Issues in Divine Kingship." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 14 (1985): 273-313.

Feeney, Denis. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Ferguson, E. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.

Fiensy, David A. *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 20. Lewiston: Mellen, 1991.

Filson, Floyd V. "The Significance of the Early House Churches." *JBL* 58 (1939): 105-12.

Flory, Marleen B. "The Deification of Roman Women." *The Ancient History Bulletin* 9, no. 3-4 (1995): 127-34.

Foster, G. "Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Goods." *American Anthropologist* 67 (1965): 296.

Foster, George M. "Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure of a Mexican Peasant Village." *American Anthropologist* 63 (1961): 1173-92.

Fuks, A. "Plato and the Social Question: The Problem of Poverty and Riches in the Republic." *Ancient Society* 8, no. 49-83 (1977).

Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of the Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1975.

-----, "Social Description and Sociological Explanation in the Study of Early Christianity: A Review Essay." *Rel Stud Rev* 5 (1979): 174-80.

-----, "Shall We Marry Our Enemies? Sociology and the New Testament." *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 256-65.

-----, "Social Description and Sociological Explanation in the Study of Early Christianity." In *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*. Ed. N. K. Gottwald, 428-40. New York: Orbis Books, 1983.

-----, "Culture as the Context for Meaning." A Review of *The New Testament World Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, by Bruce J. Malina. *Interpretation* 37 (1983): 194-97.

Garrett, Susan R. "Sociology of Early Christianity." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6, 89-99. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Geertz, Clifford. "Religion as a Cultural System." In *Reader in Comparative Religion: An Anthropological Approach*. Ed. William Lessa and Evon Vogt, 204-16. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

-----, *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

-----, *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Gellner, Ernest, and John Waterbury, eds. *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*.

London: Gerald Duckworth, 1977.

Gill, Robbin, ed. *Theology and Sociology. A Reader*. London/New York: G. Chapman.

1987.

Gilmore, David, ed. *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*. Special

Publication, 22. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1987.

Gordon, Milton M. "The Subsociety and the Subculture." In *Subcultures*. Ed. D. Arnold.

150-63. Berkeley: Glendessary, 1970.

Gorman, Frank H. "Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past: Prospects

for the Future." *Semeia* 67 (1995): 13-42.

Gouldner, Alvin W. *The Hellenistic World: A Sociological Analysis*. Part I of Enter Plato:

Classical Greece and the Origins of Social Theory. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

427-40; New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Goulet-Caze, Marie-Odile. "Le Cynisme à l'époque Impériale." In *ANRW*. Vol 2. 2720-

833. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990.

Guijarro, Santiago. "The Family in First-Century Galilee." In *Constructing Early Christian*

Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor. Ed. Halvor Moxnes, 42-65.

London/New York: Routledge, 1997.

Gutierrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. Revised

edition with Introduction. Translated and edited by Caridad Inda and John Eagleson.

Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988.

- Harrington, Daniel J. "Sociological Concepts and the Early Church: A Decade of Research." *TS* 41 (1980): 181-90.
- , "Second Testament Exegesis and the Social Sciences: A Bibliography." *BTB* 18 (1988): 77-85.
- Henslin, James M. *Down to Earth Sociology: Introductory Readings*. 9th. New York: The Free Press, 1997.
- Herzfeld, M. "Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems." *Man* 15 (1980): 339-51.
- Holmberg, Bengt. *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Horsley, Richard A. "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus, Their Principal Features and Social Origins." *JSNT* 26 (1986): 3-27.
- , *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- , "The Slave Systems of Classical Antiquity and Their Reluctant Recognition by Modern Scholars." *Semeia* 83/84 (1998): 19-66.
- Horsley, Richard A. and John S. Hanson. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs : Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. Harrisburg, PA : Trinity, 1999.
- Jacobsen, Jorunn. "A Matter of Urgency: A Response to "The Passover Supper in Exodus 12:1-20." *Semeia* 67 (1995): 63-71.
- John Paul II. "Letter Establishing the Pontifical Council for Culture." *L'Osservatore Romano*, no. 21-22 May (1982): 3. Rome.

- Johnson, Benton. "Sociological Theory and Religious Truth." *Sociological Analysis* 38 (1977): 368-88.
- Judge, Edwin A. *The Social Patterns of Christian Groups in the First Century*. London: Tyndale, 1960.
- , "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." *Journal of Religious History* 11 (1980): 201-17.
- Kee, Howard Clark. *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective*. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1980.
- , *Knowing the Truth: A Social Approach to New Testament Interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Kroeber, Alfred Louis and Clyde Kluckhohn. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.
- Krondorfer, Björn. "Re-Mythologizing Scriptural Authority: On Reading "Sacrifice and the Beginning of Kingship." *Semeia* 67 (1995): 93-107.
- Lassen, Eva Marie. "The Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. Ed. Halvor Moxnes. 103-20. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Lichtheim, George. "The Concept of Ideology." In *The Concept of Ideology and Other Essays*, 3-46. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. "Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Culture" ["Ehre und Schande in der griechischen Kultur", 1987]. In *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek*

Religion, and Miscellanea: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones. 253-80. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1990.

Long, Anthony A. "The Socratic Tradition:: Diogenes, Crates, and Hellenistic Ethics." In *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Ed. Robert Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Caze. 28-46. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1996.

MacIver, R. M. "The Family as Government in Miniature." In *The Imprint of Roman Institutions*. Ed. David W. Savage. 7-11. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1971.

Malherbe, A. J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1983.

Malina, Bruce J. "Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity by Gerd Theissen." Review of *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*, by Gerd Theissen. *CBQ* 41 (1979): 176-78.

-----, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Atlanta: John Knox. 1981.

-----, "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation." In *Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*. Ed. Norman K. Gottwald. 11-25. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. 1983.

-----, "The First Urban Christians by Wayne A. Meeks." Review of *The First Urban Christians*, by Wayne A. Meeks. *JBL* 104 (1985): 346-49.

-----, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation*. Atlanta: John Knox. 1986.

- , "'Religion" in the World of Paul: A Preliminary Sketch." *BTB* 16 (1986): 92-101.
- , "Patron and Client: The Analogy Behind Synoptic Theology." *Forum* 4, no. 1 (1988): 2-32.
- , "Christ and Time: Swiss or Mediterranean?" *CBQ* 51 (1989): 1-31.
- , "Reading Theory Perspective: Reading Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 3-23. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- , "Religion in the Imagined New Testament World: More Social Science Lenses." *Scriptura* 51 (1994): 1-26.
- , "Early Christian Groups: Using Small Groups Formation Theory to Explain Christian Organizations." In *Modeling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. Ed. Philip F. Esler, 96-113. London, UK: Routledge, 1995.
- , "Mediterranean Sacrifice: Dimensions of Domestic and Political Religion." *BTB* 26, no. 1 (1996): 26-44.
- , "Rhetorical Criticism and Social Scientific Criticism: Why Won't Romanticism Leave Us Alone?" In *Religion and Rhetoric: Second International Conference on Religion and Rhetoric*. Ed. Thomas Olbricht and Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- , Review of *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by David Arthur deSilva. *JBL* 116 (1997): 378-79.

- Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey. *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
- , "Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labeling and Deviance Theory." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 97-122. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- , "First-Century Personality: Dyadic, Not Individualistic." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 67-96. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- , "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 25-65. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Martin, Dale B. "Social-Scientific Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, 103-19. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Matthews, Keith J. "Archaeological Data, Subcultures and Social Dynamics." *Antiquity* 69, no. 264 (September 1995): 586-94.
- May, David M. *Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: A Bibliography*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1991.
- McVann, Mark. "Rituals of Status Transformation in Luke-Acts: The Case of Jesus the Prophet." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 333-60. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

-----, "Reading Mark Ritually: Honor-Shame and the Ritual of Baptism." *Semeia* 67 (1995): 179-98.

Meeks, Wayne A. "The Social Context of Pauline Theology." *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 266-77.

-----, *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

-----, "Understanding Early Christian Ethics." *JBL* 105 (1986): 3-11.

Meyers, Carol. "Temple: Jerusalem." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6. 350-69. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Monaghan, John, and Peter Just. *Social and Cultural Anthropology: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Moore, Stephen D., ed. *In Search of the Present: The Bible Through Cultural Studies*. SEMEIA. 82. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1998.

Morris, Brian. *Anthropological Studies of Religion: An Introductory Text*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Moxnes, Halvor. "Honor, Shame, and the Outside World in Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Ed. J. Neusner. 207-18. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

-----, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Interaction in Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

- , "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey. 241-68. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- , ed. *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- , "Introduction." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, 1-9. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- , "What is Family? Problems in Constructing Early Christian Families." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, 13-41. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Neusner, Joseph. ed. *The Social World Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Newsome, James D. *Greeks, Romans, Jews: Current of Culture and Belief in the New Testament World*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Preface." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ix-xviii. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- , "The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts: 'They Turn the World Upside Down'." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, 271-304. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
- Nodet, Etienne, and Justin Taylor. *The Origins of Christianity: An Exploration*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical, 1998.

- Oakman, Douglas E. "The Countryside in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 151-79. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* New York: Paulist, 1992.
- Osiek, Carolyn, and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. The Family, Religion, and Culture. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Peristiany, Jean G., ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- , "Introduction." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Ed. Jean G. Peristiany, 9-18. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- , "Honour and Shame in a Cypriot Highland Village." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, 171-90. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Pilch, John J. "Sickness and Healing in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey, 181-209. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- , Review of *Reading Sacred Texts Through American Eyes: Biblical Interpretation as Cultural Critique*, by Charles Mabee. *CBQ* 56 (1994): 116-17.

Pollini, J. "Man or god: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretation of Augustus and His Principate*. Ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher. 334-63. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1990.

Rawson, Beryl, ed. *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*. Canberra: Humanities Research Centre. 1991.

Richter, Philip J. "Recent Sociological Approaches to the Study of the New Testament." *Religion* 14 (1984): 77-90.

Robbins, Vernon K. "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey. 305-32. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 1991.

Roberts, Keith A. "Toward a Generic Concept of Counter-Culture." *Sociological Focus* 11 (1978): 111-26.

Robertson, John F. "Temples and Sanctuaries: Mesopotamia." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6, 372-76. New York: Doubleday. 1992.

Rodd, Cyril S. "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies." *JSOT* 19 (1981): 95-106.

Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "'Social Location of Thought' as a Heuristic Construct in New Testament Study." *JSNT* 30 (1987): 103-19.

-----, "The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Ed. Jerome Neyrey. 125-50. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 1991.

- Romm, James. "Dog Heads and Noble Savages: Cynicism Before the Cynics?" In *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Ed. Robert Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Caze. 121-35. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Rousseau, John J., and Rami Arav. *Jesus and His World: An Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary*. Foreword by James M. Robinson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Rowland, Christopher. "Reading the New Testament Sociologically: An Introduction." *Theology* 88 (1985): 358-64.
- Saller, Richard. "Familia, Domus, and the Roman Conception of the Family." *Phoenix* 38 (1984): 336-55.
- , "Corporal Punishment, Authority, and Obedience in the Roman Household." In *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*. Ed. Beryl Rawson. 144-65. Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 1991.
- , *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav. "Equality Within Patriarchal Structures: Some New Testament Perspectives on the Christian Fellowship as a Brother-or Sisterhood and a Family." In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. Ed. Halvor Moxnes, 150-65. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Scroggs, Robin. "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research." *NTS* 26 (1980): 164-79.

- Segal, Robert A. "The Social Sciences and the Truth of Religious Belief." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 48 (1980): 403-13.
- Searle, John R. *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: The Free Press, 1995.
- Senn, Frank C. *Christian Worship and Its Cultural Setting*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Shils, Edward. "The Concept and Function of Ideology." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 7, 66-75. New York: Macmillan and the Free Press, 1969.
- Shore, Bradd. *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Siertsema, B. "Language and World View." *The Bible Translator* 20, no. 1 (1969): 3-21.
- Smith, Dennis E., and Gene Schramm. "Meal Customs." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 4, 648-55. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "The Social Description of Early Christianity." *Religious Studies Review* 1 (1975): 19-25.
- Stambaugh, John E., and David L. Balch. *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*. Ed. Wayne A. Meeks. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Stein, M. "The Political and Social History of Judea Under Roman Rule." *A History of the Jewish People*. Ed. H. H. Ben-Sasson, 239-76. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976; Hebrew ed. 1968.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, CN: American Philological Association, 1931.

- Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Ed. & Translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- , "The First Urban Christians by Wayne A. Meeks." Review of *The First Urban Christians*. JR 65 (1985): 111-13.
- , *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Tiryakian, Edward A. "The First Urban Christians by Wayne A. Meeks." Review of *The First Urban Christians*. A. Meeks. *American Journal of Sociology* 90 (1985): 1138-40.
- Turcan, Robert. *The Cults of the Roman Empire*. Translated by Antonia Nevill. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992; French original 1989.
- Turner, Victor Witter. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Foreword by Roger D. Abrahams. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1969; reprint 1995.
- , "The Center Out There: Pilgrim's Goal." *History of Religions* 12, no. 3 (February 1973): 191-230.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- , "Houses and Households: Sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum." In *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*. Ed. Beryl Rawson. 191-227. Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 1991.
- Ward, William A. "Temples and Sanctuaries: Egypt." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6, 369-72. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Williams, James G. "Sacrifice and the Beginning of Kingship." *Semeia* 67 (1995): 73-92.

Williams, Rhys H. "Religion as Political Resource: Culture or Ideology." *The Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 35, no. 4 (December 1996): 368-78.

Wilson, Bryan R, ed. *Patterns of Sectarianism, Organisation and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements*. London: Heinemann, 1967.

-----, "A Typology of Sects in a Dynamic and Comparative Perspective." *Archives de Sociologie de Religion* 16 (1963): 49-63.

-----, "A Typology of Sects." In *Sociology of Religion*. Ed. Roland Robertson. 361-83. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969.

-----, *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*. London: Heinemann, 1973.

Worgul, George S. "Anthropological Consciousness and Biblical Theology." *BTB* 9 (1979): 3-12.

Yinger, J. Milton. "Counterculture and Subculture." *American Sociological Review* 25, no. 5 (October 1960): 625-35.

-----, *Countercultures: The Promise and Peril of a World Turned Upside Down*. New York: Free Press, 1982.

X. OTHER METHODS

Amit, Yairah. *History and Ideology: An Introduction to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible*. Translated by Yael Lotan. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Bailey, Randall C., and Tina Pippin, eds. *Race, Class, and the Politics of Bible Translation*. Semeia 76. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

- Bhabha, Homi K. "Postcolonial Criticism." In *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. S. Greenblatt and G. Gunn. 437-65. New York: Modern Language Association of America. 1992.
- Botha, Jan. "The Ethics of New Testament Interpretation." *Neotestamentica* 26, no. 1 (1992): 169-94.
- , *Subject to Whose Authority?* Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. 1994.
- Brown, Raymond E. *Biblical Exegesis and Church Doctrine*. New York/Ramsey: Paulist. 1981.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Is Exegesis Without Presuppositions Possible?" In *Existence and Faith*. Translated by Schubert M Ogden. New York: World. 1960.
- Burrows, Mark S., and Paul Rorem. *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 1991.
- Callaway, Mary C. "Canonical Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. 121-34. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox. 1993.
- Catchpole, David R. "Source, Form and Redaction Criticism of the New Testament." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 167-88. New York: Brill. 1997.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1984.
- Clines, David J. A. "Holistic Interpretation." In *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden. 292-95. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity. 1990.

- Corrington, Gail Paterson. "Redaction Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticism and Their Application*. Ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. 87-99. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox. 1993.
- Croatto, Severino. *Biblical Hermeneutics: Toward a Theory of Reading as the Production of Meaning*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. 1984.
- Cross, Edmond. *Theory and Practice of Sociocriticism*. Translated by Jerome Schwartz. Theory and History of Literature. Vol. 53. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1988.
- Demere, Patricial. *Women as Interpreters of the Bible*. New York: Paulist. 1992.
- Donahue, John R. "Redaction Criticism: Has the Hauptstrasse Become a Sackgasse?" In *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Ed. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. JSNTSup, 109. 27-57. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 1994.
- Draisma, Sipke, ed. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Kampen: KOK, 1989.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. 8th Impression. London/New York: Verso. 1975.
- , "Literature and History." In *Contexts for Criticism*. Ed. Donald Keesey. 41. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield. 1987.
- , *The Significance of Theory*. The Bucknell Lectures in Literary Theory. Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- , *Ideology: An Introduction*. New York: Verso. 1991.

- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 45-97. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Life of Jesus." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 427-75. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Fabella, Virginia, and Mercy Amba Oduyoye, eds. *With Passion and Compassion: Third Women Doing Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988.
- Fee, D. Gordon. *New Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. Rev ed. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Felder, Hope Cain, ed. *Stony the Road We Trod: African American Biblical Interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Fewell, Danna Noland. "Reading the Bible Ideologically: Feminist Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticism and Their Application*. Ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, 237-51. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Scripture & Christology: A Statement of the Biblical Commission with a Commentary*. New York: Paulist, 1986.
- Froehlich, Karlfried. Ed. & Trans. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Revised and edited by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall 2d. rev ed. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

- Gill, David J. "The Roman Empire as a Context for the New Testament." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 389-406. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Gottwald, Norman K., and Richard A. Horsley, eds. *The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993.
- Grant, Robert M., and David Tracy. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Green, Joel B., ed. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1995.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Biblical Hermeneutics in Recent Discussion: New Testament." In *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. McKim Donald K., 13-20. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Harrisville, Roy A., and Walter Sundbery. *The Bible in Modern Culture: Theology and Historical-Critical Method from Spinoza to Kasemann*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Hartin, P. J. "Methodological Principles in Interpreting the Relevance of the New Testament in South Africa." *Scriptura* 37 (1991): 1-16.
- Hartin, P. J. and J. H. Petzer, eds. *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies 12. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Hayes, John H., and Carl R. Holladay. *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook*. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox, 1987.

- Hirsch, E. D. *The Aims of Interpretation*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Hodge, Robert, and Gunther Kress. *Social Semiotics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Jeanron, Werner G. *Text and Interpretation as Categories of Theological Thinking*. Translated by Thomas J. Wilson. New York: Crossroad, 1988.
- Jones, Gareth. Review of *Theology, Ideology and Liberation: Towards a Liberative Theology*, by Peter Scott. *JTS* 48, no. 1: 369-71.
- Keegan, Terrance J. *Interpreting the Bible: A Popular Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*. New York: Paulist, 1986.
- Krentz, E. *The Historical-Critical Method*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Kugel, James L., and Rowan A. Greer. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Lategan, Bernard C. "Current Issues in the Hermeneutical Debate." *Neotestamentica* 18 (1984): 1-17.
- , "Introducing a Research Project on Contextual Hermeneutics." *Scriptura* 33 (1990): 1-5.
- , "Hermeneutics." In *ABD*. Ed. David Noel Freedman. Vol. 3, 149-54. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Marshall, I. Howard, ed. *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1979.

- Mason, Rex. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis." In *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden. 312-14. London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity. 1990.
- McGovern, Arthur F. *Liberation Theology and Its Critics: Toward an Assessment*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. 1990.
- , Review of *Theology, Ideology and Liberation: Towards a Liberative Theology*, by Peter Scott. JTS 56, no. 4 (December 1995): 804-05.
- McKenzie, L. Steven, and Stephen R. Haynes, eds. *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticism And Their Application*. Louisville, KY: Westminster. 1993.
- McKim, Donald K., ed. *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 1986.
- , "Introduction." In *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. McKim Donald K., xiii-xviii. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 1986.
- McKnight, V. Edgar. *What is Form Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress. 1969.
- Mercer, Calvin. "Anthony C. Thiselton, New Horizons in Hermeneutics." Review of New Horizons in Hermeneutics, by Anthony C. Thiselton. *CBQ* 56 (1994): 158-60.
- Meyer, Ben F. *Reality and Illusion in New Testament Scholarship: A Primer in Critical Realist Hermeneutics*. Collegeville, Mn: The Liturgical. 1994.
- Morgan, Donn F. *Between Text and Community: The "Writings" in Canonical Interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress. 1990.

- Morgan, Robert, and John Barton. *Biblical Interpretation*. The Oxford Bible Series. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Nations, A. "Historical Criticism and the Current Methodological Crisis." *SJT* 36 (1983): 59-71.
- Neuhaus, John Richard, ed. *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis: The Ratzinger Conference on the Bible and Church*. Encounter Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. *Paul, In Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
- Nida, Eugene. A. and C. R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991.
- Penchansky, David. "W. Randolph Tate, *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*." *Review of Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*, by W. Randolph Tate. *CBQ* 56 (1994): 127-29.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Pipp, Tina. "Ideological Criticisms, Liberation Criticisms, and Womanist and Feminist Criticisms." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 267-75. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Rowland, Christopher, and Mark Corner. *Liberating Exegesis: The Challenge of Liberation Theology to Biblical Studies*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1989.

- Russell, Letty M., ed. *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
- Sanders, James A. *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Contemporary Biblical Scholarship: Its Roots, Present Understandings, and Future Directions." In *Contemporary Biblical Scholarship: Its Impact on Theology and Proclamation*. Ed. Francis A. Eigo, 1-36. Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1984.
- , *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- , *Bread not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Interpretation*. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1984.
- , "The Ethics of Interpretation: De-Centering Biblical Scholarship." *JBL* 107, no. 1 (1988): 3-17.
- , *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston, MA: Beacon, 1992.
- , *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ekklesia-Logy of Liberation*. New York: Crossroad, 1993.
- , *Jesus Miriam's Child, Sophia's Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology*. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- Scott, Peter. *Theology, Ideology and Liberation: Towards a Liberative Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

- Silva, Moisés, ed. *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation: Six Volumes in One*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Smit, D. J. "The Ethics of Interpretation: New Voices from the U. S. A." *Scriptura* 33 (1990): 16-28.
- , "The Ethics of Interpretation-and South Africa." *Scriptura* 33 (1990): 29-43.
- Sobrinho, Jon. *Jesus the Liberator: A Historical-Theological View*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Stein, Robert H. "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?" *JBL* 88 (1969): 45-56.
- , *Gospels and Tradition: Studies on Redaction Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1991.
- Sterling, Gregory E. "Hellenistic Philosophy and the New Testament." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 313-58. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Stock, Augustine. "The Limits of Historical-Critical Exegesis." *BTB* 13, no. 1 (1983): 28-31.
- Tate, Randolph W. *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- The Pontifical Biblical Commission. *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*. Sherbrooke, QC: Editions Paulines, 1994.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation." In *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Ed. I. Howard Marshall, 75-104. Exeter: Paternoster, 1979.

- , *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description*. Foreword by J. B. Torrance. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- , "Hermeneutics and Theology: The Legitimacy and Necessity of Hermeneutics." In *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. McKim Donald K., 142-71. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.
- , "The New Hermeneutic." In *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. McKim Donald K., 78-107. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitation of Textual Rules." *HTR* 75, no. 4 (1982): 429-48.
- Trebilco, Paul R. "Jewish Backgrounds." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 359-88. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Tucket, Christopher M. "The Synoptic Gospels and Acts." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Tools and Studies, 477-502. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Vogels, Walter. *Interpreting Scripture in the Third Millennium*. Novalis Theological Series. Ottawa: Novalis, 1993.
- Vorster, Willem. "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Ed. Sipke Draisma, 15-26. Kampen: Kok, 1989.

Wenham, John. *A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem: Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992.

White, Leland J. "Historical and Literary Criticism: A Theological Response." *BTB* 13, no. 1 (1983): 32-34.

Wittig, Susan. "A Theory of Multiple Meanings." *Semeia* 9 (1977): 75-101.

Wood, Charles M. "Theological Hermeneutics." *Quarterly Review* 7, no. 3 (1987): 91-100.

XI. AFRICAN STUDIES

Abimbola, Wande. *Ifá: An Exposition of Ifá Literary Corpus*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Ajayi, Bade. *Ifá Divination: Its Practice Among the Yoruba of Nigeria*. Ilorin: Unilorin Press, 1996.

Awolalu, J. Omosade. *Yoruba Beliefs and Sacrificial Rites*. Burnt Mill, Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1979.

Courlander, Harold. *A Treasury of African Folklore*. New York: Marlowe and Co. 1996.

Daramola, Olu, and Adebayo Jeje. *Awon asa ati orisa ile Yoruba [Yoruba Culture and Deities]*. Ibadan: Onibon-Oje, 1967.

Delano, Isaac O. *Owe L'eshin oron: Yoruba Proverbs, Their Meaning and Usage*. Ibadan: University Press, 1979.

Idowu, E. Bọlaji. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1963.

-----, *African Traditional Religion: A Definition*. London: SCM, 1973.

Milingo, Emmanuel. *The World in Between: Christian Healing and the Struggle for Spiritual Survival*. Ed. Mona Macmillan. New York: Orbis Books, 1984.

Onaiyekan, John. *The Priesthood Among the Owe-Yoruba of Nigeria and in Pre-Monarchical Ancient Israel: A Comparative Study*. STD diss. Pontificia Universitas Urbaniana, Rome, 1975.

XII. COMPUTER SOFTWARES

BibleWorks for Windows Ver. 3.5. Big Fork, Montana: Hermeneutika Bible Research Software, 1996.

BibleWorks for Windows Ver. 4. Big Fork, Montana: Hermeneutika Bible Research Software, 1999.

Microsoft Excel 2000. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 1999.

Microsoft Word 2000. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 1999.

Microsoft Encarta Reference Suite 2001. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2001.

Nota Bene for DOS Ver. 4.5. New York, NY: Nota Bene Associates 1994.

Nota Bene for Windows: Lingua Workstation Ver. 5.1. New York, NY: Nota Bene Associates, 2000.

OmniPage Pro Ver. 10. Gatos, CA: Caere Corporation, 1999.

OmniPage Pro Ver. 9.0. Gatos, CA: Caere Corporation, 1998.