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“Behold, Your House Is Left to You”: The Theological and Narrative Place of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke’s Gospel (and Beyond)
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This study examines the place of Jerusalem and its Temple within Luke’s Gospel, arguing, in Part One, that Luke’s treatment of these related entities must be explored and understood against the broader horizon of Luke’s use of Scripture, his rhetorical milieu, and his theological context. Attending to Luke’s rhetorical context indicates sensitivity to what is termed here “subtle communication,” especially via double-meanings and use of allusion (intertextuality). Placed within Luke’s theological context, the recent destruction of Jerusalem confronted Luke (along with other late-first-century readers of Israel’s Scripture) as above all a problem of theodicy: how to defend God in the face of Jerusalem’s utter devastation. In surveying previous literature on this topic, this study notes two frequent failures: to give Luke full credit as a theologian, as well as to account properly for the narrative shape of his Gospel. Attempting in Part Two to remedy these common shortcomings, this study undertakes a reassessment of the place of Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s Gospel, analyzing crucial scenes within the Gospel in light of the Gospel’s overall narrative flow. This analysis yields a portrait of the Jerusalem
Temple in Luke’s Gospel that is complex, multi-fold, and coherent, one comprised of four interwoven strands constituting an engaging theological response to the pressing theodical concerns of his day. These strands are: 1) an interpretation of Jerusalem along the lines of Shiloh, the rejected one-time holy place of God; 2) an emphasis on the Temple’s role in disclosing Jesus’ identity, logically coupled with a narratival shift away from the Jerusalem Temple as a sacerdotal cultic site, begun with Jesus’ (and to a lesser degree John’s) arrival, and culminating at the cross; 3) an identification of Jesus as a prophet, indeed as the greatest of the prophets, vis-à-vis, and thus in conflict with, the city now described as murderer of the prophets; and 4) an appeal to a spectrum of (mostly prophetic) scriptures that depict God’s judging his people, especially the Jerusalem authorities, for their wickedness. It concludes with a brief treatment of Acts.
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PART ONE

Introduction to This Study

Francis Weinert has noted that although there has been “vast scholarly effort” to reexamine Luke’s contribution to early Christian theology since Conzelmann’s groundbreaking Die Mitte der Zeit, “at least one key Lucan theme still awaits thorough reassessment,” namely, “the role of the Temple” in Luke’s writings.  Although Weinert made this observation more than 30 years ago, the role of the Temple—and Jerusalem with it—in the Lukan writings remains a subject in need of reassessment. This is all the more surprising given that Luke references Jerusalem roughly twice as much as the rest of the NT combined and, moreover, that roughly one-sixth of Luke and Acts either occurs within or discusses the fate of the Jerusalem Temple! The need for reassessment does not arise, however, from lack of scholarly attention, as I will discuss shortly.

Here I propose, then, to reassess the role of Jerusalem and the Jerusalem Temple (JT) in Luke’s writing, especially his Gospel, and to do so:

---


1) by accounting for an underutilized yet important aspect of Luke’s context, namely, ancient theodicy,

2) through use of a critical perspective that has been underemployed in many previous pursuits of this question, narrative criticism, and

3) by attending to Luke’s pervasive and complex reliance on and use of the Jewish Scriptures throughout his Gospel.

Before taking up this challenge (Part 2), however, I must first assess recent scholarship on Luke and the JT (ch. 1) and then subsequently clarify my method for reading Luke’s writings (ch. 2), as well as the theodical context in which Luke wrote (ch. 3).

In reviewing scholarship on this question, I will demonstrate that many scholars have assessed Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s writings not as a pressing theological and scriptural problem—as I believe it was for Luke and at least some members of Luke’s audience—but primarily as a matter of Luke’s personal preference and opinion.

In drawing this distinction, I acknowledge that the opinions and preferences of the author of Luke and Acts play an important role in his presentation of Jerusalem and its Temple. These opinions and preferences are, however, significantly filtered through the theological and scriptural problem raised by the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. To

---

4 To illustrate this distinction, it is helpful to consider a phrase made common-place since Conzelmann’s groundbreaking work: Luke the Theologian. This phrase of course points to the (relatively late) scholarly appreciation of Luke as an independent and thoughtful sculptor of the texts attributed to him. In traditional consideration of Luke and the Jerusalem Temple, the dominant frame for examining the question (“view/attitude/perspective”) understands Luke to be a “theologian” only in the most generic, and least descriptive, of senses: “Luke as theologian” simply means here that Luke has an agenda or perspective which he inserts into the text as he retells the story of Jesus and the early church. Luke, within this understanding, differs little from an opinionated blogger relating the latest news story with his or her own peculiar spin on the facts. Against that, what I am arguing for here is, in part, a greater appreciation of the precise sense is which Luke is a “theologian,” one in line with Luke’s deep knowledge of and concern for the Jewish Scriptures, as well as one which takes seriously the fact that Luke takes seriously what he perceives to be the faithfulness of Israel’s God to God’s promises—a theme abundantly on display in Luke’s writings. Therefore, the distinction I am arguing for here should not be understood to mean the
reduce the question to a matter of a single, supposed perspective—in which Luke has either a “positive” or a “negative” (or, less often yet more helpfully, an “ambivalent”) attitude toward these institutions—is simply short-sighted. Given that Luke is indeed a theologian, before answering the question of Luke’s “attitude” or “perspective” on these matters, we must first attend to the place he gives these institutions within his own theological landscape. In subsequent chapters, I will attempt to demonstrate that this landscape is far richer and more varied than many have supposed.

Other commentators have approached the subject with greater attentiveness to Luke’s theological and scriptural sensibilities but have nonetheless failed to place the question of the Jerusalem Temple in the Lukan writings in the crucial context of post-70 C.E. theodicy. Yet, if we are to assess the place of Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s writings, we must ask why it is that Luke gives these Jewish artifices such great prominence in the first place, and the answer lies, I will suggest, in the theodical problem—keenly felt by so many of Luke’s contemporaries—of Jerusalem’s destruction at Roman hands in 70 C.E. Understanding the nature of the problem also sheds light on the nature of Luke’s solution. Faced with a theological and scriptural problem (see ch. 3),

frame through which I am approaching the Jerusalem Temple in Luke and Acts is, unlike previous attempts, somehow other than or outside of the ancient author’s own perspective. Rather, it is simply a more nuanced and helpful frame—though one of course ultimately filtered through Luke’s own biases and opinions—and one that places Luke’s “attitude” or “perspective” in crucial post-70 C.E. context.

Luke gives, true to Lukan form, a theological and scriptural answer, as well as—to return to my primary point here—an answer not merely conditioned by his own biases, as such.

Another factor that I will attend to in surveying literature on the subject centers on the fact that discussion of Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke’s writings has frequently been marred by attempts to dig beneath the known text forms of Luke’s writings in order to unearth putative Lukan sources. This is often done with utter and, to my mind, unreasonable dismissal of the likelihood that Luke was actually in significant agreement with the views of whatever sources he chose to include, or else that he took considerable (and presumably successful) efforts to remove views quite at odds with his own.

Finally, in the following review of scholarship (ch. 1), I will make no formal separation between works assessing Jerusalem and works assessing the JT in Luke’s writings, beyond noting which is specifically being addressed by a given work. My reasons for doing so are two-fold and complementary. First of all, my own conclusion is that, while the two entities admit a certain degree of differentiability within the Lukan world, especially spatially—e.g., Jesus or the disciples can be in Jerusalem without being in the Temple—in terms of their ultimate fate and their chief significance for Luke, the two are inextricably linked, perhaps indeed to the point of being essentially coextensive. ¹

Strong evidence for their inseparability has been presented by a number of the scholars whose works I will review, including Bachmann and Brawley. Secondly, I have not

¹ By “chief significance” here, I mean that Jerusalem and the Temple stand together as theologically significant and inter-connected entities, especially as partially coterminous physical location(s) in which God dwells and/or with which God has chosen to associate the divine name and divine presence both in the Jewish Scriptures and in the minds of many Second Temple Jews (see my discussion of Baltzer below).  Contra Walker, Jesus and the Holy City, 60.

With these preliminary comments complete, I begin my journey through previous studies on Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s writings.
CHAPTER ONE


Luke and the Jerusalem Temple: History of Research

A crucial early work on Luke and the Jerusalem Temple is an article by Old Testament scholar Klaus Baltzer. Baltzer begins by discussing the functions of the Temple in the Jewish Scriptures. From there, he asks, “How is the significance and meaning of the Temple expressed and accounted for theologically?”\(^1\) In answering this question, Baltzer notes “a plurality of theological concepts which existed simultaneously and which influenced each other”: 1) that God actually dwells in the Temple; 2) that the Temple is the dwelling place of God’s Name, the “guarantee” of God’s “real presence”; 3) that the Temple is the place of the appearance of YHWH’s \textit{kabod}.\(^2\) Baltzer also draws attention to Ezek 8–11, in which God’s \textit{kabod} leaves the Temple because of its contamination by foreign cults and goes to the Mount of Olives (11:23). Baltzer then notes Ezek 43 in which God’s presence re-enters the Temple, inaugurating the time of salvation.\(^3\) He goes on to note other OT texts in which God’s return to, or else the rebuilding of, the Temple is linked to salvation. Baltzer follows this connection between


salvation and God’s presence in the JT into Second Temple texts (viz. *Enoch* 90) and notes the eventual interchangeability of *kabod* and *shekinah* in many texts.

After a brief examination of early Christian trajectories, Baltzer turns to Luke. Baltzer’s analysis of Luke offers promising insight, especially as he avoids treating the JT in Luke as a mere matter of authorial preference; rather, “it may be that Luke pays more theological attention to the Temple” than some might suppose.⁴ He points to the central role— spatially, if not otherwise— of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke 1–2, as well as Luke’s placing the Temple temptation as third in the series (versus second in Matthew), likely to emphasize it. Where Baltzer digs in is with Jesus’ statement about Jerusalem’s desolate house in Luke 13:31–35. He takes οἶκος as a reference to the Temple itself, linking this to the reference to the Temple as בּית in Ezek 10:18. The meaning of the threat, then, is the withdrawal of the divine presence from the Temple.⁵ Baltzer strengthens this interpretation by noting that in the verses preceding the threat of the desolate house, the Pharisees tell Jesus to leave because Herod seeks his death. Put simply, “when Jesus is invited to leave, salvation leaves with him.” Baltzer then turns to Luke’s so-called “Triumphal Entry,” which he reads, following Conzelmann, in two stages: the first stage is Jesus’ triumphal pseudo-entry, in which he does not in fact enter the city, made clear through Luke’s careful editing of Mark’s location indicators; and the second stage— separated from the first by “the scene of acclamation on the Mount of Olives” (19:39–44)—Jesus’ clearing of the Temple.⁶ Baltzer then asserts a connection

---

between Jesus’ descent from the Mount of Olives to clear and then teach in the Temple and the return of the divine kabod in Ezekiel such that “Jesus and the kabod are connected” and only when Jesus is in the Temple is the Temple truly the Temple. 7 From here Baltzer adduces a number of Lukan texts that establish a connection between Jesus and the kabod—or, as he shifts to, doxa—especially the Transfiguration (Luke 9) and the Ascension (Acts 1). After suggesting several “related problems” that “should be reconsidered in view of our thesis,” including Stephen’s speech and the closing of Acts with a scene from Isaiah’s throne vision, Baltzer clarifies the relationship between Jesus and the divine presence: “because Christ, kabod/doxa, and spirit are related,” “Christ is the presence of God.”8

Baltzer’s bold thesis gains commendation from his attention to Jewish, and especially scriptural, understandings of the Temple as well as to potential intertextual influences on Luke’s divergences from the Gospel of Mark, although it is potentially weakened by the apparently insignificant place given to Ezekiel elsewhere in Luke’s writings.9 His insights will continue to inform my interpretation as this monograph proceeds.

In *No Stone on Another*, a formidable monograph assessing the significance of Jerusalem’s destruction for the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, Lloyd Gaston expends considerable energies attempting to unravel the tangled strands of data in the Lukan writings, doing so especially in chapter 4 (“The Fall of Jerusalem as a Political Event in Luke-Acts”), which is roughly the length of a small monograph. Unfortunately, much of Gaston’s discussion is limited by now-antiquated methods and assumptions, including, most problematically, his elaborate reconstruction of so-called “Proto-Luke,” along with the Proto-Luke Palestinian community, coupled with his assumption that Luke would have blindly incorporated large swaths of materials and text from this source that not only held significance neither for Luke nor for his ideal audience but which were also sometimes blatantly divergent from Luke’s own positions.

Gaston’s posited Proto-Luke remains informative in at least one regard, however: Gaston employs this supposed document from the early Palestinian church largely in order to explain the many passages which show deep concern for Israel and Jerusalem in this supposedly “Gentile” Gospel. Thus Luke’s “more conciliatory approach” toward the temple cult vis-à-vis those of Mark and Matthew stems from Luke’s retaining the

37) toward the city (ὡς ἠγγίσεν Ἰδοὺ τήν πόλιν; v. 41) and finally into the temple (καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ ἱερόν; v. 45). In fact, Baltzer’s argument for an Ezekiel-informed reading of Jesus as the divine presence in Luke 19 rests on Luke’s rearrangement of Mark such that Jesus enters the city only after the “so-called” Triumphal Entry, as well as on the fact that the disciples’ hymn of praise occurs at precisely the moment Jesus begins to descend the mountain (“The Meaning of the Temple,” 275). Chance’s third criticism betrays a misunderstanding of Baltzer’s argument; the claim that Jesus “validates” the cult springs not from Baltzer but is rather Chance’s own dubious inference from Baltzer’s thesis that Luke equates Jesus with the presence of God.


impressions of earlier and Palestinian Christian groups. Gaston also argues that the Lukan writings differentiate between the Temple proper (ναός) and the temple mount (ἱερόν), with little concern for the former. Luke’s neglect of the ναός is in line with his overall presentation of the temple not as a (sacerdotal) cultic center but as a place of prayer and proclamation, and “the temple mount is seen in Luke-Acts in a very positive but distinctively non-cultic sense.” Gaston seems to indicate the Temple figures positively in Luke’s writings primarily because of the necessity of fulfilling the prophecies which placed Jerusalem at the center of God’s redemptive work. Strangely, Gaston believes his own conclusion about Luke’s non-cultic interest in the Temple to leave Baltzer’s “interesting study” instead “rather up in the air,” whereas it may in fact complement Baltzer’s thesis: Luke may present the Temple in a primarily non-cultic way, especially following the Zechariah-Gabriel scene (see Taylor below), in order to highlight the absence of the divine presence from the Temple following the arrival of Jesus.

Michael Bachmann’s Jerusalem und der Tempel is a weighty and imposing contribution to the question at hand. In the early-going of the monograph, Bachmann labors to show the extent to which both the Temple (chs. 1, 3) and Judea itself (ch. 2) are effectively identified with Jerusalem within the Lukan theological landscape.

---

12 See Gaston, No Stone, 100–01.


14 Gaston (No Stone, 367) cites a quote from Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, to this effect but then seems to challenge at least part of Gerhardsson’s claim, leaving some ambiguity as to his own position.


16 On the close association of Jerusalem and the JT within Lukan thought, see, e.g., Bachmann, Jerusalem und der Tempel, 136.
Bachmann also insightfully notes the connection, sometimes simply implied by Luke’s narrative, between the JT and the Sanhedrin, going so far as to indicate the Sanhedrin as the ruling party of the Temple and thus as the controlling power of Jerusalem and therefore in some sense of Judea as well (see Luke 19:47; 20:1; 24:20; Acts 4:1; 5:24, 26). Bachmann sees the JT as having many meaningful purposes within the Lukan world—prayer, teaching, pilgrimage, law-observance (discussed in ch. 4 of his study)—but he acknowledges that this function extends only to Jews (including Christian Jews) and not to Gentiles (hence the curtailed citation of Isaiah in Luke 19:46). Bachmann does not reduce Luke’s treatment of the Temple to a simple exploration of Luke’s general “perception” of the JT but rather attempts to unravel Luke’s complex presentation of this central Jewish institution.

Although Bachmann often proceeds on the basis of word studies, he is attentive to the overarching narrative dynamics of Luke’s works. Thus he notes the structural similarities—and putatively chiastic structure—of Luke 1:5–2:52, 19:45–24, and Acts 1–8:3, 21:15–23:32. Even so, Bachmann does not pay sufficient attention to the place of the Jerusalem cult within the flow of Luke’s narrative. Bachmann claims on the basis of the Zechariah scene in Luke 1 that Luke is remarkable for leaving so significant a cultic dimension to the JT, and when he proceeds to discuss the role of the cult within Luke’s writings, he proceeds by a topical analysis which generally hinders appreciation for

---


18 Bachmann, Jerusalem und der Tempel, 177, 179–80. Showing some sensitivity to the unfolding Lukan drama is his comment that Luke recognizes the central cultic status of the JT within Judaism at least, a fact which entails “eine wichtige Voraussetzung für die in den lukanische Schriften noch zu schildernden Ereignisse zu klären” (Jerusalem und der Tempel, 186).
thematic or theological movement within Luke’s narrative itself. Thus there is room for adding to as well as revising the picture he offers of the cult in Luke’s writings. Also, Bachmann seems to find little light to be shed on the subject by examination of Luke’s use of the LXX, although he does explore Lukian intratextuality at considerable length (especially the chiasm noted above and similarities between Acts’ presentation of Stephen’s and Paul’s accusations in Jerusalem).

First in his unpublished dissertation and then in several subsequent articles, Francis Weinert has offered what is for some a powerful and compelling voice on the question at hand and as such must be dealt with at some length. Weinert argues forcefully that Luke evinces a decidedly positive attitude toward the Temple in his writings. In making his case, Weinert casts himself as one fighting against an interpretive bias long overdue for rebutting, namely, the “widespread presumption” that Luke maintains a critical attitude toward the Temple. Against this alleged consensus, Weinert notes that “the vast majority” of the 60 or so references to the Temple in Luke’s writings are positive or neutral. Weinert highlights many of these positive references to the Temple in the Lukan corpus, presenting them in their best possible light, and also

---

19 Thus he groups his discussion of the Temple (ch. 4) under the headings of the Temple’s “official” (cultic officials and Sanhedrin) and “unofficial” (teaching, pilgrimages, offerings, prayer) capacities within Luke’s writings. Though employing helpful categories, by structuring the discussion in this manner, Bachmann does not optimize the potential for rendering exegetical insights on the basis of the flow of the narrative itself (which is treated as relatively static).


makes much of Luke’s redaction of Mark. These Lukan distinctives reveal the JT to be a place of prayer and devotion and a place that “remains worthy of Christian respect.”

But Weinert knows that the real rub for his thesis are those passages in Luke’s writings that seem clearly to criticize the Temple, which are, by Weinert’s count: 4 in the Gospel (the “desolate house” pronouncement in 13:34-35, the clearing of the Temple in 19:45-46, the foretelling of the Temple’s destruction in 21:5-7, and the tearing of the Temple veil in 23:45), and 3 in Acts (Paul’s Areopagus Speech, Stephen’s Speech, and the claim that Stephen rejects the Temple in Acts 6:13-14).

Even so, Weinert himself cues in on two scenes as particularly damning: Stephen’s Speech (Acts 7) and Jesus’ saying about the desolate house (Luke 13:34-35). Weinert gives primary attention to each of these two passages in respective articles. Regarding Jesus’ saying about the “abandoned house,” Weinert ultimately concludes that οἶκος refers not to the Temple but to “Israel’s Judean leadership.” Weinert’s conclusion is achieved only 1) by placing far too much interpretive weight on minor variations from Matthew’s account, 2) by an unsound assertion that because Luke places the saying long before Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem, Luke’s Jesus indicates not a permanent but only a temporary desolation, or—as he prefers—“be[ing] left to its own,” for Jerusalem’s house, and 3) by assuming, when needed, that certain elements simply enter Luke’s text

---


24 Weinert, “Meaning of the Temple,” 89.


26 E.g., Weinert’s assertion of a disjunctive δὲ—which, even if true, still cannot bear the weight of his claims—is for me unconvincing (“Abandoned House,” 73).

27 Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 73.
not because they reflect Luke’s own opinions, but because they were incidentally introduced bits from Luke’s putative source.\textsuperscript{28} Also requiring re-evaluation is Weinert’s argument that οἶκος refers to the Judean leadership to the exclusion of the JT.\textsuperscript{29} Weinert’s attempt to rehabilitate Stephen’s Speech is equally ineffective, as he completely sidesteps (at least in his article) Luke’s highly problematic use of the idolatry-laden χειροποίητος in Acts 7:47.\textsuperscript{30} Overall, then, the only overwhelmingly positive bias toward the Temple that emerges in Weinert’s analysis is his own, and the exegetically sensitive reader is left with a conundrum that Weinert has done little to resolve.

Beyond his tendentious handling of the above difficult passages in Luke 13 and Acts 7, several shortcomings mar Weinert’s work. Among these is the puzzling fact that Weinert often arranges passages in jumbled or even reverse sequence, and so in his article on the “meaning of the temple” he considers first Luke 19–24, then Luke 3–18, and finally 1–2. This decision is shaped by his methodological preference for redaction criticism.\textsuperscript{31} Still, it strikes one as quite odd that, despite Weinert’s acknowledgement of “Luke’s dependence on narrative progression to develop his thought,”\textsuperscript{32} the insights of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[28] E.g., Weinert attempts to dismiss v. 35a by claiming “it is most likely that Luke simply is following his source at this point” (Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 73). Weinert concludes that Luke edits his (putative) sources in vv. 34-35 mainly “to bring out the personal thrust and prophetic-historical character of Jesus’ ministry” and attempts to downplay the meaning this “prophetic-historical” emphasis may have regarding the Temple’s fate (Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 74).
\item[29] Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 75–76.
\item[30] χειροποίητος occurs nine times in the LXX (Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 19:1; 21:9; 31:7; 46:6); the only passage in which the reference to idolatry is potentially uncertain is Lev 26:30. Heightening the sting of Stephen’s accusation, Isaiah regularly uses the term to refer to the vain images of foreign nations (two exceptions, 2:18 and 31:7, refer to Israel’s own idols).
\item[31] See Weinert, “The Meaning of the Temple,” 85–86.
\end{footnotes}
narrative criticism (admittedly jejune in the 1980s) are so gapingly absent in Weinert’s study. Moreover, Weinert’s analysis leans so heavily on redaction criticism, with occasional (sometimes bizarre) grammatical and lexical arguments, that he seems entirely to overlook the light that might be shed on the subject via consideration of either intertextuality or (more puzzlingly) the larger context within which Luke wrote, including the context of theodicy. Weinert also seems to neglect a more recent context, namely, the context of modern discussion of the JT in Luke’s writings, as he fails to interact with, despite citing(!), Baltzer’s important article, which might have issued a warning note to his simplified conclusion that in Luke 19–24 Luke’s “overriding intent is to present the Temple in terms of the very best values for which it stands.”

Finally, despite Weinert’s occasional use of more theological language (“the meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts”) and his concern for the role of the Temple in Luke’s writings as it relates to Lukan and NT theology, Weinert carries out his discussion of the Temple in Luke’s writings primarily on the level of addressing Luke’s personal biases and views. This shortsightedness is commensurate with Weinert’s overall neglect of contextual factors in assessing his subject. Despite these limitations, Weinert’s work serves as an important

---

33 Weinert, “Meaning of the Temple,” 87. His neglect of Baltzer can be seen in his claim that attempts to argue for a negative Lukan attitude toward the Temple rest primarily on the 7 difficult passages (4 from Luke, 3 from Acts) that he addresses (“Abandoned House,” 70). Weinert dismisses Baltzer’s article as one that “interprets Lucan Temple texts from a non-Lucan standpoint,” doing so with particular reliance on the OT (“Abandoned House,” 69)—thus failing to note that Luke’s use of the OT may in fact be a key source of input regarding the question of the place of Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke’s writings. Likewise, Weinert’s attempt to differentiate the Jerusalem authorities from the Temple itself (“Meaning of the Temple,” 86) might have found a note of warning in the work of Bachmann.

34 Weinert, “Meaning of the Temple,” 85.

way-marker due to his dogged and rightful insistence on the many passages in Luke and Acts which present the Temple in a positive light.


Unfortunately, Giblin nonetheless arrives at many a dead-end. As to Luke’s audience and purpose, he argues that Luke brings up Jerusalem’s destruction so often in part to prompt proper moral reflection in his readers, within the “historical-typological mode” and in the style of the Deuteronomistic History. While moral instruction was surely an important and frequent aim of ancient historiography, it was by no means the only such aim, and Giblin’s brief discussion neither properly establishes the genre of Luke’s Gospel nor succeeds in establishing this one aim—among so many options—as the clear and immediate cause behind Luke’s emphasis on Jerusalem. Perhaps even more problematic is Giblin’s treatment of the narrative of Luke’s Gospel. He represents a positive step beyond the work of Gaston, or perhaps even of Weinert, in that he is rather hesitant to dismiss portions of Luke’s Gospel as aberrant, accidental insertions from some

---


source material or other and in that he more closely attends to the overall shape of Luke’s narrative. Yet, despite his aim of exhausting the relevant texts, what he omits is damning: Giblin not only begins his examination in earnest only with the Jerusalem Journey but also, with little or no explanation, omits virtually the entirety of Luke 1–2 from consideration.  Likewise, he overlooks several important scenes even within the Journey section, including the Parable of the Fig Tree (13:6-9). Thus Giblin’s study offers glimpses of a way forward but does not successfully live up to its initial promise.

Robert L. Brawley has addressed this topic as well, in his monograph Luke-Acts and the Jews. Influenced by Weinert’s strongly positive reading of the JT and by the ancient mythological worldview reconstructed by M. Eliade, Brawley argues that Luke views Jerusalem as the navel of the earth, the axis mundi, and as such the Temple is not only the place of prayer par excellence but is in fact, along with the city itself, the contact point between heaven and earth. This sociologically informed reading finds subsequent

---

38 Beyond a brief consideration of Luke’s preface, in which Luke supposedly “types his reader” and on which Giblin hangs his historical-typological reading of the Gospel (Destruction, 10–14), Giblin’s treatment of Luke 1–2 consists essentially of a single sentence noting that “Luke’s childhood (1.5–2.52) partially fulfills its introductory function by drawing the reader’s attention to Jerusalem and the temple as a fitting place for prophetic disclosure and for Jesus’ own maturing concerns” and a footnoted reference to Weinert’s dissertation (Destruction, 1). Giblin surely omits this section because of its failure to explicitly mention Jerusalem’s destruction (but see ch. 4 below); still, for anyone concerned with “the narrative progression” of Luke’s Gospel (Destruction, viii), how could the above summary of Luke 1–2 possibly be thought to suffice? Giblin’s omission of Luke 1–2 is particularly ironic in light of his complaint that previous studies of Jerusalem’s destruction in Luke’s Gospel have failed to consider all of the relevant portions of the Third Gospel, at least in a way that presupposes “their coherence on the redactional level”—an assumption for which, at least, Giblin is to be commended (Destruction, 6).


support in the work of Joel Green. Brawley also suggests that Luke may anticipate Jerusalem’s restoration as God’s favored city.\textsuperscript{41}

In his \textit{Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts}, Philip Esler attempts to unravel the motivation behind what is for him Luke’s “ambivalent attitude” toward the Temple.\textsuperscript{42} Esler makes his case for Luke’s ambivalence by first citing the positive evidence adduced by Weinert and others, then noting the strikingly negative evidence that Weinert attempts to explain away, identifying Stephen’s speech and in particular the use of χειροποίητος in 7:48 as “the shoal upon which all attempts to argue for a totally favourable attitude to the Temple in Luke-Acts must inevitably founder.”\textsuperscript{43} He also takes issue with attempts to explain away Stephen’s harsh words as a piece of “discordant” tradition that somehow slipped into Luke’s work.\textsuperscript{44} Esler goes on to explain Luke’s ambivalence toward the Temple as a mirror-image of the mixed feelings that so many of Luke’s putative community members (i.e., former “god-fearers”)\textsuperscript{45} would have felt toward the Temple. For him, the clenching passage for this interpretation appears to be the conversion of Cornelius’ household in Acts 10. Esler draws particular attention to two comments: the angel’s words to Cornelius that his prayers and alms have risen as a memorial before God.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Thus Esler separates his discussion of the Temple from Jerusalem proper; see Esler, \textit{Community}, 132.
\item Esler, \textit{Community}, 134. Esler is surely correct in his assessment here, even if “Luke-Acts” is allowed to be Luke \textit{and} Acts, as in the present study—so long as one assumes (as I do) that, whatever the precise literary and narrative relationship between Luke and Acts, the author would not maintain a view in one of his works which was entirely contrary to those indicated in the other. I consider this basic level of non-contradiction between the works to be a reasonable operative assumption, one which, though subject to refutation, is ultimately borne out by the evidence which I will present (on this subject at least).
\item Esler, \textit{Community}, 135.
\item See Esler, \textit{Community}, ch. 1.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
(10:4), which Esler takes as an intentional parallel to LXX descriptions of Temple sacrifices, and Peter’s comment in vv 34-35 that God accepts those from every nation who fear God and act justly. For Esler, the implication is undeniable: by applying the language of Temple sacrifice to the extra-Temple activities of a Gentile and by having an authoritative figure state, directly contrary to the Temple’s stratified zones of admission, that God accepts Gentiles on the basis of reverence and justice, Luke’s narrative discloses a Temple that “has been replaced.”46

Despite Esler’s persistence in referring to Luke’s “attitude” toward the Temple, Esler’s analysis operates on a deeper level than a mere assessment of Luke’s personal biases, not only through his attempts to reconstruct Luke’s original audience and its importance for shaping Luke’s narrative(s) but also through his attention to the scriptural precedents influencing Luke’s works. Regarding the inclusion of Gentiles via the replacement of the Temple, Esler highlights Isaianic expectations, writing: “Thus Luke shows that for Gentiles as well the words of Is 53.6-8 have been fulfilled, but in a way quite contrary to that envisaged by Isaiah”—i.e., by the removal of the Temple as the center of cultic life, rather than via the inclusion of foreigners (and eunuchs) into the Temple’s cultic worship.47 All told, Esler offers an assessment of Luke’s “attitude” that both avoids the one-sided reading of which Weinert is culpable and also probes beneath the question of mere bias to attempt to disclose the motivations that informed Luke’s presentation of the JT.

46 Esler, Community, 161–62.

47 Esler, Community, 162.
In his published doctoral dissertation, J. Bradley Chance seeks to interpret “Luke’s perception of Jerusalem and the temple in the context of his eschatology.”\(^{48}\) Chance narrows in on Lukan eschatology rather than examining these institutions within Lukan thought at large because he feels the broader task has already been achieved by the likes of Weinert and Bachmann.\(^{49}\) Chance begins his study by exploring the eschatological functions of Jerusalem and the Temple after the exile and into Second Temple Judaism, identifying four common “interrelated motifs” surrounding these institutions: 1) the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, which 2) “would serve as the focal centers of God’s restored people” as well as 3) “important places in Yahweh’s dealing with the nations,” with, in some cases, 4) a belief that the Messiah would play a significant role (not further defined) vis-à-vis the Temple and its city.\(^{50}\) His survey of early Christian literature other than Luke and Acts leads him to conclude that early Christians were aware of these expectations but reformulated them such that the physical institutions were stripped of further significance, usually because they are now replaced by either Jesus himself (Johannine literature) or the early Christian community (Paul, Mark, Matthew, 1 Peter, also Revelation) or both (Hebrews).\(^{51}\)

Against this trend stands Luke, Chance contends, who emphasizes the fulfillment of God’s promises of salvation to Israel in Jerusalem and the Temple environs (ch. 3).

\(^{48}\) Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age*, 3 (emphasis added).

\(^{49}\) Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age*, 2–3. Chance of course does not agree with these authors on all points and, e.g., criticizes Weinert for drawing a wedge between the Temple and Jerusalem in his writings (2).

\(^{50}\) Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age*, 5–6.

\(^{51}\) Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age*, 33.
Luke also connects these institutions to promises of universal salvation (ch. 4) by announcing salvation to the Gentiles in Jerusalem and the JT, by setting them as the location from whence springs the Gentile mission, and by having the Jerusalem church, to whom Paul is linked and “even subjugate[ed],” sanction the universal mission. Given that Luke accorded such significance to these institutions, Luke “could not understand their destruction as the obliteration of satanic and worthless structure,” but rather he roots their destruction in the city’s consistent rejection of Jesus and in fact may have left room for a physically restored city and temple. Chance closes his study with a consideration of the source of Luke’s “view” of Jerusalem and the JT, arguing that it likely emerged from familiarity with Jewish traditions regarding these structures.

Though Chance’s study is marked by frequently solid discussion, his analysis of Luke’s writings is hindered by his general inattentiveness to the flow of Luke’s narrative—such that passages from various parts of Luke’s writings are largely divorced their place within Luke’s larger narrative then re-assembled as disconnected shards meant to drive home the point at hand. Likewise, while his attempting to place Luke within the relevant streams of Jewish thought and eschatological expectations is a true strength of Chance’s study, he seems often to overlook relevant scriptural precedents and echoes

---

52 See Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age*, 104–8; he also argues for connections based, e.g., on portraying the Hellenists “as legitimate extensions of the Jerusalem church” (106).


56 Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age*, e.g., 36–37, 104–6.
for and behind Luke’s words. Finally and positively, despite not infrequently speaking of Luke’s “view” or “perception” of Jerusalem and the Temple, Chance seems rightly to acknowledge in Luke some measure of theological creativity and sensitivity (see Conclusion).

In his article, “The Origin of Luke’s Positive Perception of the Temple,”⁵⁷ James M. Dawsey, taking a cue from Weinert, takes for granted that Luke has a positive attitude toward the Temple. Dawsey adopts more than Weinert’s conclusions, however; he also seems to assume the approach to the question that he presumably inherited from Weinert: namely, asking the question of how Jerusalem fits within the Lukan corpus from the perspective of Luke’s personal view. Thus Dawsey “will take up the question of the origin of Luke’s perception of the temple” and concerns himself “with Luke’s view of the temple.”⁵⁸ In his article, Dawsey expounds the thesis that, contrary to Chance’s claim that Luke’s putative positive view of the temple comes from Jewish tradition, Luke in facts testifies to an early Christian view that held the Temple in great esteem—and which may come, Dawsey hints, from early Jerusalem leaders like Peter and James the Just. Dawsey’s argument hinges largely on differentiating Luke 19:45–20:47 from Mark’s parallel material, thus indicating that Luke in fact relies not on Mark but on an earlier Christian tradition. Whatever the merits of Dawsey’s source-level analysis, it errs in


⁵⁸ Dawsey, “Positive Perception,” 6 (my emphasis). The language of personal opinion, perspective, or attitude continues throughout the article—e.g., “the Lukan view of the Temple” (8), “a positive view of the Temple” (10). Dawsey does at points frame the question more broadly (to my thinking)—e.g., “the meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts” (9; my emphasis)—but his overall discussion indicates that this apparently broader lens for assessing the temple in Luke and Acts actually falls within the standard (and narrower) conception centered around “Luke’s attitude/perception/view.”
effectively reducing Luke’s treatment of Jerusalem and the JT to a rather unimaginative parroting of the perspective of his (hypothetical) community.

Joel Green has worked to bring narrative critical insights to bear on the question of Luke’s theology of the Temple, though only partially so. In his examination of the rending of the veil in Luke 23:44-49 within Luke’s larger theology, Green argues that for Luke the spreading of salvation to Gentiles—which proceeds naturally subsequent to Jesus’ death—requires “the resolution of the barrier separating Gentile and Jew, the temple.” The Temple does not have to be destroyed, however, in order to achieve this resolution, because in fact the Temple would continue to have “important roles to play within the early Christian mission.” All that needed to be “neutralized” was “the power of the Temple to regulate socio-religious boundaries of purity and holiness.” To explain how Jesus’ death accomplished this neutralization of the JT’s regulatory role over socio-religious boundaries, Green draws on the sociological analyses of David Knipe, Mircea Eliade, and Clifford Geertz. He argues that Luke conceives of the JT as “God’s dwelling,” “the locus of God’s presence,” “the meeting place of God and humanity,” adducing this from Luke 1:8-23; 2:22-24, 36-38, 49; 19:46; 24:53; Acts 2:46-47; 3:1; 21:26; 22:17; 24:18; and placing special importance on the words of the boy Jesus in 2:49, which he interprets as a reference to the JT. Green then interprets the JT in Lukan


60 Green, “The Demise of the Temple,” 506.

theology within the framework of Geertz’s notion of “cultural centers” and identifies it, within the Lukan world, as “a cultural center whose segregating zones extend out from the temple mount to determine social relations” differentiated along lines of ethnicity and gender. Green ties his reading to Esler’s and asserts his agreement with Esler that Luke’s purpose was to show the demise of the JT’s role as fountainhead of these lines of segregation.62

A further function of the JT within Lukan thought is “its role as a center of teaching . . . and pious observance.” Green takes 19:45-46 as “foundational, for (apart from 2.46-7) it is after this event that activity within the temple becomes the norm for Jesus and his followers.”63 Green takes Luke’s omission here of the universalistic “for all the nations” from Isa 56:7 as a signal that the JT, while still enjoying an important role in salvation-history, “is no longer the center around which life is oriented.” Rather, it will continue as a place of prayer and instruction and, instead of being the site of the ingathering of the nations, will be “the point-of-departures for the mission to all peoples.”64 Green argues, finally, that this reading of the JT is underscored by Luke’s frequent and often pivotal locating of the JT as the site of revelations regarding God’s universal mission to all peoples, as in Luke 2:25-32 and Acts 2 and 22.

In addition to its enlightening attention to sociological studies of sacred space and cultural centers, Green’s argument commends itself for its attention to the location of given passages within the flow of Luke’s narrative and for its deep attentiveness to Lukan

63 Green, “The Demise of the Temple,” 511.
64 Green, “The Demise of the Temple,” 512.
theology: in Green’s hands, Luke is no mere simpleton, somewhat hastily including, excluding, or rewriting texts based on his own (rather thinly construed) biases, but is a reflective, intelligent sculptor of his text. The brevity of Green’s study, however, leaves many rocks unturned, many passages under-explored. Thus his essay serves as both a substantive (if brief) contribution and a sign-post pointing in the direction of future promising avenues of study regarding Luke’s theology and treatment of Jerusalem’s Temple (and thus perhaps implicitly also Jerusalem proper as well).

Robert J. Karris’ brief introduction to the Gospel of Luke in the New Jerome Biblical Commentary stands as a surprising exception among scholarly efforts to sort out the place of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke’s writings. Unlike so many commentators, Karris hones in on the theodical nature of the problem. He writes, “The key question deals with theodicy: If God has not been faithful to the elect people and has allowed their holy city and Temple to be destroyed, what reason do Gentile Christians . . . have to think that God will be faithful to the promises made to them?” Karris’ answer is that Luke provides “a kerygmatic story, which we call Luke-Acts,” in which God proves faithful to the promises to Israel through Jesus, but in an unexpected way, including the inclusion of Samaritans, tax collectors, Gentiles, and the like. Otherwise, Karris does not elaborate on the implications of this theodical problem or on Luke’s attempts to address it.

Peter W.L. Walker’s study of Jerusalem in the New Testament includes a significant chapter on Luke’s writings. Walker’s study is both an admirable synthesis


66 Walker, Jesus and the Holy City, 57–112.
of much of the preceding scholarship on this subject and a commendable step forward in the discussion: he synthesizes where those before him were correct and blazes new ground where required. Thus Walker combines good exegetical instincts with attentiveness to Luke’s narrative dynamics, attempts to account for Luke’s use of the LXX, and even leaves some room for Lukan subtlety.\(^{67}\) Paying attention to the flow of Luke’s narrative, Walker perceives a shift—indeed one amounting to “a dramatic surprise”\(^{68}\)—in Luke’s presentation of the Temple between Luke 1–2 and Luke’s subsequent narrative. Walker also rightly rejects one-sided positive readings (ala Weinert) of the evidence in Luke’s writings and resists readings which attempt to solve the riddle by positing discordant source materials.\(^{69}\) Even so, Walker makes the somewhat unhelpful decision to discuss Jerusalem and the JT separately, in keeping with his method of discussion in Mark and Matthew.\(^{70}\) All told, Walker’s treatment strikes many of the right chords and thus will serve as a valuable discussion partner in the chapters that follow.

Nicholas H. Taylor has contributed numerous articles discussing the place of the JT in Luke’s writings.\(^{71}\) Taylor cues in on the context of Luke’s writings as key,

\(^{67}\) Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, e.g., 61–62 (narrative sensitivity); 66, 83 (LXX); 61 n.22 (subtlety). Overall, Walker’s discussion of Jerusalem and the JT in Acts is slightly more on point, I think, than his discussion of Luke’s Gospel.

\(^{68}\) Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 61.


\(^{70}\) He himself notes that the two are “inter-connected” in Luke’s Gospel (Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 63).

identifying Luke’s context as the last quarter of the first century C.E., when most Jews held high expectations for an imminent rebuilding of Jerusalem and its Temple. Against this expectation, Taylor argues, Luke constructs his Gospel and Acts in such a way as to present the divine presence as no longer localizable to any one place, including the JT. Much of Taylor’s analysis rests on a careful study of the related terms applied to the JT in Luke’s writings (οἶκος, ναός, ἱερόν, and ὁ τόπος ὁ ἅγιος), which largely succeeds despite Taylor’s methodological emphasis on redaction criticism. Taylor maintains that Luke employs οἶκος in relation to the Temple (though it does not necessarily signify only the Temple) in contexts in which there is conflict between Jesus or his followers and the Jewish Judean leadership.

Most significant is Taylor’s observation that Luke applies ναός positively to the Jerusalem Temple only during the scene in which Gabriel appears to Zechariah; thereafter, all other uses of ναός show “divine residency in the temple is denied and the notion thereof derided.” Taylor argues that the polemical use of ναός after the Gabriel-Zechariah scene is because in Luke’s symbolic world the divine presence departs from the Temple sometime around the beginning of John the Baptist’s ministry in the wilderness. Following that, Jesus himself embodies the divine presence (drawing here on Terence Donaldson and Baltzer), which is then dispersed among the Church in Acts via

---


the Holy Spirit. In line with his interpretation, Taylor argues that Luke, against the grain of the other Synoptic writers, separates Jesus’ death from the destruction of the Temple, since the Temple has already fulfilled its function prior to Jesus’ death. Luke’s placing the rending of the Temple veil prior to Jesus’ death is to show, then, the reality that has already transpired: the divine presence has already departed from the Temple.

Taylor’s work on the Temple in Luke and Acts provides illumination on a number of fronts, not least of which are Taylor’s attempt to place Luke’s treatment of the Jerusalem Temple within its larger context, including both historical and theological factors, and also Taylor’s attention to where things occur within Luke’s narrative(s).

Particularly noteworthy in the latter class is his attention to Luke’s multivalent and narratively conditioned use of ναός. Even so, I take issue with Taylor’s claim that Luke must be read against widespread Jewish hopes of a restored Jerusalem, since I see relatively strong evidence of a concern for theodicy in Luke’s writings (discussed especially in ch. 3) and comparatively weak evidence of a desire to temper expectations of a restored Jerusalem (Acts 1:6-8 being the likeliest evidence for this).

Indeed Taylor himself adduces scant internal evidence for his claim but rather relies on an inference from external evidence, which he does not himself bring to the table. Overall, his discussion of context is thin on evidence.

---

75 E.g., Taylor, “Jerusalem Temple,” 474.
78 In “Jerusalem Temple,” Taylor attempts to differentiate a period of optimistic anticipation of a rebuilt Temple (76–100 C.E.) from “a later period” characterized by “the resignation to the loss of the
Taking up the theodical question from Karris is Cyprian Robert Hutcheon. Hutcheon seems to approach the question of the place of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke’s writings not predominantly from the perspective of a Lukan “view” but rather shows genuine respect for Luke’s capacity for theological expression and reflection, probably in part because of his attending to Karris’ theodical understanding of the JT for Luke, as well as the fact that Hutcheon’s article is itself an attempt at a positive theological contribution. In addition to his considerable reliance on Karris for the theodical framework, Hutcheon appeals frequently to the insights and conclusions of Weinert, Baltzer, and Green, also relying heavily on Edvin Larsson when discussing Acts 6–7. In fact, comprising much of Hutcheon’s article are conclusions drawn from these and other authors regarding Luke 12; 19:28–21:38; 23:45; and Acts 6–7, based on which he ultimately concludes that “Luke manifests a fundamentally positive attitude toward the Jerusalem Temple,” though, again, without reducing the question to a matter of mere preference or of Luke’s simply acquiescing to source content.

Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us.’” He cites a number of documents (4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, Josephus’ B.J., and 1 Enoch) but does not indicate to which period he believes them to belong (460). As to positive evidence for this supposed widespread hope of restoration, little is forthcoming in Taylor’s work. E.g., he infers a rejection of the Temple’s holding eschatological significance from Luke’s abbreviation of Isaiah 56:7 in Luke 19:46 and takes this as Luke’s dampening of restorationist hopes for the JT—hardly compelling internal evidence. Arguing, on the other hand, that many Jews in the general post-70 C.E. era experienced considerable theodical angst in the wake of the utter devastation and the triumph of Israel’s pagan oppressors brought about by the first Judean revolt is, e.g., Richard Bauckham “Apocalypses,” in Judaism and Variegated Nomism: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism, Vol 1 (ed. D. A Carson, P.T. O’Brien, and M.A. Seifrid; WUNT 140; Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 135–88 (cf. 160).

Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us.’”

Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us,’” speaks, e.g., of “Luke’s theological position” (16) and asks “what role is played by ‘the Temple’ in Lukan theology” (6).

See Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us,’” 28ff., although Hutcheon does not lay out the full scope of the theodical problem that Luke faced.

Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us,’” 26.
Where Hutcheon offers his own unique contribution, beyond his synthetic and helpful discussion of previous works, is in his elaboration of Baltzer’s claim of a significant connection between Jesus and the kabod. Hutcheon argues that Luke’s writings offer a sustained “‘Gentile midrash’ on the Ezekiel’s vision of the return of the kabod” in Ezek 43 such that when Jesus enters the Temple in Luke 19, Luke conjures the imagery of the return of the kabod in Ezek 43:1-5. Hutcheon strengthens his case (and moves beyond Baltzer’s thesis) by noting the overshadowing associated with YHWH’s kabod in the Temple at key places in the Jewish Scriptures, which he ties to Luke’s sole mention among the Synoptics of Jesus’ doxa (the LXX rendering of kabod) at the Transfiguration (9:32), also an event of over-shadowing. Having established the connection, Hutcheon reads, though all too briefly, the imagery of divine presence, with patterns of ascent and descent, across the Lukan corpus: Descending, the spirit “over-shadows” Mary and the “exiled” Kabod again takes residence; then the identity of the “Kabod-Jesus” is revealed at the Transfiguration, where the departure at Jerusalem is mentioned; when Jesus enters Jerusalem, “the Jerusalem temple becomes truly ‘the Temple’”; at the crucifixion, the Spirit returns (“mini-ascent”) to the Father, then descends again with Jesus’ resurrection, only to ascend again (“maxi-ascent”) to heaven; Stephen gains a vision of the kabod at the right hand of God.

Hutcheon’s argument suffers from a brevity out of all proportion to the boldness of his claims, as well as from its flying wildly in the face of the traditional but faltering

---

83 Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us,’” 29ff.
84 Hutcheon, “‘God Is with Us,’” 32–33 (emphasis original).
assessment that Luke has a relatively “low” Christology. Still, his work is promising especially in that it not only recognizes the theodical problem facing Luke but also both allows for true theological sensitivity on the part of Luke and attends to Luke’s deep knowledge of and reliance on the Scriptures of Israel in crafting his narrative and in answering troubling theological questions.

Bruce Longenecker has contributed a brief but insightful essay to the discussion. Longenecker notes that, by tying the story of Christianity so closely to the story of Judaism—and specifically by equating the God of the Jews with the God of the Christians—Luke plays a potentially dangerous game, for in Luke’s context (Longenecker imagines Luke to be writing ca. 90 C.E.) the God of the Jews has suffered a considerable loss of honor via the destruction of Jerusalem. Longenecker supplies all-important historical and theological context, noting the imperial propaganda and machinations that trumpeted Rome’s victory over the Jewish Temple and, by extension, the Jewish God, and noting the earlier struggles of Israel’s prophets to ward off similarly denigrating assessments of Israel’s God after apparent defeat at the hands of foreign powers. All told, “the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE was yet another indicator that, when forced to compete with the gods of mightier forces, the God who had overseen Jewish history was clearly an inferior god.” These contextual factors necessitated that Luke “include within his historical monograph a strong current of

---

85 He of course finds support in the classic article by Baltzer, on which he so heavily relies. Moreover, the conclusion of a “low” Lukan Christology has faced recent, rather strong reevaluation at the formidable hands of, among others, C. Kavin Rowe, Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009).

theodicy defending not simply the Christian movement itself but specifically, and most importantly, its God.” Longenecker goes on to demonstrate the similarly theodical thrusts of various Jewish (e.g., 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, Josephus) and Christian (e.g., Matthew, John) documents of this time: the need for a strong theodical defense of Israel’s God was keenly felt indeed.


87 Longenecker, “Rome’s Victory,” 93.
89 Longenecker, “Rome’s Victory,” 98.
Longenecker’s brief essay provides a critical contextual insight for assessing Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke’s writings: “after the temple’s destruction in 70 CE, any theology animated by a salvation-historical continuity involving the God of the Jews needed to include a strong dose of theodicy.”91 This is a crucial insight for my study, although I believe the theodical necessity confronting Luke in fact had an additional head beyond the one highlighted by Longenecker (see ch. 3). I also dissent from Longenecker’s claim (already qualified by his own essay) that Luke’s attempts at a positive theodicy lie exclusively in narrative strands other than the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple: on my reading, Luke attempts a positive theodicy in narrative strands both highlighting the destructive events of 70 C.E. and focused elsewhere.

A recent article by Geir Otto Holmås offers fresh insights to Luke’s theology of the Temple through its careful attention to Lukan narrative dynamics.92 While the main take-away of the article is to complicate the commonly asserted claim that Luke “emphasizes” the temple as a place of prayer in the early-going of Acts (Holmås claims that these references are incidental rather than emphatic), Holmås offers a powerful, though brief re-reading of the Temple in Luke’s Gospel.93 He claims that the fundamental differences between the presentation of the Temple in Luke 1–2 and latter parts of the Gospel must not be ignored. The narrative flow of Luke 1–2 shows that the proper function of prayer and piety in the Temple is to lead to acknowledgement of Jesus as Messiah, but, as the Gospel unfolds, “the temple shows itself, increasingly, to be the

91 Longenecker, “Rome’s Victory,” 102.


focal point for Jerusalem’s rejection of the Messiah.” Hence, Jesus’ prophetic actions against the Temple and against its worshipers in Luke 19. Needing more development is Holmås’ claim that the purpose for Luke’s presentation of the Temple is as apologetic, “an attempt to legitimate the young Christian ‘sect,’” especially vis-à-vis Jewish polemic.94 Yet he shows commendable insight and attention to the narrative flow of Luke’s writings.

Summary

Among other things, then, previous research indicates the close, sometimes overlapping, identification of Jerusalem and the Temple in the Lukan world and indicates the variety of opinions and approaches that have engaged and emerged with reference to the question at hand. In particular, while some commentators maintain that Luke evinces a decidedly positive assessment of Jerusalem and the Temple (Bachmann, Weinert, Dawsey), others rightly note the deep and puzzling ambivalence of the evidence.95 The old source-critical solutions to this ambivalence are hardly satisfying today—as seen perhaps above all in their abandonment by recent commentators—and the newer attempts to resolve the ambivalence (esp. Esler, Green, Holmås) have brought fresh insights yet still leave much ground to be explored.

94 Holmås, “‘My House Shall Be Called a House of Prayer,’” 415, 416.

95 Stating the matter aptly is Holmås: “The crux of the presentation of the temple in Luke-Acts is the discrepancy between, on the one hand, the fact that the holy place is used consistently for positive religious ends by Jesus and his disciples and, on the other hand, the clearly critical comments in several key texts” (“‘My House Shall Be Called a House of Prayer,’” 396).
Most importantly, the foregoing review of research, while not exhaustive, has suggested (sometimes by negative example) the lines which the present study must follow, if it is to get a handle on the place of Jerusalem and the Temple within Lukan theology: attention to Luke’s use of the Old Testament, an emphasis on addressing the question within a narrative-critical framework, and an operating assumption that privileges Luke as a reflective, intelligent sculptor of the text—a theologian in a truer sense than is often granted. The work of Baltzer, Taylor, Green, Karris, Hutcheon, Longenecker, and Holmás, has, to varying degrees, shown the value, perhaps even the


97 Supporting this conclusion is the observation by Klauck that to answer whether Jerusalem has ongoing significance for Luke, one must explore Luke’s larger theological vision, including his attitude toward the Old Testament (“Die Heilige Stadt,” 146).
necessity of following these lines. The work of several recent commentators also points in the direction of theodicy as a profitable contextual piece for exploring the question.\textsuperscript{98} Though some have undertaken comprehensive assessments of Jerusalem and the Temple in (either of) Luke’s writings (Gaston, Bachmann, Giblin, Weinert, Esler, and Chance, from the perspective of eschatology)—and despite the valuable insights these studies have produced—none of these commentators has proceeded with the narrative-critical, intertextual, and theodical attentiveness that the work of Baltzer, Taylor, Green, Karris, Longenecker, and others commends, and, besides Chance and Esler, few of these comprehensive treatments give Luke adequate respect as a theologian.

Indeed the most insightful analyses of the topic have often been the most tantalizingly brief. Their initial probes into the subject await extension both via new exegetical exploration and through the synthetic work of expanding and integrating their often disparate insights. Though I will give comparatively full treatment only to Luke’s Gospel, the pages that follow will help, I hope, to fill the lacuna in our understanding of Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s writings.

\textit{Conclusion: Looking Backward and Moving Ahead}

Past scholarly work on the question of the place of Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke’s writings has thus illuminated a path for pursuing the question of the place of Jerusalem and the Temple within Lukan theology, a path marked by Luke’s narrative

\textsuperscript{98} Longenecker, along with Hutcheon and Karris, is the major representative arguing for a sharp theodical edge in Luke’s writings, but a number of more pastorally oriented commentators articulate this concern as well, including Snook, “Interpreting Luke’s Theodicy,” and Llewellyn, “The Consolation of Israel,” 13. Likewise, Keener comments that “Judea’s function in his narrative [Acts] also includes an element of theodicy, explaining the holy city’s destruction by showing the elite’s rejection of Israel’s rightful spiritual leadership” (Acts, 1:473).
form and theological and scriptural acumen (ch. 2) and also Luke’s theodical context (ch. 3). Many have begun down the path, while others have strayed into blind alleys or (more generously) interconnected but ultimately divergent trails. Some have even flown over the path from a great height and attempted to peer through the foliage and fog to see where precisely, and by what terrain, the path might lead. I aim in the pages that follow to pursue the path on the ground level, so to speak, and farther than those who have come before—all the way to its first major vista: the breaking point between Luke and Acts. There, having surveyed the terrain of Luke’s Gospel, I will offer an account of what Acts might hold in store (appendix 1). While I might wish to follow the path to its very end—and thus continue the trail through Acts—external circumstances (here the concrete realities of dissertation requirements) sometimes curtail journeys before their proper end.

Many of course hold Luke and Acts to be inseparable halves of a two-volume work and thus may view my journey as not only partial but also incomplete. While I will not attempt to address the question of the literary relationship between the two works here, I will defend my procedure in the pages that follow by noting 1) the strong critique many have brought against the (ever stalwart) majority on this question and 2) the very strong evidence that Luke’s earliest identifiable (and admittedly second century)

---

99 The work of several scholars also suggests the relevance of sociological models for assessing the question (viz. Brawley, Esler, Green, often drawing on Eliade). I will attempt to incorporate some of the insights from these analyses in Part 2 of this study, though I have been unable to incorporate them in any systematic way. This path, like many, requires that one pack only lightly, and I am already encumbered with the luggage pertaining to ancient theodicy, narrative criticism, and Lukan intertextuality.

audiences in fact read and encountered Luke and Acts as separate, if related, works. In addition to this, 3) in Acts (and Acts 7 in particular) Luke the author goes beyond anything explicitly present in his Gospel in his criticism of the JT. While Luke’s ideal audience (discussed in ch. 2) may ultimately hear aspects of Luke’s Gospel in light of his eventual treatment of the city and its Temple in Acts, it is also valid to ask, as I will, how they would have understood Luke’s Gospel on its own. This is because, simply put, “Luke’s Gospel is narratively intelligible on its own, apart from Acts.” If I thereby settle for the runner-up prize of arriving at (my version of) the theology of Jerusalem and the Temple present merely in Luke’s Gospel, with only an appended overture toward Luke’s thought as a whole, I can only say that this is indeed a goal worthy of pursuit.


103 Thus I accede to Johnson’s claim that a “literary-critical reading . . . of Luke’s entire narrative [i.e., Luke and Acts] is best for one purpose, namely understanding his literary and theological voice” (“Is Reception History Pertinent?” 162). Hence, the appendix on Acts in this volume.
CHAPTER TWO

Reading Luke: Narrative, Subtlety, and Echoes of Scripture

Reading Luke’s Narrative

In terms of method, I follow in this study the insight of Joel Green, N.H. Taylor, J. Bradley Chance, Geir Otto Holmås, and others, that the question of Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke’s writings must be asked and answered with respect to Luke’s stated intention of providing auditors with a narrative (διήγησις), and one that is orderly (καθεξῆς) at that.¹ As Luke Johnson aptly states the matter, referring to Luke’s plan of presenting things καθεξῆς: “The exegetical implication is that, in Luke, we need to attend not only to what Luke says but also to where in the story he says it. Losing the thread of the story . . . means losing the thread of meaning.”² Likewise, Joel Green has emphasized the importance of “exploring the particular shaping [Luke] has given his narrative” for grasping Lukan theology.³

I will thus undertake a narrative-critical reading, though making several departures from the norm, including from the usual emphasis on a first-time reading/hearing. There are several reasons for not limiting one’s approach to simply a


first-time reading, including the fact that emphasis on a first-time reading is an almost entirely arbitrary convention within the field and also, more cogently, the strong evidence (discussed below) that Luke sometimes communicates subtly in a way not likely to produce ideal comprehension in his audience on a first reading.\(^4\)

The typical assumption of a first-time reading makes sense in that allowing for multiple exposures creates certain potential methodological dilemmas. The assumption of a one-time reader/auditor allows for strictly sequential interpretation, and when interpreting sequentially, interpreters have a firm handle on what the audience knows and what the audience does not know—and can make significant hay of the fact. Allowing for multiple exposures, on the other hand, may potentially problematize adherence to Johnson’s earlier-cited advice of attending to where things happen in Luke’s narrative(s).

Fortunately, a relatively simple solution to this potential dilemma lies in differentiating between what the auditor knows (which in the case of the ideal reader/audience extends well beyond the narrative up to the pericope under consideration) and between the flow of the narrative itself (which consists of the narrative up to the pericope under consideration). We need not know that the audience only knows so much (and no more)

\(^4\) I am hardly alone in maintaining that the import of Luke’s writings are, at least on occasion, best felt by multiple exposures. The need for multiple exposures is, e.g., implicit in Bruce Longenecker’s discussion of the narrative gap at Luke 4:30, especially in that the “norms and directives” or “field of reality” of Luke’s texts in light of which the audience is invited to read Lukan gaps would hardly be accessible to an audience who had heard only the first 4 chapters of Luke’s Gospel (Hearing the Silence: Jesus on the Edge and God in the Gap—Luke 4 in Narrative Perspective [Eugene, Oreg.: Cascade Books, 2012]). Note Mark A. Powell’s claim that some texts appear to presume an understanding that arises only after multiple exposures (What Is Narrative Criticism? [GBS, NT Series; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990], 20). Craig S. Keener claims that likely repeated readings of Luke and Acts in house churches would have allowed “ideal hearers to pick up nuances and repeated themes not available to first-time hearers” and cites several ancient works, in various genres, that commend multiple exposures for catching a speech’s or work’s full meaning (e.g., Quintilian, Inst. 10.1.20–21; Keener, Acts, 1:18).
in order to conclude that they could or would interpret a given bit of narrative in light of the overall narrative order and rhetorical flow.

Although I will rely heavily on the insights of narrative criticism in my analysis of Luke’s works, especially its keen focus on setting, plot, and characterization, I will not always foreground these theoretical undergirdings when discussing Luke’s writings—as doing so often has the ironic effect of removing auditors’ focus from the narrative itself to the abstract apparatus being used to analyze the narrative—nor will I employ the full range of narrative-critical constructs and their linked verbage. Moreover, I follow Joel Green in using certain terms from discourse analysis, and indeed in several respects my method leans in the direction of discourse analysis over against tradition formulations of narrative criticism. My eschewing of certain favored terms and concepts from narrative criticism plays out in fairly evident ways regarding my discussion of both author and audience.

---

5 Here I am in line with C. Kavin Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 9–10.

6 See Joel Green, “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Interpretation,” in Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation (ed. Joel B. Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 175–96. I employ “co-text,” however, with reference to the sections surrounding the passage or verse under discussion (thus as equivalent to his “local/immediate co-text”; 183–84), and, while, following Green, sometimes using “context” with reference “to the sociohistorical realities within which the Lukan text . . . is set” (183), I also retain the common use of “context” to refer to the general position of a given passage or verse within the whole of Luke/Acts (thus as equivalent to the broad sense of “co-text” in Green; 183–84).

7 As described by Joel Green (“Discourse Analysis and New Testament Interpretation”), discourse analysis combines interest in the text qua text with ongoing concern for the history and tradition behind the text (177, 178)—which certainly also characterizes the present study. The openness of discourse analysis to multiple possible readings (179) also informs the present study. Although I retain something of the traditional concern for understanding how Luke’s “original audience” (here, Luke’s “ideal audience”) might have heard his writing(s), I am also within the theoretical playing field of discourse analysis. My investigation is simply attuned to “the discourse event” as it pertains to how a particular, historically-situated “ideal/model reader” (i.e., a late first-century adult concerned with theodicy and well-versed in the LXX) might have heard Luke’s Gospel (and also Acts).
Regarding the nexus of options for parsing out the authorial side of things, I not only make no distinction between “implied author” and “narrator,” but I also generally avoid use of “implied author” in favor of simply “Luke,” or “the Evangelist.” I make the former decision, first, in recognition of Luke’s writings as ancient works falling under the broad umbrella of “historical writing,” the Third Gospel probably as a *bios* and Acts probably as some sort of non-elite historical writing.\(^8\) Several have noted that the distinction between “narrator” and “author,” which may be appropriate to works of fiction, applies far less readily to works of non-fiction.\(^9\) Additionally, with precious few exceptions (viz. Lucian of Samosata and Apuleius), ancient works simply do not employ the differentiation between implied author and (an “unreliable”) narrator that is relatively endemic in the literature of recent centuries. Thus distinctions between implied author and narrator are unlikely to be helpful in assessing Luke’s works, especially in light of the genre differences between the Lukan writings and the minority report of satirists like Lucian and Apuleius.\(^10\) My reason for eschewing “implied author” in favor of simply

---

\(^8\) Increasingly since the work of Richard Burridge, there seems to be a broad consensus that the Gospels represent a form of ancient *bios*. I find the case for Acts as a historical work to be convincingly made in the thorough introduction to Craig Keener’s recent commentary on Acts (*Acts*, vol. 1, chs. 3–6), although I am not ready to endorse his more precise classifications of Acts as a popular-level historical monograph meant to tell the story of a people.

\(^9\) See the discussion in Petri Merenlahti and Raimo Hakola, “Reconceiving Narrative Criticism,” in *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism* (ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni; JSNTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 37–46. “In non-fictional narratives, therefore, the narrator represents the author . . . . fictional stories . . . can be told from whatever point of view the writers finds best for his or her purposes. In other words, in non-fictional narratives, narrative structures are more transparent as to the aims and purposes of the author than in non-fictional [*sic!*] narratives” (37–38).

“Luke” (and, less frequently, “the Evangelist”) rests neither on a facile assumption that the author of Luke and Acts is the same historical person known from Pauline writings (which is difficult to demonstrate) nor on a desire to subjugate narrative analysis of the text to a particular historical reconstruction.

Still, I side with the many narrative critics who increasingly recognize that narratival analysis need not be divorced from, and indeed can be greatly aided by, attention to the historical and social context in which a text was written.11 As Jack Dean Kingsbury has noted, “Once one fully understands the ‘world of the story,’ one can then move to a reconstruction of the ‘world of the evangelist.’”12 And indeed, “[m]ore than ever, interpretations of the Gospel narratives are drawing upon our knowledge of the history, society and cultures of the first-century Mediterranean world as a means to help us understand the story better.”13 This is precisely what I aim to do in this study. My study thus falls along the trajectory of narrative reading spearheaded by, among others, Charles H. Talbert.14

---

11 Cf. Merenlahti and Hakola, “Reconceiving Narrative Criticism,” 34, 48: “In the case of the Gospels, the forms of narrative analysis that are more open to questions concerning the ideological and historical background of the text must be considered preferable, because they pay due attention to the nature of the Gospels as non-fictional narratives” (emphasis added).


14 See especially Charles H. Talbert, Reading Luke-Acts in Its Mediterranean Milieu (NovTSup 107; Leiden: Brill, 2003). I do not share Talbert’s conviction that such readings must avoid, with surgical precision, any reference to authorial intention. For a short but incisive defense of speaking of authorial intention regarding ancient works, see Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 4 n.12. I share broad sympathies with Rowe’s methodology, including his reticence toward over-loading one’s narrative reading with theoretical trappings and jargon (9) and his interest in producing a historically sensitive narrative reading (14–15).
The key contextual pieces that will shape my narrative reading are 1) the rhetoric-infused ethos of the Greco-Roman world, 15 2) the late 1st century context in which Luke wrote, a context in which questions of theodicy were especially prominent (discussed in ch. 3 below), and 3) Luke’s probable use of Mark. Thus my narrative reading of Luke, informed by the rhetorical models and praxis of the ancient world and attuned to redactional critical insights, has a strong genetic relationship to the narrative-rhetorical reading employed by Mikeal C. Parsons. 16 Unlike Parsons’ commentaries, however, my study of course has neither the space nor the scope for tracing in detail the narrative flow of each of Luke’s works and therefore stands under the mandate of keying in on those scenes which provide greatest grist for assessing the JT in Luke (and to a lesser degree Acts), even while not losing sight of the larger narrative dynamics at play in the work(s).

Emphasis on context also significantly informs my approach to the audience of Luke’s writings. I am interested in how key segments of Luke and Acts might have sounded to a particular, “ideal” audience, namely, an audience sensitive to the conventions of ancient rhetoric in general, including the widespread use of subtle communication, sensitive also to issues of theodicy, and thoroughly knowledgeable of the Scriptures whose fulfillment Luke takes such great pains to show in the events surrounding the lives of Jesus and the early church. Although Luke’s writings

15 Common to and pervasive in this rhetoric-infused ethos, particularly during the latter half of the 1st century, was the use of subtle communication, as in “figured speech,” “emphasis,” and even enthymemes. See Frederick Ahl, “The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome,” AJP 105 (1984): 174–208; and see further below.

themselves suggest an audience attuned to such emphases. I recognize that such an “ideal audience” to some degree arises from my own imaginary, though historically and contextually constrained, reconstruction. Thus here I am in some ways simply expanding, in light of the increasing acknowledgment of ancient context as an appropriate informant for narrative criticism, Mark Allan Powell’s description of an informed audience under his rubric of the “normative process of reading.” My “ideal audience” is also akin to the “Model Reader” described by Umberto Eco and as such arises from—or at least is constrained by—the text itself.

A final point requires comment. My reconstruction of a likely hearing of the Third Gospel by members of Luke’s ideal audience follows the majority of narrative-

---

17 See the works of Parsons and others for Luke’s use of ancient rhetoric at a middling but non-elite level (e.g., “Luke and the Progymnasmata: A Preliminary Investigation into the Preliminary Exercises,” in Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse [ed. T. Penner and C. Vander Stichele; SBL Symposium Series 20; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2004], 43–63). See the discussion below for evidence of Lukian subtlety. See, e.g., Kurz, Reading Luke, 16, for the audience’s presumed intimate knowledge of Scripture. See Luke’s considerable emphasis on the destruction of Jerusalem and the JT compared to Mark and Matthew, as well as his theodical parables (all in ch. 3 below), for his sensitivity to issues of theodicy.

18 As noted by Rhoads, “Narrative Criticism,” 269.

19 See Mark Allan Powell, “Narrative Criticism,” 242–44. I also see myself somewhat in line regarding Luke’s “ideal audience” with Craig Keener (Acts, e.g., 1:18).

20 Umberto Eco describes his “Model Reader” as one who has adequate cultural and textual knowledge for pursuing “interesting interpretive paths” when encountering a text. I also follow him in considering the whole of a text to be the indispensable basis for judging interpretations of that text (“How to prove a conjecture about the intention of a text? The only way is to check it upon the text as a coherent whole”), an idea which he in turn attributes to Augustine’s De doctrina christiana. Unlike Eco, however, I persist in thinking that the “empirical author” has a more than nominal say—and certainly more say than any other Model Reader—in constraining the meaning of a text, at least when examining ancient and sacred texts like those of Luke. The reason for our divergence here may be that Eco’s theory applies specifically to “aesthetic text(s)” vis-à-vis their readers and author and to texts addressed to unknown audiences instead of to a single reader (and I will not take up the question of a possible “Lukan community” here). So I want to draw from Eco’s notion of Model Readers (my “ideal audience”) and his claim that conjectures must be judged based on the entirety of the work about which they are made, while sitting light to his views about the relative interpretive authority of authors, texts, and interpreters. See Umberto Eco, “The Author and His Interpreters” (Lecture at The Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America, 1996; http://www.themodernword.com/eco/eco_author.html).
critical studies, particularly early ones, in assuming the thematic and narrative coherence of the work under examination—a position which, as we have seen, a number of previous studies on Jerusalem and Temple in Luke’s writings have found convenient to deny and which, furthermore, some from within even narrative-critical circles have recently challenged.21 I agree with these latter critics that the coherence of Luke’s Gospel remains a heuristic assumption, one in need of verification, and I acknowledge their concern that this assumption not take on a life of its own and thereby entice the interpreter into all manner of exegetical gymnastics for the purpose of maintaining what was only, at the beginning, a heuristic device—duly noted.22 Still, I believe it fair and circumspect to start by assuming the relative coherence23 of any work, while remaining open to the possibility that this assumption should, in the course of analysis, prove unlikely, even untenable.24 In part I am guided here by Umberto Eco’s contention that the only way to judge conjectures about texts (admittedly “aesthetic texts”) is “to check it upon the text as a coherent whole.”25 My study will show, I hope, that on the subject of Jerusalem and the Temple Luke offers a coherent, if multifaceted, portrait.


23 Merenlahti and Hakola (“Reconceiving,” 31–32) rightly note the fact that ancient writers were generally less preoccupied with coherence than modern ones—hence the qualifying “relative.”

24 Otherwise, one becomes involved in the comparatively greater danger of automatically writing off any apparent tensions or diversity within a work as mere incoherence.

25 Eco, “The Author.”
Subtlety in Luke and Beyond

Lukan Subtlety: Seen as through a Veil?

Luke’s use of subtle communication is a standard, if usually tacitly acknowledged, feature of many interpretations of his writings, including especially many narrative ones. The burgeoning work on Lukan gaps, for example, certainly provides powerful illumination of a particular type of subtlety, one that requires significant audience involvement and that presupposes, on most readings, multiple audience exposures to Luke’s works.26 Discussions of Luke’s use of Scripture also often presuppose a level of engagement and insight on the part of the audience that amounts to subtle communication on Luke’s part—as seen, no less, in my previous discussion of Baltzer’s, Hutcheon’s, and Taylor’s readings of Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke (ch. 1).27 Additionally, narrative critics sometimes read the Gospels, especially since Culpepper’s Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel, as containing occasional “implicit commentary.” Though the specifics of such “implicit commentary” has become an occasion for debate, its general recognition among...

26 See comments above on Longenecker, God in the Gap.

27 This is also true, e.g., of Richard Hays’ recent work on intertextuality in Matthew’s Gospel. Thus Hays claims that Matthew’s carefully balanced genealogical structure, highlighting Jesus’ Abrahamic and Davidic lineage and ascending from Abraham to David and then descending after David into exile and suffering its post-exilic “obscurity,” “signals that the coming of Jesus portends the end of Israel’s exile.” He likewise claims that the appearance of the four women (all likely “ethnic outsiders”) in the genealogy “encourages us to recall their stories and to reflect that they prefigure the mission to all nations that is announced in the Gospel’s closing chapter” (“Torah Reconfigured: Reading Scripture with Matthew,” Speech delivered at 2011 Winter Pastor’s School, Truett Seminary, Baylor University). Whether Hays’ reading is a correct interpretation of Matt 1, it certainly pays Matthew’s Gospel the compliment of assuming that significant import lies below the surface claims of the Gospel—i.e., that Matthew engages in what I have termed “subtle communication.”
narrative critics of the Gospels serves as a further illustration of subtle communication, present in Luke as well as, it appears, the other NT Gospel writers.\(^{28}\)

Much of the above work pointing toward subtle communication in Luke’s writings (and among the other Gospel writers) has come from narrative critics,\(^ {29}\) and these insights have yet to be placed fully within their ancient historical context. While I certainly will not attempt entirely to fill the lacuna here, I do hope to construct a bit of a makeshift bridge, especially by noting discussions of methods of subtle communication among select members of the elite Greco-Roman declaimers.\(^ {30}\)


\(^ {29}\) From the perspective of discourse analysis, as I understand it, the presence and potential of subtlety is constrained primarily by a) the reader/auditor who encounters the text, and b) the text itself, which places certain constraints on meaning (cf. Green, “Discourse Analysis,” 178–79). The sorts of subtlety within the Lukan text that I will argue for in chs. 4–6 are in line with these constraints on the possible meaning. Regarding, e.g., Luke 2:38, which I take as an ironic statement of Jerusalem’s imminent demise, perhaps as read through Isa 63, the ideal auditor’s location post-70 C.E. and amidst pressing concerns for theodicy authorize my reading from the side of the auditor, whereas it is the text’s shape itself (i.e., its highly ironic use of apparent *metonymy*/synecdoche and its co-textual positioning after the ominous second prophecy of Simeon) that authorizes—and in fact, gives rise to—my interpretation of the verse.

\(^ {30}\) Arguing for Lukan subtlety (though not in such terms) on the basis on ancient rhetoric, particularly by use of enthymemes, is Vernon K. Robbins: “the Gospel of Luke interweaves enthymemistic networks in the text with social, cultural, ideological, and theological enthymemes that evoke contexts outside the work. In some instances, unexpressed premises or conclusions for enthymemes are expressed elsewhere in the work and create an explicit enthymemistic network in the text. In the same portion of text, however, the premises or conclusions missing from the enthymemes may reside in social, cultural, ideological, and theology environments outside the text” (idem, “From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13,” in Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson [ed. R.P. Thompson and T.E. Phillips; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998], 191–214 [192]).
Subtle communication, operating under a number of guises and rubrics, was a common feature of the ancient rhetorical milieu. Numerous among the elite rhetors of antiquity attest to its presence and indeed pervasiveness in their day, sometimes disapprovingly so.\footnote{For the discussion that follows in this section I am deeply indebted both to the work of and personal interaction I have had with Jason Whitlark (see esp. his “‘Here We Do Not Have a City That Remains’: A Figured Critique of Roman Imperial Propaganda in Hebrews 13:14,” \textit{JBL} 131.1 [2012]: 161–179). Although I take issue with several aspects of his discussion regarding \textit{figured speech} in the ancient world, his essay has been an indispensable conversation partner.}

In his discussion of figures in Book 9 of the \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, Quintilian refers to the related—or, as Quintilian himself suggests, perhaps even equivalent—techniques of \textit{emphasis} and \textit{figured speech}.\footnote{“Similar, if not identical with this figure \textit{emphasis}, is another \textit{figured speech}" (Quintilian, \textit{Institutes}, 9.2.65). I will follow Quintilian in treating these techniques together. All quotes of Quintilian’s \textit{Institutio Oratoria} come from \textit{LCL} (trans. H.E. Butler; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1920).} He describes \textit{emphasis} as a figure in which “some hidden meaning is extracted from some phrase” (9.2.64). Along with a quote from Virgil’s \textit{Aeneid}, he cites the line from Ovid, “O Mother, happy in thy spouse!” as an example of \textit{emphasis}, here indicating the sexual desire which the daughter (Zmyrna/Myrrha) who speaks the line has for her father (9.2.64). This is subtle communication indeed.

Quintilian then describes \textit{figured speech} as the technique

\[
\text{whereby we excite some suspicion to indicate that our meaning is other than our words would seem to imply; but our meaning is not in this case contrary to that which we express, as is the case in } \text{irony, but rather } \text{a hidden meaning which is left to the hearer to discover. (9.2.65; emphasis added)}
\]

Quintilian goes on to discuss \textit{figured speech} at some length, and several aspects of this discussion merit comment here. First, Quintilian gives several indications of the

\section*{A (Greco-Roman) World of Subtlety}

Subtle communication, operating under a number of guises and rubrics, was a common feature of the ancient rhetorical milieu. Numerous among the elite rhetors of antiquity attest to its presence and indeed pervasiveness in their day, sometimes disapprovingly so.\footnote{For the discussion that follows in this section I am deeply indebted both to the work of and personal interaction I have had with Jason Whitlark (see esp. his “‘Here We Do Not Have a City That Remains’: A Figured Critique of Roman Imperial Propaganda in Hebrews 13:14,” \textit{JBL} 131.1 [2012]: 161–179). Although I take issue with several aspects of his discussion regarding \textit{figured speech} in the ancient world, his essay has been an indispensable conversation partner.}
pervasive use of this figure in the late first-century rhetorical scene of which he was part. It “is much in vogue at the present time” and “is of the commonest occurrence” such that he thinks he “shall be expected to make some comment” (9.2.65). Indeed, many over-used this technique in the early days of Quintilian’s teaching (9.2.77) and employed the technique at all manner of inappropriate times (9.2.79). In light of the ubiquity of this figure Quintilian is, secondly, eager to place restrictions on it. Early in his discussion of it, Quintilian tells us that figured speech is only to be done under three circumstances: 1) when “it is unsafe to speak openly”; 2) when “it is unseemly to speak openly”; or 3) “when it is employed solely with a view to the elegance of what we say, and gives greater pleasure by reason of the novelty and variety thus introduced” versus expressing oneself more straightforwardly (9.2.66). Later, Quintilian, despite his initial list of three, gives what is indeed a fourth cause of using figured speech: suggestive power. Thus, “some things, again, which cannot be proved, may, on the other, be suggested by the employment of some figure. For at times such hidden shafts will stick, and the fact that they are not noticed will prevent their being drawn out” (9.2.75).

Even so, when it comes to figured speech, Quintilian positions himself as something of a moderate-liberal, one who would put constraints on the technique, though without like some forbidding it entirely (9.2.69). Among these moderating constraints are his advice that one not employ words of “doubtful or double meaning”—even though he later acknowledges that the great Cicero did such on occasion (9.2.99)—and, more importantly still, that the figure not hinge “on ambiguous collocations of words” (9.2.69).

---

33 As rightly noted by Ivar Vegge, 2 Corinthians: A Letter about Reconciliation: A Psychagogical, Epistolographical and Rhetorical Analysis (WUNT 239; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 129.
He also instructs his audience not to employ *figured speech* too frequently (9.2.72). In discussing the use of *figured speech* for elegance (9.2.96–99), Quintilian gives several examples for how this may be done, including through allusion, which is “by far the most artistic” use of *figured speech* (9.2.97). His example is “the case where a rival candidate speaks against an ex-tyrant who had abdicated on condition of his receiving amnesty: ‘I am not permitted to speak against you. But a little while ago I wished to kill you’” (9.2.97). Thus the allusion is not to a text but to a well-known fact of recent local history.

Thirdly, Quintilian’s advice on this figure is clearly shaped by the predominant setting in which he imagines it will be practiced—the court of law. Thus his advice pertains specifically to presenting before judges (e.g., 9.2.72, 76, 80) and to presenting against opposing counsel (e.g., 9.2.75). All of the (ample) examples which he gives for the first two conditions (dangerous, unseemly) are in a forensic setting, save the last two examples, in which he discusses “those *figures* of which the Greeks are so fond, by means of which they give gentle expression to unpleasant facts” (9.2.92). In fact, his caution in employing figures (noted above) seems to be somewhat specific to the courtroom setting in which he imagines them to be employed and in which an injudicious use of *figured speech* may prove counterproductive, even damning (cf. 9.2.80, 95).

The key points of relevance which emerge from Quintilian’s discussion of *emphasis* and *figured speech* are: 1) its pervasive use in 1st century C.E. Latin, and probably also Greek, rhetoric; 2) that Quintilian and apparently other elite declaimers wish to put limits on it or else to squelch it entirely; 3) that this is partly so because of its danger in a forensic setting; 4) that Quintilian is not sure whether there is a dividing line between *emphasis* and *figured speech*, and any difference seems to be one primarily of
setting, as he gives examples of the former from literary works and of the latter from forensic settings (real or preparatory); 5) that Quintilian discourages use of double-meaning words but commends use of allusions for *figured speech*. Before discussing the relevance of these points for interpretation of Luke, I must consider other discussions of these subtle methods of communication among the elite Greco-Roman declaimers, building from the above discussion of Quintilian.

Ps.-Cicero also discusses *emphasis* in *Ad Herennium* Book 4, in which he states: “Emphasis is the figure which leaves more to be suspected than has been actually asserted” (4.53.67).\footnote{All quotes of *Ad Herennium* come from *LCL* (trans. Harry Caplan; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954). The entire discussion comes from *Ad Herennium* 4.53.67.} He gives five means of producing emphasis: hyperbole, ambiguity, logical consequence, aposiopesis, and analogy. The discussion of ambiguity is instructive, for, while warning against ambiguities “which render the style obscure,” he commends exploiting the multiple meanings of words as a means of causing one’s audience to suspect more than has been asserted: “It will be easy to find them [points of *emphasis*] if we know and pay heed to the double and multiple meanings of words.” Thus he offers a dissenting voice on this score from the more cautious advice of Quintilian.

He goes on to describe emphasis by logical consequence with the example of addressing the son of a “fishmonger” with the line, “‘Quiet, you, whose father used to wipe his nose with his forearm.’” The logical consequence plays to an apparently well-known stereotype regarding fishmongers and thus highlights the man’s questionable
pedigree through use of a hyper-truncated enthymeme.\textsuperscript{35} Emphasis by analogy draws a parallel between one (presumably contemporary) event and a well-known situation or narrative and thus insinuates a connection between the two situations, as in: “Do not, Saturninus, rely too much on the popular mob—unavenged lie the Gracchi.” The point is that, just as the Gracchi, who enjoyed popular support, were publicly murdered, so Saturninus may suffer a similar fate and should not allow himself to become over-confident on the basis of popular support.

Compared with Quintilian, then, Ps.-Cicero does not show hesitancy in employing this figure but instead commends it: “This figure sometimes possesses liveliness and distinction in the highest degree.” Likewise, Ad Herennium commends exploiting the multiple meanings of words, in direct opposition to Quintilian’s proscription. The rhetors agree, however, in commending use of allusion when implying more than one states (under “emphasis by analogy” for Ps.-Cicero).

On the Greek side and in the first century B.C.E., Ps.-Demetrius, in his On Style, discusses the “covert allusion” (ἐσχηματισμένος ἐν λόγῳ), which pairs with the figured speech of Quintilian.\textsuperscript{36} Like Quintilian, Demetrius believes this technique is wildly over-

\textsuperscript{35} I am referring to enthymeme as a truncated syllogism here, which is how it has often been understood, although the term had numerous meanings in ancient rhetoric and although some challenge this understanding of the term (see David E. Aune, “Enthymeme,” in The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric [ed. David E. Aune; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003], 150–57). Here, what is stated is the conclusion, viz. that the man’s father wiped his nose with his forearm, which leads via the unstated (and general) premise that fishmongers wipe their noses this way to the unstated specific premise—and the basis of the jab—that the man is the son of a fishmonger. Thus instead of disclosing one premise and the conclusion, Ps.-Cicero here combines enthymeme with emphasis, giving a hyper-truncated enthymeme in which only the conclusion is stated.

used (287) and, like Quintilian, seeks to place constraints upon its use (288). The constraints he commends bear some similarity to those of Quintilian, though they are far from identical: “covert allusion” must be used only with “good taste (εὐπρεπείας)” and “circumspection (ἀσφαλείας).” As his examples demonstrate, “circumspection” and “good taste” incorporate not only situations in which it is dangerous for one to speak openly, because of being under a tyrant (289) or speaking to eminent persons (292–93) or even to fickle populaces (294), but also instances in which one might, e.g., censure companions in a way that is incisive though not openly reproachful (288). Thus he agrees with Quintilian and Ps.-Cicero that a “covert allusion” may suitably be used for elegance and effect, apart from more pragmatic concerns (288, 290, 295–97). Ps.-Demetrius also agrees with Ps.-Cicero against Quintilian in commending the use of words with multiple meanings, especially as a means of subtle censure (291).

Further discussions of figured speech appear after the time of Luke’s writings, in the Ars rhetorica of Ps.-Dionysius (2nd century) and Ps.-Hermogenes’ rhetorical handbook (5th century). These treatments have little bearing on my study and so are not

---

37 He concludes by saying of the “Socratic” manner of figured speech: “Such dialogues met with great success in the days of their first invention, or rather they took society by storm through their verisimilitude, their vividness, their nobly didactic character” (298).

38 Ps.-Demetrius is well-known for his commendation also of allegory (ἀλληγορία), over-against plain-speaking (ἁπλος), because of allegory’s efficacy especially when threatening others (100). He explains: “Often the indirect expression is more impressive than the direct” (104). Even so, restraint must be practiced, lest one speak in riddles (102).

39 “This ambiguous way of speaking, though not irony, yet has a suggestion of it” (291).

addressed at any length here, beyond noting that *Ars rhetorica* assembles an impressive amount of examples of *figured speech* from classical Greco-Roman literature, showing that “not only did they [classical authors] use it [*figured speech*], but they used it self-consciously.”

It is, then, both an ancient and a classical aspect of Greco-Roman communication. Thus, it is unsurprising that Frederick Ahl described figured speech as “the normal mode of discourse throughout much of Greek and Roman antiquity.”

In the table below, I summarize the most salient points from Quintilian, Ps.-Cicero, and Ps.-Demetrius for my study:

Table 1: The Rhetoric of Subtlety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Quintilian</th>
<th>Ps.-Cicero</th>
<th>Ps.-Demetrius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commends <em>figured speech</em>?</td>
<td>Yes, with constraints</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves use of <em>figured speech</em> for elegance, effectiveness?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attests to ubiquity of <em>figured speech</em> in first century C.E. or earlier?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(unclear)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves use of allusion to achieve <em>figured speech</em>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves polysemy to achieve <em>figured speech</em>?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 Heath, “Pseudo-Dionysius,” 83. Russell, indicating his belief that Ps.-Dionysius at times overreaches, concludes that the writings attributed to Dionysius on rhetoric “may even seem to give countenance” to modern attempts “to uncover hidden agenda in so much ancient writing. More modestly, they may encourage us at least to identify examples of multi-purpose or schematized speeches of their own age” (“Figured Speeches,” 168). Luke, too, is widely acknowledged as a composer of speeches.

The point of the above discussion has not been to attempt by synthesis to arrive at a standard nomenclature for and understanding of a putatively monolithic practice of *figured speech* in the ancient world: such monolithic practice likely never existed, as the diversity of the sources attests. Rather, my purpose has been to demonstrate, first, the ubiquity of practices that may be grouped under the rubric of “subtle communication” in the rhetorical milieu in which Luke composed the Third Gospel and Acts. This ubiquity is seen not least in the efforts of members of the elite declaimers to proscribe or at the very least to constrain this practice. Moreover, even these elite declaimers allow for use of *figured speech*, or subtle communication, for reasons other than sheer pragmatism (when dangerous or unseemly), especially for elegance and effectiveness.

Given these factors, it is highly likely that Luke, too, would have employed subtle communication and might have done so for a number of reasons, not only because of, e.g., a putative fear of imperial recourse. Although I will not here engage in lengthy consideration of Luke’s purposes for employing subtle communication when discussing the fate of Jerusalem and its Temple (among other things), it is apropos to note that Luke may have done so from motives both of seemliness (i.e., he did not wish to harp upon the

---

43 This is the error with which Whitlark flirts, I believe (“Figured Critique,” 165); I view it as problematic that key parts of Whitlark’s synthesis rely exclusively on the witness of Ps.-Dionysius and Hermogenes, both of whom write later than the NT period, by Whitlark’s own accounting, and whose works may show common authorship or at least common tradition (see Heath, “Pseudo-Dionysius,” 85–86).

44 Covert speech of the sort under discussion here seems to have flourished beginning with Nero’s reign (see Ahl, “The Art of Safe Criticism”; Timothy J. Robinson, “In the Court of Time: The Reckoning of a Monster in the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca,” *Arethusa* 38 [2005]: 223–57).

45 For further discussion of the possible motives for subtle communication (or “implied speech”), see Vegge, *2 Corinthians*, 134–37.

46 Whitlark seems essentially to limit the “conditions” under which *figured speech* is called for to criticism of imperial power (“Figured Critique,” 166–69).
painful fact for some members of his audience of Jerusalem’s destruction, beyond the necessary Jesus sayings that spoke to such), of elegance,\footnote{Vegge notes as “a general attitude among Demetrius’ contemporaries” that “implied speech is given a higher status than explicit speech” (2 Corinthians, 131).} and of efficacy, especially since, as Quintilian for one maintains, some arguments are most powerfully made not by open assertion but by leaving an insinuation that sticks into one’s audience like a barb and eventually makes its meaning felt.

Furthermore, these elite declaimers offer hints as to how Luke is likely to employ subtle communication. Each of the three rhetoricians whom we have examined allow for subtle communication by allusion, and two commend subtle communication through exploiting the polyvalent meanings of some words, while the third, who opposes this latter practice, nonetheless cites an example of such from Cicero, no less. The examples of allusion which we have considered come usually from well-known events or stories within the shared narrative and literary milieu of the rhetor and audience. It is likely, then, that Luke’s allusions will draw primarily from the Scriptures of Israel, especially as expressed in the Septuagint, since this represents the primary shared cultural script between Luke and his ideal audience.\footnote{Luke probably also refers to events from recent Judean history in, e.g., 13:1-5; 19:11-27. However, it is the LXX which is his primary source material for allusions. Kenneth R. Jones considers the typological use of Babylon for Rome in works of the Pseudepigrapha as similar to figured speech (Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.: Apocalypses and Related Pseudepigrapha [Leiden: Brill, 2011], 34); Luke, as I will explore, also employs typologies rooted in the sacred history of Israel, albeit with a less clearly defined motive than that of his contemporary Jewish apocalypticists.} Regarding the question of multivalent words, Luke is well-known for exploiting the several meanings of words,\footnote{See especially Daniel Marguerat’s helpful discussion of Luke’s “ambivalence sémantique,” which he identifies with the rhetorical figure of “l’amphibologie,” which “est en effet le support littéraire de la polysémie” (“Luc-Actes Entre Jérusalem et Rome. Un Procédé Lucanien de Double Signification,” NTS 45.1 [1999]: 74–79 [79]). His claim that Luke employs this figure in service of his theological aims (80) anticipates the present study, as well as, e.g., C. Kavin Rowe’s work on narrative Christology.} even despite the
warnings against such in rhetorical handbooks with which Luke may have been familiar.\textsuperscript{50} This long-maintained recognition, plus the witness of both Ps.-Cicero and Ps.-Demetrius, suggests reading Luke with eyes and ears sharpened to attend to possible polyvalence of meaning and expression.

\textit{Summary}

The practical and theoretical discussions of rhetoric by tradents both ancient and modern thus suggest the propriety of reading ancient works, and in particular those of Luke, as containing subtle communication. Although the variety of witnesses do not readily yield a facile catalog of the (presumably) limited number of tactics or methods by which that subtle communication is likely to arrive, still some general summary comments may prove useful. Kurz suggests irony and misunderstanding and, to a lesser degree, symbolism and structure as means of Lukan subtle communication (i.e., “implicit commentary”).\textsuperscript{51} Numerous other Lukan commentators identify (even if only implicitly so) Luke’s frequent and complex use of the Jewish Scriptures as a key source of subtle communication.\textsuperscript{52} The ancient witnesses suggest that both allusion and irony or subtle

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} E.g., Theon, \textit{Progymnasmata} 81 (George A. Kennedy, trans., \textit{Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric} [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2003], 31).
\item \textsuperscript{51} Kurz, \textit{Reading Luke}, ch. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{52} This is the case, as I have noted elsewhere, with Baltzer and Karris, but it is also ubiquitous in, e.g., Thomas L. Brodie’s work on Lukan intertextuality. This fact is also suggested by Richard Hays’ work on echoes in the letters of Paul, especially his discussion of \textit{metalepsis}: “When a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts. . . . Allusive echo suggests to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed.” Just later: “\textit{Metalepsis . . . places the reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences}” (Richard B Hays, \textit{Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul} [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989], 20; emphasis added).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
meaning—especially through the exploitation of a word’s multiple meanings\textsuperscript{53}—were key and frequent means of subtle communication. Their witness, combined with the insight-bearing readings of previous scholarship on Luke, suggests that we should expect to find subtle meaning in Luke’s writings both via allusion and use of polyvalent words.

\textit{Intertextuality in Luke’s Writings}

Given the discussion above, this study must not neglect to consider more fully Luke’s use of Israel’s Scriptures.\textsuperscript{54} Although the scope of this project does not allow for a full history of research on Lukan intertextuality, I will attempt to give some further indications of where this study falls within the larger world of scholarship on Luke’s use of Scripture.

In one of the more recent monographs on Lukan intertextuality, Kenneth Litwak characterizes previous readings of Lukan intertextuality as operating with the schemas of 1) prophecy-and-fulfillment, 2) creation of continuity with Israel’s past, especially through the use of imitation, or 3) typology.\textsuperscript{55} Litwak rejects the first and last of these schemas and endorses a modified understanding of the second, what he calls “framing in discourse.”\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{53} Despite, again, the warnings against such in the \textit{progymnastic} tradition (e.g., Theon, \textit{Prog.} 81 [Kennedy, 31]).

\textsuperscript{54} In attempting throughout this study to analyze Luke’s use of the Jewish Scriptures, I will rely upon the best-available critical versions of the LXX, assuming for heuristic purposes that those versions correspond accurately to the Jewish Scriptures as Luke knew and used them. Thus I employ Rahlf’s edition, supplemented by the updated Göttingen editions, when available (e.g., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Sirach; the Göttingen edition is not yet available for 1 Kings, unfortunately).


Though I disagree with many of Litwak’s conclusions, his study proves a helpful discussion partner. While he is correct in saying that neither prophecy-and-fulfillment nor typological readings accounts for the full range of Lukan intertextuality and is correct that Luke’s use of scripture has as at least its partial aim to show continuity between the people whose story Luke narrates and the sacred history of God’s people told in the Scriptures of Israel, Litwak’s “framing in discourse” nonetheless fails, I believe, to provide an entirely satisfactory lens for viewing Luke’s use of scripture.

First of all, Litwak rejects too much. For instance, it is clear to me, as it has been to many commentators, that Luke does at points employ scripture in a manner that chiefly emphasizes the fulfillment of prophecy, especially in explicit quotations for the purposes of developing Christology in Acts. Additionally, Litwak’s rejection of typological use of the Scriptures is premature. He seems to adduce two reasons for rejecting typological readings: 1) commentators employ it without precisely defining what typology means, and 2) typology cannot account for the full range of Lukan intertextuality. As to the first criticism, that commentators often employ the language of typology without narrowly defining its meaning is perhaps less problematic than might appear on first glance. Litwak short-circuits the discussion, however, by proposing his own very-

---


58 There are, after all, a number of arenas, particularly in the realm of what we generally label the aesthetic, in which intuitive recognition far outstrips the human capacity for precise formalization. To use a modern example, the caricatures that have been a mainstay of magazines and newspapers for centuries (from the low-brow *Mad Magazine* to the uptown *New Yorker*) are clearly recognizable to most human beings with the requisite cultural encyclopedia for reading them—and so this caricature with a diminutive jaw-line and comically (and rudely) exaggerated ears is clearly meant to be Ross Perot, one-time presidential candidate, etc. The difficulty of formalizing the recognition that comes naturally to most humans finds vivid demonstration, however, in the fact that programming a computer to recognize these intuitively processed distortions has proven nearly impossible: What the human mind of normal readers does naturally, intuitively, the human mind of computer programmers has found nearly impossible to formalize (see, e.g., Ben Austen, “What Caricatures Can Teach Us about Facial Recognition”;

60
unhelpful (and admittedly “narrow”) definition of typology: “a rubric by which a person, event or thing in the Scriptures of Israel is mapped on a point-by-point basis to some New Testament person, event or thing.” He proceeds to reject a Moses typology for Jesus in Luke on the basis that, e.g., Moses never calls twelve disciples. In doing so, Litwak demonstrates only the unsatisfactory nature of his own definition of typology and not its inutility as a theoretical schema for Lukan intertextuality. A more chastened definition, such as “typology is a rubric in which a person, event, or thing in the Scriptures of Israel is mapped to a person, event, or thing in the New Testament on enough recognizable points to establish a meaningful connection, one that is informed by, and that subsequently informs, its larger narrative context,” would prove, I think, more useful.

This is precisely the kind of theoretical apparatus that might be adduced, e.g., from Luke Johnson’s discussion of Luke’s subtle framing of Jesus as a prophet both like and yet greater than Moses across the majority of Luke and the early parts of Acts. Moreover, denial of typological patterns in Luke’s writings is simply untenable in light of Luke’s

http://www.wired.com/magazine/2011/07/ff_caricature/; accessed 5-3-13). Human language is of course far less restrictive than the binary languages of computer programming, but still this illustrates the frequent difficulty of formalizing even basic and nearly universal modes of human intuition.

Litwak, Echoes, 59.

This more restrained definition of typology might be adequate to characterize, e.g., Richard Hays’ claims regarding Matthew’s Gospel: “. . . we have to reckon with Matthew’s use of typology, his deft narration of tales that [Donald] Senior [in “The Lure of the Formula Quotations”] describes as ‘shadow stories from the Old Testament.’ . . . The story of Herod’s slaughter of the innocents echoes Pharaoh’s decree to kill the Hebrew children, and by so doing it suggests that Herod, who claims to be ‘King of the Jews,’ is actually to be identified typologically with Israel’s ancient oppressor and that it is Jesus who is really the ‘King of the Jews.’” Hays goes on to claim that “these sort of typological allusions” are “all over the place in Matthew” (“Torah Re-configured”; emphasis added).
own well-recognized proclivities for typologically linking characters also within his own works (Jesus and Paul, Jesus and Peter, Jesus and Stephen, etc.).

An additional problem with Litwak’s proposal is his driving concern to find a single schema that accounts for the entire spectrum of Luke’s use of scripture, despite Litwak’s own recognition that Luke’s presentation of scripture varies widely throughout Luke and Acts, from subtle echoes to explicit quotations to citations with an introductory formula such as “it is written.” Given the range of Luke’s use of scripture in his narratives, on what basis does Litwak assume that a single schema will account adequately for Lukan intertextuality? Indeed it seems to me, then, both on a priori grounds and on the basis of previous scholarship, that Luke employs Scripture to a multiplicity of ends such that multiple schemas, including both fulfillment-from-prophesy and typology, are apropos, especially if these typological readings account also for the larger narrative dynamics of Luke’s works.

In this regard, it is apropos to note that when Luke explicitly quotes scripture, usually with a formula, he generally does so to show the fulfillment of prophecy,

---


62 Though he would surely object, it seems to me that it may be possible to collapse most or all of Litwak’s “framing in discourse” into a narrative-sensitive typological reading (alternately, he might suggest collapsing my “narratively attuned typology” into his “framing in discourse”!). Though “framing in discourse” may in theory have a greater capacity for sorting for the abundance of intertextual echoes in certain Lukan passages (e.g., Luke 1–2), in practice Litwak’s “choosing only those passages from Israel’s Scriptures that qualify as intertextual echoes by [his] criteria . . . and which have interpretive value for my argument” mitigates this potential theoretical advantage (Echoes, 69; emphasis added).

63 In the following (brief) discussion of Luke’s use of scripture, I consider Luke and Acts together, since recent attempts to argue for divergent authorship have hardly dinted the long-held consensus of joint authorship and since nearly all commentators view Acts as a sequel to Luke, even if not (ala Parsons) a sequel solely to Luke.

Luke’s use of intertextual echoes is far more complicated still, and matters are exacerbated by disagreement as to what precisely constitutes and how to identify “echoes.” On the question of identifying echoes, I generally follow Richard Hays’ classic work *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, but I join Brawley and Litwak in giving preeminence to two of Hays’ criteria (availability and volume), though without jettisoning the rest of Hays’ criteria (esp. recurrence and history of interpretation).

I also follow Brawley in broadening Hays’ “volume” criterion to measure volume not only on the basis of the “phraseological plane” but also in terms of replicated “form, genre, setting, and plot.” Luke’s writings are of course replete with echoes of Israel’s

---

64 Also exacerbating matters is the fact that scholarly interests regarding intertextuality continue “to accord privilege to explicit quotations and obvious allusions,” as Richard Hays and Joel Green remarked in 1995 (“The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers,” in *Hearing the New Testament*, 237), yet this remains true today.

65 By this, I mean that I generally employ Hays’ criteria, with the adaptations noted above, and that I am inclined to view “echoes” as intentional, or else subconscious but still informative, allusions by an author that he may have reasonably expected his audience to notice, at least on multiple exposures, and that, when heard, may contribute additional meaning to the obvious sense of the text. Thus “echoes” may be used with reference both to the author (the resonances that he intends or, less frequently, that he subconsciously includes) and to auditors (resonances that they were ideally able to detect).


scripture, particularly in Luke 1–2, and these echoes serve, in my estimation, to multiple ends. Sometimes Luke echoes scripture for the same purpose that he often explicitly cites scripture, i.e., in order to show the fulfillment of prophecy, as in the echoing of the Isaianic hopes of the Lord’s salvation reaching to “the end of the world” in Acts 1:8 (cf. Isa 49:6; Acts 13:47). At other points, Luke echoes portions of scripture for typological reasons, drawing a connection between a character in his story, usually Jesus, and OT figures, especially the prophets, for reasons that must be mapped across the narrative landscapes of both the source text and Luke’s narrative(s). These uses of echoes also contribute—as does Luke’s penchant for copying the style of the LXX as an end in itself—to Luke’s creating a story that feels and sounds like the sacred stories of God’s people. 68

Because of the importance of Luke’s typological use of echoes for my analysis of Luke’s Gospel (Part 2), I must give this facet of Lukan intertextuality further attention. 69

As noted above, many commentators view the many echoes of Elijah and Moses respecting Jesus in Luke’s Gospel as bearing typological import—that is, as establishing some manner of connection, the meaning of which is constrained by and specific to the

68 I believe that, while simple imitation of Septuagintal style was on occasions an end in itself for Luke (as argued by Litwak and Green), it was not typically Luke’s chief end in echoing the LXX.

characters being linked. Thomas Brodie’s work on Jesus as a prophet like Elijah/Elisha in Luke’s Gospel is well-known, and J. Severino Croatto has more recently explored a number of prophetic typologies employed for Jesus by Luke.

To rehearse only briefly two of the most significant typologies, Luke portrays Jesus after the pattern of both Elijah/Elisha and Moses. The typological use of Elijah/Elisha occurs frequently in Luke 3–9: Jesus describes himself with reference to these therapeutic prophets (4:24-27), Jesus raises the widow’s son (7:11-16; cf. 3 Kgdms 17:17-24), the fulfillment of the days of Jesus’ ἀνάλημψις brings about his final turn toward Jerusalem (9:51; cf. 4 Kgdms 2:9-10), and the sons of Zebedee seek to destroy a Samaritan village on the pattern of Elijah (9:52-56; 4 Kgdms 1:10-12). Likewise, Luke’s depiction of Jesus’ Transfiguration “unmistakably refers” to the events on Mt. Sinai: “the mount, Moses, the glory, the cloud.” Add to this Jesus’ speaking with Moses and Elijah about his ἔξοδος (9:31), and we hardly need Peter’s testimony in Acts 3:22-26 to associate Jesus with the prophet like Moses. The Third Gospel in fact explores and offers a host of typological connections between Jesus and the prophets of old—some of which

70 Bock prefers “typological-prophetic usage” instead of “typology”; while his explanation has merit, it risks conflating salvation-historical with literary concerns (Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, 49, 291–92).


73 Croatto, “Jesus, Prophet,” 461.
will receive additional attention in Part 2. Whether it is a theoretically necessary feature of typological connections in general,\textsuperscript{74} in practice these typological links establish a connection that is synkritical in nature, specifically one that demonstrates Jesus’ superiority over against the prophets whose lives and ministries provide the pattern for his own.\textsuperscript{75}

It is important to note that the import of these typological connections may extend beyond linking the primary figures themselves, entailing further connections between the characters or groups—or even the broader situational aspects—that surround the typologically linked characters. As an example, in presenting Jesus as in some ways parallel to Jeremiah, warning of imminent national destruction, Luke 13:34-35—despite the fairly unelaborated typological connection between Jesus and Jeremiah—nonetheless also implies a link between the nation of Israel who persisted in immorality during Jeremiah’s day and Jesus’ contemporary countrymen and -women.\textsuperscript{76}

Luke is alone neither in his typological identification of NT figures with OT characters nor in his broadening these initial connections to entail further, often covert connections. Richard Hays sees a “typological” linking between Jesus and Jeremiah in the citation of Jer 7 in Mark 11:17, along with the sandwiching scene of Jesus’ cursing

\textsuperscript{74} Probably following Goppelt, Bock claims this “progressive” sense as a necessary feature of typology generally (Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, 49); so does Davidson, despite noting this emphasis does not in fact appear in the very passage (1 Cor 10) from which he adduces it (Typology, 281). Regarding Lukan typology, this nuance works well when considering typological connections between Jesus and OT prophets but is problematized by Luke’s use of “internal typologies” between characters within his works—clearly, e.g., Stephen, typologically linked to Jesus in Acts 7, is not supposed to be greater than his Lord!

\textsuperscript{75} For example, whereas Elijah has to plead with God and then lie on top of the boy in order to revive him (3 Kgdms 17:17-24), Jesus does so with merely a word (Luke 7:14-15). For further examples of Luke’s synkritical pairing of Jesus and Elijah, see Keener, Acts, 1:714–15.

\textsuperscript{76} As Bock notes (Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, 119).
the fig tree, which he takes to echo Jer 8:13. Hays goes on to argue that the typological link extends beyond even the characters Jesus and Jeremiah:

Just as Jeremiah condemned the prophets and priests who spoke false deceptive words of peace and comfort while practicing injustice and idolatry, so Jesus takes up the mantle of Jeremiah to condemn the Temple establishment once again. The phrase “den of robbers” and the image of the barren fig tree provide the imaginative links; *for the reader who grasps the connection, the outward-rippling implications are clear.* As judgment fell upon Israel in Jeremiah's time, so it looms once again over the Temple.\(^{77}\)

Typological connections thus open rich, and challenging, avenues of meaning.

Therefore, unraveling the import of Luke’s typological use of echoes is certainly an art and as such admits a great deal of ambiguity. At each point, one must ask, How far does the Lukan text allow this connection to reach? Would Luke’s ideal audience (or any first-century audience) be likely or able to draw such-and-such a conclusion, or are we over-reading the connection? These are persistent questions that are not easily resolved, and they certainly haunt the present study. Still, the risk of over-reading Luke’s use of typology must be held in balance with the equally great risk of under-reading. We may hear too much in a series of echoes: we may also hear too little. The risk of hearing too little is heightened by the general unfamiliarity of most moderns, even biblical scholars, with the LXX—a limitation Luke’s ideal audience, and certainly Luke himself, did not share.\(^{78}\) As James A. Sanders cautions: “[Luke] knew certain parts of Scripture in such

\(^{77}\) Richard B. Hays, “Can the Gospels Teach Us How to Read the Old Testament?” *Pro Ecclesia* 11.4 (2002): 402–18 (406–9); emphasis added. Another example from Hays’ work on intertextuality comes from his claim that Matthew, when including the four (foreign) women in Jesus’ genealogy, “is already, I think, hinting at a major theme in his Gospel, namely that the story of Israel is open to the inclusion of Gentiles. . . . Matthew doesn’t explain any of that. He doesn’t quote any of the passages in which the women appear. But he includes them in the genealogy and thereby encourages us to recall their stories” (“Torah Reconfigured”).

\(^{78}\) See Litwak, *Echoes*, 61.
depth that unless the modern interpreter also knows the Septuagint . . . very well indeed he or she will miss major points Luke wanted to score.”

Conclusion

The pages above spell out the major features of my reading of Luke’s writings: a modified narrative criticism and attention to Lukan subtlety, including Lukan echoes from the LXX. The departures I have taken from standard narrative-critical lines consist of an emphasis on multiple exposures to Luke’s writings (instead of a first-time reading); a blurring of the traditional demarcating lines among “author,” “implied author,” and “narrator” because of considerations of genre and era and in order to locate my narrative reading within Luke’s historical context; a reading toward what I characterize as “Luke’s ideal audience” (including one well-versed in the LXX); and an operative assumption of the relative coherence of Luke’s writings.

An analysis of ancient rhetoricians around the time that Luke wrote has shown the pervasiveness of subtle communication in Luke’s ancient rhetorical milieu, especially through allusion and use of words with polyvalent meanings. While concerns for safety often governed use of subtlety, this was by no means the only motivation that spurred ancients to employ emphasis, figured speech, and other methods of subtle communication. Thus we need not surmise fear of reprisal as a necessary preliminary to identifying subtle communication in Luke’s writings.

Finally, I have explored intertextuality in Luke’s writings, drawing especially on the work of Litwak and Hays. Despite Litwak’s objections, “typology” remains a viable

---

and indeed elucidating category for exploring Luke’s use of OT characters for mapping out the identity of Jesus—as well as for broadening his audience’s understanding of the events and characters surrounding Jesus.

These pieces—narrative criticism, subtle communication, and intertextuality—are key lenses for reading Luke’s narrative(s), and they will significantly shape and inform my discussion in Part 2 below. Before turning there, however, I must consider another important feature of Luke’s context: the theodicy crisis that arose with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.
CHAPTER THREE
Theodicy in the Ancient and Lukan Worlds

Theodicy in the Ancient World

Ancient theodicy is, as I have claimed, the final major contextual piece that is needed for proper evaluation of the place of Jerusalem and its Temple within Lukan theology. Thus I will here explore theodicy in the ancient world, and especially in Luke’s post-70 C.E. milieu,¹ and then within Luke’s own writings.

Despite its coining by the modern philosopher Leibniz, “theodicy” has found increasing applicability to ancient texts, both in term and in concept.² The term arose within the Christian tradition and thus originally adhered to the Christian monotheistic deity (“God”), but it has been applied also to polytheistic texts and cultures.³ Even so, because my interests here pertain to so-called “monotheistic” understandings of theodicy, I will employ the term “God” in discussing theodicy.

---

¹ I follow the scholarly majority in identifying Luke’s Gospel (and Acts) as written post-70 C.E. However, neither am I dogmatic on this point nor does my thesis hinge on it. Whether Luke wrote post-70 C.E., 1) his Gospel clearly shows interest in questions of theodicy, as I will explore in this chapter, and 2) Luke clearly knows the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as an unavoidable fact, and so the theodicy-centric angst of many within the post-70 C.E. world necessarily touches the Lukan world as well, though, if he writes prior to 70 C.E., admittedly not with its eventual fever-pitch intensity.

² Consider, e.g., Walter Brueggemann’s bold statement that “‘Theodicy’ is the ultimate, inescapable problem of the Old Testament (although the term is never used)” (“Some Aspects of Theodicy in Old Testament Faith,” PRSt 26.3 [1998]: 253–68 [253]).

³ For more on the history of theodicy, including Max Weber’s broadening it to include “any attempt to render suffering and evil sensible,” thus without the necessity of a monotheistic framework, see Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor, “Introduction,” in Theodicy in the World of the Bible (ed. A. Laato and J.C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 2003), vii–liv (x–xi).
In general terms, theodicy is the human attempt to provide justification for God vis-à-vis the problem of evil and human suffering. The widely recognized conceptual pillars upon which the problem of evil and human suffering rest (within Jewish and Christian understandings) are: 1) God’s sovereign power and 2) God’s goodness, 3) in the face of evil and suffering, especially as experienced by human beings. Theodicy arises from the “existential need to explain suffering and evil”\(^4\) that arises in different communities and among different individuals across diverse cultures and eras. Therefore, when examining the theodical aspects of ancient texts, we need not limit our gaze to explicit or formalized discussions but should also be attuned to indications of the existential crisis that gives rise to theodicy in human experience.\(^5\)

Helpful in this regard is Walter Brueggemann’s language of a “theodicy settlement,” in which a community’s (or, I should like to add, an individual’s) mental map about “the kinds of beliefs that produce . . . good outcomes . . . and bad outcomes” based on God’s pleasure/displeasure correspond roughly to their lived experienced. Complementary to this is a “crisis of theodicy,” in which the old settlement has been dislodged. Brueggemann rightly notes that the theodicy settlement is powerful even when implicit, as it often is.\(^6\) While I am skeptical of attempts to distill detailed maps of

---

\(^4\) This is the framing given for theodical analysis by Elizabeth Boase, who draws on the earlier article by Brueggemann (“Constructing Meaning in the Face of Suffering: Theodicy in Lamentations,” \(VT\) 58 [2008]: 449–68 [454]).

\(^5\) As Brueggemann aptly puts it: “Ancient Israel never engaged in the speculative activity of what the modern world has come to term ‘theodicy.’ It had no interest in rational, speculative adventurism to defend Yahweh’s righteous sovereignty” (“Some Aspects of Theodicy,” 264).

\(^6\) Brueggemann, “Some Aspects of Theodicy,” 253. Brueggemann argues that a grand “theodicy settlement” runs across the entire Old Testament in which God’s covenant people are blessed when they do good (retribution theology, in Green-Charlesworth terms) and that answers to the theodicy crisis that arises when this settlement is disturbed usually take the form of either “an enemy” (of many different shades) who intrudes to interrupt the normal good order of things or, less frequently and more daringly, of
the events or claims that have given rise to theodical crisis from a given ancient text, I do see profit and promise in attempting, through attention to context, to outline the general contours of the theodical milieu in which a given author operated.

Problems associated with theodicy were keenly felt by many Jews in the aftermath of Jerusalem’s devastating destruction in 70 C.E. First-century Jews of course enjoyed a rich textual tradition to draw upon in pursuing questions of theodicy. Though Jews were by no means unique among peoples of the ancient world in their asking and attempting to answer questions of theodicy, Judaism shares with Christianity (and apparently also Islam) common theodical avenues and constraints that differentiate the great monotheistic religions from other religious traditions.

Yahweh’s own breaking of the settlement. Brueggemann’s synthesis, though helpful in many regards, omits several important pieces that are assembled by the Laato and de Moor volume (discussed below).

7 I view this as a shortcoming of (or perhaps, rather, an over-extension within) James Crenshaw’s article on theodicy in Sirach, in which he outlines the philosophical/theological “attack” leveled against the author’s views by his putative ideological opponents (“The Problem of Theodicy in Sirach: On Human Bondage,” JBL 94.1 [1975]: 47–64).

8 James H. Charlesworth claims that “Jews became increasingly concerned about theodicy from the third century BCE to the early second century CE” and goes on to note that “[w]ith the loss of the Land and the Second Temple in 70 CE, one can imagine that theodicy reached one of its highest points in the history of Jewish thought,” with 4 Ezra as “the prime example of deep penetrating reflection on theodicy” (“Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings: A Selected Overview,” in Theodicy in the World of the Bible [ed. A. Laato and J.C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 470–508 [470–71]). Later, he specifies 63 B.C.E. to 135 C.E. as the time of greatest existential angst for Jews (477).


10 See the essays on Akkadian, Ugaritic, Egyptian, and Hittite traditions of theodicy in Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor, eds., Theodicy in the World of the Bible (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

11 See the helpful discussion to this effect in Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xxiv–xxx.
One prominent synthesis has created a taxonomy for ancient monotheistic theodicy consisting of six “typologies”: retribution theology, educative theodicy, eschatological theodicy, the mystery of theodicy (or “theodicy deferred”), communion theodicy, and human determinism. A brief explanation of each is in order.

With its roots in ancient Near Eastern culture, retribution theology “is the prevailing type of theodicy in the Jewish Scriptures”; it affirms evil as a punishment/response to human infidelity and wickedness. The second most prominent type of theodicy in the Old Testament, educative theodicy, has its roots, according to Laato and de Moor, in the wisdom tradition of the ancient Near East, in the experience of the exile, and later in Jewish martyr theology. It provides an understanding of at least some human suffering as educative, imparting an improved perspective or character to the one who suffers, as with Job and Jeremiah, especially as in Jeremiah’s “confessions.” Eschatological theodicy, also known as “recompense theodicy,” justifies suffering in the present with reference to benefits to be gained at the end of human history. This is “the usual way to comfort and exhort the righteous ones to live according to the will of God in the Second Temple Judaism” and is presupposed in the New Testament. “Theodicy deferred,” which appears in the Wisdom Literature and the Psalms of the Old Testament, answers the problem of evil with a sort of non-answer:

12 These are the Green-Charlesworth typologies, brought together by Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xxix–xxx.


14 Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xxxix.


16 Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xlv.
human beings (and sometimes super-human beings) simply do not know the answer to the riddle of suffering and evil. Key examples of this type of theodicy appear in Job (see esp. Job 28) and parts of 4 Ezra. Communion theodicy emphasizes the role of suffering in drawing human beings closer to God, with the Servant Song of Isa 53 as perhaps the best example in the Old Testament. Human determinism approximates understandings of Fate prominent in the Hellenistic world: humans are simply fated to attain this or that end. Elements of this “rather drastic” response to the problem of evil and suffering appear in 4 Ezra and Qoheleth.

Omitted from the Green-Charlesworth typology is discussion of what Brueggemann calls “the enemy”—a character, whether human or super-human, who steps into the picture causing pain, suffering, and evil, most often Satan/the devil.

Although Laato and de Moor correctly note the absence of “dualistic interpretive models”

---

17 Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xlvi–xlviii. Mention of 4 Ezra in particular necessitates acknowledgement that these theodicy categories are, especially when applied to concrete texts, heuristic categories, describing theodical approaches that in fact often intermingle and interact within a single work. This is certainly the case with 4 Ezra, in which the main character (perhaps mimicking the author’s own experience) undergoes a transformation in his understanding of God’s justice vis-à-vis Jerusalem’s demise (see especially Bruce W. Longenecker, 2 Esdras [Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995], 96–98). This progressive, as well as the generally dialogical, nature of 4 Ezra makes it especially elusive of single theodical categories (see the warning against just such a “harmonization” in Longenecker, 2 Esdras, 21). In general, the earlier episodes (I–III), in which Ezra resists and carps against Uriel’s claims, including the central assertion that human beings (even members of the covenant community) cannot understand God’s ways, seems to display a healthy dose of theodicy deferred. By contrast, the later parts of 4 Ezra (episodes IV–VII), in which Ezra has undergone his transformation, lean more firmly in the direction of retribution theology (since Ezra finally acknowledges God’s justice in condemning sinners, even among Israel, despite Ezra’s personal grief regarding this truth) and eschatological theodicy (since Ezra comes to find “consolation” in the visions of the future, heavenly sphere); on this, see especially Longenecker, 2 Esdras; also, Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1–11 (JSNTSup 57; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); “Locating 4 Ezra: A Consideration of Its Social Settings and Functions,” JSJ 28.3 (1997): 285–93. Note that, while theodicy deferred thus does not seem to be in line with the author’s own (eventual) theodical preferences, the early chapters of 4 Ezra nonetheless offer a compelling tutorial in this theodical approach.


19 Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” liv.
in Jewish theology such that Yahweh’s presence always effectively dispels and prevails against “evil powers,” they apparently overlook the fact that it is Yahweh’s absence in the text which leaves room for the actions of these nefarious beings (whether human or beyond), even if only temporarily so. A tempting logical response to this fact might be something along the lines of: “Well, if God’s absence is what allows these enemies to be effective, then they don’t represent a theodical response since their presence still leaves unanswered the foundational question of, ‘Why was God absent?’” The rational basis of this response likely does not override the existential relief many believers nonetheless gained (and gain) from attributing evil to the free will, or at least relatively unconstrained action, of other beings. I suggest adding, then, “enemy theodicy” to the Green-Charlesworth typologies for Jewish-Christian theodical responses.

_Theodicy in the Judaism(s) of Luke’s Day_

A full examination of the theodical lines traced in the various extant Jewish documents from the third century B.C.E. to 135 C.E. obviously lies far beyond the scope of this study. Thus I will attempt here only to give some sense of the shape of the land, specifically by indicating the theodical “pride of place” occupied by the recent, horrifically realized, destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple for many Jews. As I

---

20 Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xxvii.

21 Indeed there is some evidence from the psychological sciences indicating that Christians who possess “robust notions of Satan” have more positive feelings toward God and are less likely to blame God for evil; see Richard Beck and Sara Taylor, “The Emotional Burden of Monotheism: Satan, Theodicy, and Relationship with God,” _JPsyT_ 36.3 (2008): 151–60. Beck and Taylor describe “robust notions of Satan” as enabling one to utilize “warfare theodicy” (_passim_).

22 Though claiming that “theodicy became the central issue” for Second Temple Jews dealing with the Babylonian (587–586 B.C.E.), Seleucid (169–168 B.C.E.), Roman (63 B.C.E.), and second Roman (70 C.E.) desecrations and demolitions of the JT, Michael E. Stone (“Reactions to Destruc-

75
move into the era in question, I will note some of the theodical typologies employed by the texts and will comment upon each work’s proclivity for orienting questions with respect to the two sides of God’s character that are jeopardized when a theodicy settlement is disrupted, God’s goodness and God’s power.

According to Charlesworth, Jewish documents from the third and second centuries B.C.E. (i.e., primarily the OT Apocrypha) show relatively little concern for theodicy and usually accept as satisfactory the dominant theodical line laid out in the OT, retribution theology, with the addition of eschatological theodicy23 (which may be viewed, after all, as a variant of retribution theology, with a significant temporal twist).

Things began to change after 63 B.C.E., though only moderately so and though this was primarily true only for mainstream Jews residing in Palestine, at least prior to 70 C.E.24 Thus the Qumran documents reveal only modest concern for theodicy and usually work things out along the lines sketched for the OT Apocrypha (retribution theology, plus eschatological theodicy).25 David Runia argues that Philo likewise evinces a theodical stance largely characterized by retribution theology and educative theodicy, especially in

---

23 See Charlesworth, “Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings,” 473–77. Stone seems to view retribution theology as more prominent in the wake of Antiochus Epiphanes’ and Pompey’s desecrations of the JT (e.g., 2 Maccabees, Judith, Psalms of Solomon) and eschatological theodicy as dominant subsequently (e.g., 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra), though this is probably because he views eschatological theodicy primarily in terms of a heavenly Jerusalem instead of emphasis on eventual (eschatological) rewards (Stone, “Reactions to Destructions,” 196–200).


25 Charlesworth, “Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings,” 477–82. Charlesworth adds also “Proleptic Fulfillment” as a theodical avenue pursued in the DSS (481), but this falls within “eschatological theodicy” in the combined Green-Charlesworth typologies (see Laato and de Moor, “Introduction,” xxix).
the wake of God’s apparent vindication of the righteous (Alexandrian) Jews vis-à-vis Flaccus and Gaius in 38–41 C.E., though there are also hues of “theodicy deferred.”

If representative of the views of Jerusalemite Jews after 63 B.C.E, the *Psalms of Solomon* indicate that the gradual tightening of the Roman “noose” around Judea’s neck beginning with Pompey’s desecration of the JT in 63 B.C.E. increased theodical angst for Jews dwelling in the Holy Land. The author of the *Psalms of Solomon*, reflecting on Pompey’s sacrilege, solves the problem by reasserting retribution theology (*Pss. Sol.* 2, 8), an interpretation strengthened by Pompey’s own eventual demise (reflected upon in 2:26-27). Theodicy has been brought to the forefront in the composer’s mind and, if he is at all representative, also in the minds of many Judean Jews, yet the old settlement (retribution theology) remains intact. This settlement would withstand Roman aggression only so long, however.

Despite the detectable increase in theodical angst for Judean Jews following Rome’s seizure of the Holy Land, the true watershed in ancient Jewish theodicy came with the events culminating in the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple in 70 C.E. It

---


29 Indeed, “God’s chief function according to the psalms [of Solomon] is that of judge, justly dispensing reward and punishment for human deeds” (Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 238).
was the aftermath of that national tragedy that produced such theodically-tortuous works as 2 Baruch and, above all, 4 Ezra.\(^{30}\)

Receiving its impetus from the Flavian era of Roman hegemony,\(^{31}\) 4 Ezra is something of a theodical tour de force,\(^{32}\) with potent strains of theodicy deferred, retribution theology, and eschatological theodicy\(^{33}\)—with, as noted earlier, theodicy deferred dominating episodes I–III and retribution theology and eschatological theodicy winning the day after Ezra’s “transformation” (episodes IV–VII). Time and again in episodes I–III, the narrator’s petitions and complaints regarding the inscrutability of God’s justice in the midst of Jerusalem’s destruction and Israel’s subjugation to the

---

30 Without question, Jewish responses to the national tragedy that culminated in 70 C.E. varied considerably—a fact I certainly do not wish to obscure here. Some works written shortly after and with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and the decimation of so many facets of 1\(^{st}\) century Jewish identity show relatively little trace of theodical concern, such as Josephus. Other works seem more concerned about Judea’s subjugation to Rome than about the destruction of the Temple specifically. This is what Kenneth R. Jones claims regarding 4 Ezra (Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 57), though he may overstate matters (see 4 Ezra 3.27, 28; 5.25; 6.19; and Vision 4). A clearer example of this attitude is found in Sib. Or. 4.24-30, 130-36, where, although God will punish the Romans for defeating the Jews, via the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius, nevertheless God’s people will reject all temples (so Charlesworth, “Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings,” 488–89). Those works which show a preoccupation with the Temple often envision an eschatological solution to the Temple’s present desolate state, as in Sib. Or. 5.414-33; 2 Bar. 4.2-7; 4 Ezra 7.26-28; 9.38–10.59; 13.36 (see Chance, Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age, 7), and not infrequently the appearance of the eschatological Temple coincides with the arrival of a messianic figure (e.g., Sib. Or. 5; 4 Ezra; Apoc. Ab. 29–31; not so in 3 Baruch, however). For a balanced assessment of the impact of this war on the various segments of Jewish society, see Lee I.A. Levine, “Judaism from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the End of the Second Jewish Revolt: 70–135 C.E.,” in Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development (ed. Hershel Shanks; Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), 125–50 (125–32).

31 So Jacob M. Myers, I and II Esdras (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), 129; also, Longenecker, 2 Esdras, 13–14; and Michael E. Stone, Fourth Ezra (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 9–10, 361–65, arguing for 4 Ezra’s composition at the end of Domitian’s reign on the basis of Vision 5 (chs. 11–12). Not dissenting from the majority position, though allowing for a date as late as 120 C.E. is Bruce M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra,” in OTP, 1:520.

32 Putting the matter succinctly is Bruce W. Longenecker: “Whether in frustration or in confidence, [4 Ezra] is throughout a work of theodicy—that is, an attempt to understand and defend belief in the justice and sovereignty of God in view of the desperate condition of God’s world” (2 Esdras, 12).

33 There are other traces of other ancient theodicy categories as well, e.g., educative as well as eschatological theodicy in 7:14-16.
nations are met with the stern response that God’s ways are precisely that, inscrutable. A key example occurs in 4:1-21, where the angelic figure Uriel responds to the seer’s query with riddles meant to show his inability to comprehend. The seer replies to the non-answer which he receives with the claim that he seeks knowledge not of heavenly but of earthly things (4:22-25), and the cryptic answer which the seer then receives from his angelic host (4:26-32) suggests the resolution lies in the eschatological future.34 This is precisely what Ezra (and attentive auditors) discovers to be the case as 4 Ezra unfolds into Ezra’s visions of the eschatological future (episodes V–VI).

It is the failed calculus of classical retribution theology (3:28-36), combined with covenantal assurances (4:22-25; 5:21-30; 6:55-59), that has apparently given rise to the initial (and profound) theodicy crisis.35 Thus questions seem to orient not around God’s power but primarily around God’s goodness—here expressed, unsurprisingly, in terms of faithfulness and justice. And so the narrator agonizes: Why did God not take away from Israel the evil heart inherited from Adam (3.20-27)? And how is God just in punishing Zion when its destroyers are equally wicked (3.28-36)? And how can God allow his chosen people to be tormented by the nations (5.23-30; 6.55-59)? And then, with Ezra broadening his theodical concern to include all of humanity,36 why should human beings be so unfortunate as to possess the vexing knowledge of their own mortality—a mortality which stands always and cognizantly under the sentence of future judgment (7.62-69)?

34 See Stone, Fourth Ezra, 81–82.

35 Longnecker ascribes 4 Ezra to “‘crisis of faith’ literature” (2 Esdras, 11).

36 On Ezra’s shift of focus from the covenantal people of God to all of humanity in episode III, see Longenecker, 2 Esdras, 46–55.
Though it is possible to conceive of some of these questions as betraying a lack of confidence in God’s power, they seem most naturally to point rather to foundering confidence in God’s faithfulness and justice.\(^{37}\)

A number of similarities link \textit{2 Baruch} to \textit{4 Ezra}. Among these are the use of the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem as the fictional setting, pseudonymous claim to have been penned by an ancient, well-known scribe, and shared use of apocalyptic genre.\(^{38}\) In \textit{2 Baruch}, however, the logic of retribution theology more readily prevails (cf. 1–5), and God himself brings destruction on Jerusalem through the agency of four angels (6–8) and will ultimately punish the arrogant Romans (36, 38–40).\(^{39}\) The author seems eager to assure auditors that, despite the destruction of God’s city and God’s house, God need not be attributed lack of power (5:1–4). Hence, surely, the destruction of Jerusalem by angelic agency\(^{40}\) as well as the divine voice which invites in the conquering army.\(^{41}\) Indeed, God will eventually bring judgment on the arrogant nations by which he has destroyed his own people (13:8-11; 14.2), and the narrator confidently anticipates the eventual appearance of the true Jerusalem, the heavenly city (4.2-7). Thus, again, eschatology buttresses retribution theology.

\(^{37}\) Thus Jones notes that, in response to \textit{4 Ezra}’s painful and probing questions, “[o]ne might be tempted to doubt the justice of God” (\textit{Jewish Reactions to the Destruction}, 123).

\(^{38}\) For these, and additional similarities, see Nickelsburg, \textit{Jewish Literature}, 270, 283–85.

\(^{39}\) See Jones, \textit{Jewish Reactions to the Destruction}, 97–100.

\(^{40}\) As Charlesworth notes, “By denying that the Romans destroyed Jerusalem and by stressing that it was accomplished through God’s commands, the author endorses the power of ‘the mighty God’” (“Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings,” 493). Charlesworth derides this claim as “patently absurd” and has an overall poor opinion of \textit{2 Baruch} and its, for him, “rather too facile solution to theodicy” (492).

\(^{41}\) Jones notes that the voice of invitation suggests that otherwise the invading army would not have been able to enter the city and the Temple and that “the guardian” no longer “resided within”; in “this way efficacy is restored to God” (\textit{Jewish Reactions to the Destruction}, 91, 92).
Despite its ultimate confidence in retribution theology, 2 Baruch has its own moments of anguished theodicy, such as occur in chapters 10, 14, and 35. Thus can the narrator ask: “What have they profited who have knowledge before you, and who did not walk in vanity like the rest of the nations, and who did not say to the dead: ‘Give life to us,’ but always feared you and did not leave your ways?” (14.5, OTP). He goes on to ask why the deeds of Zion’s many righteous people should not have offset the wicked deeds of other of its residents (14.7). In this passage, reminiscent of the early episodes of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch probes the matter of God’s justice and faithfulness. Even so, its overall confidence in retribution theology seems to override these (nonetheless poignant) moments of searching doubt, and its careful and elaborate depiction of God’s angels as Jerusalem’s true undoing indicate a comparatively greater concern for the other half of the theodical coin: God’s power.42

Other apocalypses that likely come from this time and from a shared tradition also address the theodical problem created by the destruction of Jerusalem, though less desperately than do (at times) 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. These are the Apocalypse of Abraham and possibly 3 Baruch.43 According to Nickelsburg’s early analysis, these works follow 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in attributing Jerusalem’s demise to the people’s

42 See Jones, Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 91–93.

43 George Nickelsburg includes 3 Baruch as an apocalypse from this period in the first edition of his Jewish Literature (280–81, 303, 304) but excludes it in the second edition. H.E. Gaylord Jr. is sure neither of 3 Baruch’s dating nor to what extent it is a basically Jewish work with limited Christian interpolations versus a combination of an earlier Jewish and a later Christian work, though the Jewish parts may well be from the era in question (“3 Baruch,” in OTP, 1:655–56 [653–61]). Charlesworth does not include 3 Baruch in his discussion of Jewish works from this period (“Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings”). On the other hand, Richard Bauckham places 3 Baruch in this period (The Jewish World around the New Testament [WUNT 233; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 114), and Jones locates both 3 Baruch and 4 Baruch within this period (Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 112, 119–20, 156). Though including 3 Baruch, I have given it minimal space, and none of my conclusions rest on its witness.
sinfulness (retribution theology; see Apoc. Ab. 24–26) while anticipating punishment for Jerusalem’s destroyers (retribution theology) and awaiting eschatological reward (eschatological theodicy). While overall they demonstrate little of the agonized reflection that is characteristic of 4 Ezra and that appears also in 2 Baruch, the Apocalypse of Abraham does place a pained question in the patriarch’s mouth upon his vision of the Temple’s destruction: “Eternal, Mighty One! If this is so, why now have you afflicted my heart and why will it be so?” (27.6, OTP). This pathos-laden exclamation, combined with God’s immediate response that the suffering is due to the wickedness of Abraham’s heirs, speaks to a concern for God’s faithfulness and justice—what kind of a God would not only allow Abraham to see such a thing but also allow it to happen? The answer is that the God who does so, does so on just terms. The later, ekphrastic description of God’s destruction of the “heathen” who harmed his people speaks to a concern for asserting God’s power (31.1-8).

Though it begins with a weeping scribe lamenting Jerusalem’s destruction (1.1-5), 3 Baruch moves briskly away from such pathos-inducing imagery to breathtaking heavenly visions which demonstrate the awesome power of God and the justice of his universe (e.g., 2.7; 3.7-8; 9.7; 11.7-9; 15.2-4; 16.2-4). Thus 3 Baruch affirms the justice but especially the power of God in the aftermath of Jerusalem’s desolation. It is also notable for its apparent concern regarding the proper maintenance of human-divine

---

44 Idem, Jewish Literature (1st ed.), 303. Overall, the Apocalypse of Abraham, though raising the question of theodicy, seems quite content with the classical theodicy settlement found in retribution theodicy, augmented with eschatological theodicy (27.1-12; 29:17-21).

45 Interpreting 3 Baruch as preeminently concerned with the “efficacy”—i.e., power—of Israel’s God is Jones, Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 111–13, 121–23.
affairs in the wake of the Temple’s destruction—a problem resolved by the heavenly
ministrations of the angel Michael.\footnote{46 See Gaylord, “3 Baruch,” in \textit{OTP}, 1:659.}

At least two\footnote{47 Charlesworth takes \textit{Sib. Or.} 3.51-56, 75-92, 288-94 as referring to the recently realized
destruction of Jerusalem (“Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings,” 489), while John J. Collins takes them to be
2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. works of Egyptian provenance (“The Sibylline Oracles, Book 3,” in \textit{OTP}, 1:354–
61).} of the \textit{Sibylline Oracles} contain portions composed in the aftermath
of the Flavian assault on Jerusalem (\textit{Sib. Or.} 4.115-36; 5.397-429). \textit{Sibylline Oracle} 4
affirms the destruction of Jerusalem as punishment for the sinfulness of God’s people
(4.117-18), but even so God will punish her destroyers with the cosmic destruction of
Vesuvius (4.130-37)\footnote{48 See Charlesworth, “Theodicy in Early Jewish Writings,” 488–89; Jones, \textit{Jewish Reactions to the
Destruction}, 178, 194.}—all perfectly in accord with the tenets of retribution theology.\footnote{49 Cf. Jones, \textit{Jewish Reactions to the Destruction}, 204.}
Both God’s justice and God’s power are preserved. \textit{Sibylline Oracle} 5 preserves these
dual facets of God’s character as well, though it leaves ripe avenues of doubt regarding
God’s power by attributing the catastrophe solely to Roman aggression (5.397-410).
Only God’s subsequent destruction of Titus (5.411-13) and eschatological subjugation of
all of creation via a messianic figure (5.414-434) secure God’s power and faithfulness.

Even Josephus—albeit from a mixed pot of motives—heads off potential
accusations against the power of Israel’s God by claiming that the God of the Jews went
over to Rome. While it is doubtful whether Josephus can be counted as showing genuine
theodical concern in the aftermath of 70 C.E., he may at least demonstrate an awareness
of the fragility of the reputation of Israel’s God in the wake of those events and so indirectly bear witness to the prominence of issues of theodicy among Jews in his day.

Collectively, the above works indicate the powerful pull toward theodicy felt by many pious believers in Israel’s God in the wake of the disastrous events of 70 C.E. These works employ a variety of theodical avenues for resolving the challenge to God’s character brought about by Jerusalem’s destruction, and they give varying weight to the complementary sides of God’s character brought into question by the theodicy crisis, God’s power and God’s faithfulness and justice.

**Theodicy in Luke**

Like several of his Jewish contemporaries, Luke seems to have felt the theodical angst of the post-70 C.E. world, whether as a matter of personal existential angst or, more likely, as a significant part of the general intellectual and cultural milieu of which he and members of his audience were part. I will explore the theodical emphases of Luke’s Gospel below. Though much of the evidence centers around Luke’s considerable interest in the fate of Jerusalem and its Temple, two theodical parables, both unique to the Third Gospel, also demonstrate a concern for theodicy apart from any obvious reference to Jerusalem or the Temple. After considering the theodical evidence in Luke’s Gospel, I will examine the likely (and necessarily speculative) reasons for Luke’s interest in

---

50 While it is difficult to know to what degree these works should be “weighed rather than counted” in drawing a sketch of Jewish sentiments between 70 and 132 C.E., it is remarkable how many of the extant works directly address issues of theodicy (each of the 4 apocalypses, in my view) and how many show some recognition of the need to shore-up God’s reputation (the Sibylline Oracles and Josephus). Even if 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch display a literary relationship (so Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 284) or indeed even if all of the works addressed above were “written in some sort of dialogue with each others” (so Jones, *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction*, 156), it is noteworthy that these works, in spite of their many similarities, do theodicy so differently, thereby testifying to the diversity of those who were drawn to questions of theodicy at this time.
theodicy, the contextual factors that may have shaped and given poignancy to questions of theodicy for Luke and for Luke’s ideal audience.

It hardly needs saying that Luke spends considerably more time and effort probing Jerusalem’s fate, including its role in the unfolding eschatological drama, than do the other canonical Gospels. I will place the evidence for such within the flow of Luke’s narrative in chapter 4–6, and so here I will simply assemble (some of) such evidence as rough, semi-quantified “data.” One of Luke’s early (and unique) characters speaks to those “awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem” (2:38). Luke includes Jesus’ initial lament over Jerusalem (Luke 13:34-35), found also in Matt 23:37-39, and adds to it the notice of Jerusalem’s role as murderer of the prophets (13:33). Luke also includes another, unique lamentation of Jesus over the city (19:41-44), raises and obliquely responds to the question of whether Jesus’ drawing near to Jerusalem entails the imminent arrival of the kingdom (19:11-27), makes the “Temple-cleansing” the climax of his Journey section (19:45-46; see comments ad loc. in ch. 6), makes Jerusalem’s destruction—elaborated in rather vivid terms—a focal point of his “Eschatological Discourse” (21:20-22), and references Jerusalem’s demise even during Jesus’ march to the cross (23:27-31). Moreover, Luke begins Acts with what is probably a veiled reference to expectations of Jerusalem’s political restoration (1:6).

Though further evidence will be forthcoming in

---

my examination of Luke’s Gospel in chapters 4–6, the hasty rehearsal above more than establishes Luke’s surpassing interest in Jerusalem’s fate.\textsuperscript{52}

As noted in chapter 1, Luke concerns himself with Jerusalem more than any other New Testament writer—as seen even in the number of times he mentions the city’s name (roughly two-thirds of the occurrences in the New Testament)—and so perhaps his including so much material about Jerusalem’s fate reflects not a theodical concern per se but is simply a by-product of Luke’s general interest in the city. This answer is unsatisfying, however, for the simple reason that, in Luke’s milieu, to discuss Jerusalem—the (immediate) fate of which has been sealed in the Lukan (literary) world and almost certainly also in the (real) world of Luke’s audience—is to court questions of theodicy. That Luke himself so frequently and so poignantly draws his auditors’ attention not only to Jerusalem but also specifically to its fate serves as corroboration of this truth. Whatever general interest Luke may have in Jerusalem, he clearly expresses a specific and pointed interest in its tragic demise and in questions of its role in salvation history. In so doing, Luke concerns himself with issues of theodicy.

At a number of specific points, Luke appears either to raise the question of theodicy or even to employ one of the expected Jewish-Christian theodical typologies. Without making any claims to being exhaustive and without attempting to situate the following episodes adequately in their narrative context (see chs. 4–6), I note the following.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{52} See also the helpful survey of the Lukan landscape in Holmås, “‘My House Shall Be Called a House of Prayer,’” 396.}
Luke’s theodical parables. Two uniquely Lukan parables employ the language and themes of theodicy. These are the Parable of the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8) and the Parable of the Persistent Widow (18:1-8). The parables share a number of similarities which frequently lead commentators to consider them together: the initial reluctance but eventual capitulation of the character of whom the request is made; their similar use of παρέχω (11:7; 18:5); and Luke’s explicitly framing each within the context of a discussion of prayer. I will consider them together here as well.

Luke 11:5-8, which tells the story of a midnight visit and the reluctant “friend” who eventually responds to the petitioner’s requests for provisions, occurs within “an extended presentation on prayer in 11:1-13” and at several points connects conceptually to that larger framing, especially the mention of bread (vv. 3, 5) and the shared emphasis on petitioning with vv. 9-10. As such, most interpretations of the parable within its narrative context take it as a parable giving instruction regarding prayer. Verse 5 introduces a hypothetical question, one that runs to the end of v. 7 and one which expects

---


56 See the helpful history of research in Ernest Van Eck, “When Neighbours Are Not Neighbours: A Social-Scientific Reading of the Parable of the Friend at Midnight (Lk 11:5-8),” HTS 67.1 (2011): 1–14 (2), whose own interpretation intentionally divorces the parable from its Lukan context, taking it as attributable to the historical Jesus, and reads it from a socio-scientific perspective. Whatever the value of considering this parable apart from its Lukan context, it is Luke’s theology—and thus his framing here—which commands our interest at present.
a negative answer: “Who among you if such and such happened would refuse your friend?”

Though the meaning of τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ (“his shamelessness”) in v. 8 is contested, it almost certainly carries a negative connotation and probably refers to the shamelessness of the petitioner. In this case, the point is that, even if the man in bed would not give bread on the basis of “friendship” and the mores of ancient reciprocity, still, because of the petitioner’s “shamelessness,” the man in bed would not refuse his request.

Only later, in v. 13, does Luke supply the critical interpretive lens for the parable.

There, commenting on the father who would not give his son undesirable gifts (vv. 11-12), Jesus states: πάσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ ὑπάρχου δώσει πνεῦμα ἄγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν


58 See esp. Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 442–45; and idem, “Anaideia and the Friend at Midnight (Luke 11:8),” JBL 116.3 (1997): 505–13, who notes that the word never has a positive meaning in the extant literature through the 4th century C.E. except in some Christian interpretations of Luke 11:8; also, Van Eck, “When Neighbours Are Not Neighbours,” 10–11; Everett Huffard, “The Parable of the Friend at Midnight: God’s Honor or Man’s Persistence?” RQ 21.3 (1978): 154–60. The attribution of ἀναίδεια to the man in bed seems largely to be based on the reconstruction of ancient village life by, among others, William Herzog, which he somewhat famously summarizes with the line: “Bolted doors and sleeping children are minor obstacles easily overcome” (idem, Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 202). While I am hesitant to shirk social-scientific reconstructions of the realia and values of the ancient world, I am even more resistant to allowing such reconstructions to override the evidence of the ancient texts themselves. Here, Luke’s temporal indicator that it was midnight (μεσονύκτω; v. 5), combined with the man’s objections (v. 7), plus the more natural reading of τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ (v. 8) as a reference to the petitioner (see Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:912), suggests that, at least for Luke’s ideal audience, the petition is taken to fall potentially outside the bounds of normal friendship—and thus the “shamelessness” belongs to the man making the request.

Admittedly, the passage admits a good deal of ambiguity, especially in its use of personal pronouns; see Marshall, Luke, 465, for a (cautiously) dissenting opinion. Even if I am mistaken in this and ἀναίδεια indeed refers to the shame which the man in bed hopes to avoid, it has relatively little bearing on my larger reading of the passage, since the from-lesser-to-greater import of the passage still coheres. Alternately, Luke may leave the referent intentionally vague, thus allowing for a double-meaning in which the petitioner acts shamelessly and the man in bed responds in order to avoid the shame of failing to be hospitable.
αὐτόν. This framing encourages the Lukan audience to read the earlier parable in a from-
lesser-to-greater sense⁶⁰ and thereby discourages a reading that seeks a one-to-one
allegory between every character and feature of the parable and believers’ devotional
lives.⁶¹ Rather, Luke seems here only to affirm the general truth, with an illustration
from ancient village life, that God responds to believers’ petitions.

Even so, the positioning of God vis-à-vis the man who is potentially hesitant to
respond favorably to his petitioner opens up a common theodical vista: God the remote,
God the hesitant, dilatory respondent. This theodical vista comes fully into view,
however, only with a subsequent (related) parable: the Parable of the Persistent Widow.

Located near the end of Luke’s Journey section, following upon a discussion by
Jesus regarding eschatological trials that await his disciples (17:22-37), “The Parable of
the Persistent Widow” (Luke 18:1-8) invites a surprising comparison between God and
an unscrupulous judge.⁶² Like its counterpart in Luke 11, this parable offers a “how
much more” argument—clearly implied by Jesus’ words in vv. 6-7—one which absorbs
much of the potentially unsavory comparison. Again, the point is precisely that God is
not like the judge in the parable and so will answer the prayers of his people.⁶³ Even so,

---

⁶⁰ Robbins’ rejection of an argument from lesser to greater here in favor of an argument from
analogy is not compelling (“From Enthymeme to Theology,” 204–5).

⁶¹ Because of this, Huffard’s claim that attributing ἄναστα to the petitioner implies “that it would
be shameful to go to God with our needs” (“Parable of the Friend at Midnight,” 155) is simply mistaken.
Rather, “[t]he whole point of the parable . . . is that God is not like the sleeper. It is a parable contrasting
God with the sleeper” (Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 447; emphasis original).

⁶² “Jesus’ choice of this brutal judge to illustrate God’s helpfulness must have shocked his
audience” (Jeremias, Parables of Jesus, 156).

⁶³ Though he may be something of a needed correction to those who skip entirely over the
parable’s potential attribution of unsavory character-traits to God, nonetheless overplaying his hand is
this parable again opens—and in fact opens further—the theodical vista from Luke 11:5-8: Will God answer his petitioners? Not only does it do so by comparing God to the judge—though, again, the nature of the comparison (qal wahomer) significantly mutes the potentially negative aspects of the comparison—but the fronting which Luke gives to the parable also raises theodical concerns: Jesus told them the parable in order to show that it was necessary to pray continually and never to give up (v. 1). The need for persistence in prayer cannot but simultaneously indicate the reality that prayers are sometimes (from a human perspective) slow in being answered.64 This is true even if the parable teaches not only persistence regarding specific issues of petition but also as a holistic way of life, in anticipation of the kingdom’s arrival and in the midst of suffering.65

The theodical vista which these parables, and in particular 18:1-8, open is that which appears rather often in the Psalms (e.g., 42:9-11 [41:10-12]; 59:4-5 [58:5-6]; 74:1-11 [73:1-11]; 77:7-9 [76:8-10]; 88 [87] [LXX]) and in other Jewish works, including

Suffering,” *HBT* 32 (2010): 33–57. While he accuses New Testament scholars of “a proclivity to religionism” in failing to note the supposedly negative portrayals of God in Luke 11:5-8; 18:1-8; and elsewhere, Metzger’s reading suffers from its own ideological biases, as seen especially in his denial of a “from the lesser to the greater” interpretation in these parables (“Where Has Yahweh Gone?” 51, 52–53), which is clearly implied by 11:13 and 18:6-7 (e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1177, 1180). Still, he is on-target in noting that these parables raise or at least hint at deeper issues in assuming the need for persistence in prayer (“Where Has Yahweh Gone?” 53).

64 The question of how God relates to the judge, after all, does not exhaust the parable’s import since “the attitude of the judge and the attitude of the woman . . . are tightly woven into the parable” (Marshall, *Luke*, 671); we must also consider the import of Luke’s comparing the widow’s need for persistence to the realities of discipleship (framed against the eschatological backdrop of Luke 17:20-35). This theodical angle is heightened if μακροθυμεῖ (v. 7) is interpreted as a reference to God’s self-concealment, as argued by Klaus Haacker, “Lukas 18:7 als Anspielung auf den Deus absconditus,” *NovT* 53 (2011): 267–72.

Luke’s rough contemporaries, 3 Baruch and 4 Ezra. Thus Ps 88 [87] urges, “O LORD, God of my salvation, when, at night, I cry out in your presence, let my prayer come before you; incline your ear to my cry” (vv. 1-2), and more bitterly still complains, “But I, O LORD, cry out to you; in the morning my prayer comes before you. O LORD, why do you cast me off? Why do you hide your face from me? (vv. 13-14; NRSV). And Ps 74(73):10-11 cries out: “How long, O God, is the foe to scoff? Is the enemy to revile your name forever? Why do you hold back your hand; why do you keep your hand in your bosom?” (NRSV). God’s absence is, for the author, keenly felt. Much later, 3 Baruch bitterly reports the nations’ mocking response to Jerusalem’s destruction: “Where is their God?” (1.2, Greek version, OTP). Relatedly, 4 Ezra protests the seeming disjuncture between God’s righteousness and the injustice of the author’s lived experience, a protest which, while going beyond complaint of God’s absence in the face of enemy aggression, rests upon the foundation of such complaint:

those things which we daily experience: why Israel has been given over to the gentiles as a reproach; why the people whom you loved has been given over to godless tribes . . . and why we pass from the world like locusts, and why our life is like a mist, and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. (4.23-25, OTP)

---

66 Cf. 2 Pet 3:9. This vista of theodicy—the question of whether God will provide his healing presence and will respond to the petitions of his people—continues as a live theological concern today and in fact has reached something of a breaking point for some in light of the horrendous events of World War II and the Holocaust. Putting the problem to music is the self-professed Christian, Bono, lead singer-songwriter of the band U2: “God is good, but will he listen?” (“Staring at the Sun”).

67 This psalm also accuses God of tormenting the psalmist (vv. 6-8, 15-18) and thus falls under Brueggemann’s minority of cases in which God himself has broken the theodicy settlement (“Some Aspects of Theodicy,” 253). Such unsettling charges never appear in Luke’s writing, to my knowledge, and so I will not pursue them further.

68 For an insightful discussion of this taunt as fundamental to the entire project of 3 Baruch, see Jones, Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 111–42.
Such passages reflect the disruption, in Brueggemann’s terms, of the theodicy settlement, a disruption brought about by the actions of an enemy in God’s apparent absence.

The situation envisioned in Luke’s Parable of the Persistent Widow, who seeks vindication (ἐκδίκησόν με) against her opponent (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου μου; v. 3), is akin to those described above. Thus the parable taps into the theodical angst expressed throughout Jewish tradition dating back to the Psalms, likely with reference to Jesus’ earlier indication that suffering will be an inescapable reality for the faithful (17:33). When Luke’s Jesus gives a strong affirmation of God’s speedy (or, less likely, sudden) attentiveness to the elect’s cries for justice (vv. 7-8), then, the Gospel writer is engaging in nothing less than an act of theodicy: he affirms that God will indeed prove faithful.69 More specifically, this affirmation of God’s faithfulness in granting justice affirms a general, even if partial, picture of retribution theology: God, who is powerful (as Luke here presupposes and elsewhere clearly affirms), will conduct the affairs of the cosmos such that justice ultimately prevails. If Luke indeed colors the passage “with a decidedly eschatological edge,” which is likely in light of its positioning next to 17:22-37,70 then it may be not only an expression of retribution theology but also of that subset of retribution theology, recompense theodicy.71

---

69 Cf. Herzog’s comment: “While persistent prayer and the continuance of faith under persecution may be related to each other, they both raise a common question, not of eschatology but of theodicy” (Parables as Subversive Speech, 217; emphasis added).


71 It is also unclear to what degree the “eschatological travails” described at the end of Luke 17 will find recompense in the form of eschatological reward versus grace in the present (or even in what sense the “eschatological” nature of such travails should be understood within Lukan theology—a question
Luke’s theodical contribution here goes even beyond these reflections, however, for he ends this section with something of a twist—namely, the question which Jesus poses: “But when the Son of Man comes, will he find τὴν πίστιν on the earth?” (v. 8). This question reorients the discussion from a focus on the faithfulness of God—which is at least partially called into question by the very act of becoming an object of discussion—to a question regarding the human response to God’s faithfulness: Will τὴν πίστιν prevail on the earth? Rather than simply affirm God’s faithfulness, Luke turns the tables by questioning human faithfulness.

**Luke 13:1-5.** Here, in the midst of Jesus’ circuitous journey to Jerusalem, unidentified members of the crowd speak to Jesus of an otherwise unknown incident: Pilate mixed the blood of certain Galileans with their sacrifices. Jesus’ response is surprising: These Galileans, despite what members of his (and Luke’s?) narrative audience might think, were no worse sinners than others; in fact, his audience will suffer the same fate, barring their repentance (vv. 2-3). Then Jesus cites the apparently well-known incident in which the Tower of Siloam fell, killing 18 people, and affirms that these were no more guilty than anyone else living in Jerusalem (v. 4); he follows this with a second exhortation to repent (v. 5).

---

I will not attempt to resolve here). Luke likely expresses both retribution theology and recompense theodicy here. Given that Luke may be echoing the description of the judge and widow in Sir 35:11-24 (LXX) (see Green, Luke, 638; Marshall, Luke, 675)—albeit with significant modifications—and that Sir 35:11-24 offers a clear affirmation of retribution theology, this line should probably not be seen to recede too far over against the eschatological moorings of the passage that precedes the parable.

Jesus’ response to the initial prompt from his audience clearly places his comments here within the world of ancient theodicy; these Galileans, who suffered so cruelly, were presumed by members of the audience to be guilty of particularly heinous wickedness. This is retribution theology in its clearest and most stringent form: Suffering reveals immorality as a corollary to the immutable and universally applicable truth that God punishes evildoers. Jesus rebuffs this harsh position by affirming in v. 2 that these Galileans were no worse than other Galileans.

Jesus’ answer grows more complicated and perplexing in the verses that follow, however. In v. 3, his audience—in a shocking turn of events—stands under the threat of a similar destruction, and moreover, so also do the residents of Jerusalem, as v. 4 implies. Particularly in light of the parable that follows and that clearly complements vv. 1-5, many interpreters take this passage as a call to national repentance (see discussion in ch. 5). Thus the Jewish nation as a whole—of which Jerusalem is the center and soul—stands under the mandate of repentance: otherwise, doom awaits.

This reading of Luke 13:1-5 as a warning of the need for national repentance serves to place conditions on the earlier rejection of retribution theology: the Galileans and Jerusalemites who did not suffer were no less guilty than their compatriots who suffered so terribly in part because the entire lot of them is guilty! Thus Luke 13:1-5 clearly speaks to concerns of ancient theodicy yet does not speak clearly in doing so. On the other hand, it rejects strict retribution theology, given that, whatever their eventual fate, other Galileans and Jerusalemites did not in fact suffer as did the victims described

---

73 Hence, Luke’s not incidentally choosing Jerusalem as the location of the second disaster example (v. 4).
in vv. 1, 4. Even so, on the other hand, the passage affirms the general truth of retribution theology by asserting a link between the nation’s eventual (earthly) fate and its moral status (clearly implied by the mandate to repent). Thus Luke 13:1-5 both partially rejects and partially affirms retribution theology.

Acts 1:6-8. As noted above, when the disciples inquire “when God would restore the kingdom to Israel,” they employ a term (ἀποκαθίστημι) that, for auditors familiar with the LXX, would conjure ancient hopes of Israel’s political restoration, almost certainly conceived in terms of self-rule. The question of Israel’s political restoration, relevant in the ca. 30 C.E. narrative setting, would have been all the more poignant and far more theodically pointed in Luke’s probable post-70 C.E. context. A similar desire to know the timeline of Israel’s restoration appears in theodically oriented works of the period (e.g., 4 Ezra 4.33–5.13; 6.7; Apoc. Ab. 28–29). The disciples’ query and Jesus’ response in v. 7 that it was simply not their place to know “the times and the seasons which the Father has set by his own authority” falls within the tradition of theodicy deferred.74 Not only does Jesus not answer their query, but his immediately shifting to what appears to be another topic (the spread of the gospel) in v. 8 seems even to invalidate the question, leaving doubtful whether such a restoration will ever occur, at least as conceived by the inquirers.

Perhaps also belonging in this category of theodicy is Jesus’ enigmatic claim that “Jerusalem will be trampled by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled” (Luke 21:24). Here, more clearly than in Acts 1:7, Jesus seems to indicate some sort of

---

74 Cf. 4 Ezra 4:21, 33; 6:7-10; also, 3:14, in which God reveals the secrets of the end of time to Abraham alone, and at night.
eventual restoration for Jerusalem specifically, but the puzzling reference to “the times of the Gentiles” seems to confound further (productive) inquiry. As in Apoc. Ab. 28–29 or the early episodes (I–III) of 4 Ezra, the auditor is given some indication of future timelines and future events but in so cryptic a way as to be left effectively in the dark regarding these future events. To describe future events of import in such cryptic, mysterious language is a hallmark not only of apocalyptic writing in general but also of apocalyptic writings that embrace “the mystery of theodicy.”

**Explanations for Jesus’ humiliation via crucifixion.** Beginning in Luke 24 and then at numerous points in Acts, Luke interprets Jesus’ crucifixion as a necessary part of God’s plan—a concern already hinted at through Jesus’ own use of δεῖ in Luke 9:22; 13:33; 17:25 (admittedly with reliance on Mark); and foreshadowed by Luke’s reference to Isaiah’ suffering servant in his Passion Narrative (Luke 22:37). The claim that Jesus, as Messiah, had to suffer in order to fulfill the Scriptures (Luke 24:25-27) and thus did so according to the plan and foreknowledge of God (Acts 2:23; 4:28), despite his innocence (Acts 3:14), and was vindicated by God’s raising him (Acts 2:24; 3:15)—Luke makes this interpretation of, and explanation for, Jesus’ death a key point in the early chapters of Acts and probably does so for several reasons. For one, this is simply the interpretation of Jesus’ death which Luke himself believes to be true and which he attributes to the early Jerusalem Church. But this is not the whole of the story, for Luke takes pains not only to express this view but to give it something of center stage in Luke 24 and the early-going of Acts, also punctuating it, e.g., by stressing the culpability of the Jewish leaders who crucified Jesus, which by corollary emphasizes Jesus’ innocence. Luke does
this in Acts but especially via his changes to Mark’s Passion Narrative. These changes collectively demonstrate Luke’s efforts to shape his interpretation of Jesus’ death for further rhetorical purposes.

Likely among such rhetorical purposes is to offer a positive theodical argument. Here the problem centers not on God’s power or faithfulness, but rather on the person of Jesus and specifically the shame and degradation which his death by crucifixion would entail for many first-century auditors. Could this crucified, humiliated man really be “Lord,” “Messiah,” and “Savior”? Though this project could be more fittingly characterized as “Christodicy,” it is closely akin to, and perhaps in Luke’s theology even a subset of, theodicy. Interestingly, this type of “theodicy” would fall largely within the category of theodicy by “determinism,” which is seldom employed by extant Jewish works from antiquity. In this case, however, we have a determinism shaped not by the governance of implacable Fate but by the plan of Israel’s God, as foretold in Israel’s Scriptures.

Acts as “apologetic” literature. Claims that Acts evinces “apologetic” concerns are common among Lukan scholars. Most argue only for apologetic intent, though

---


some have gone so far as to suggest apology as a facet of Acts’ literary genre. The precise nature of Acts’ supposed apologetic intent has proven difficult to pin down, however. Perhaps the most plausible suggestion is Luke Johnson’s claim that Luke addresses the large-scale rejection of Jesus by God’s chosen people and defends “God’s fidelity to his people and to his own word.” If this is the case, (Luke-)Acts “is . . . in the broadest sense a theodicy.”

*Summary.* There exists strong evidence, then, that both in individual pericopes and perhaps also in the macro-dynamics of Acts in particular, Luke concerns himself with matters of theodicy. These concerns seem to orient more toward questions of God’s faithfulness than toward questions of God’s power, as in the theodical parables and the macro-level theodical lines identified by Johnson.

*Lukan Theodicy Crisis*

This brief examination demonstrates Luke’s interest in and concern for theodicy. This fact, viewed against both Luke’s exceeding interest in Jerusalem and its Temple and the theodicy-saturated milieu in which Luke likely operated (70–135 C.E.), suggests that the utter devastation of Jerusalem and its Temple as a result of the failed revolt against

---


Rome was a point of theodical concern for Luke. In Brueggemann’s terms, the events of 70 C.E. appear to have opened room for a theodicy crisis—or (more cautiously) a theodicy challenge—for Luke and/or for members of his audience.

But why should this be so, that the so-called “Gentile” Evangelist should consider the destruction of the Jewish holy city and Temple a cause for theodical reflection? I offer the following suggestions.

First of all, the events that culminated in 70 C.E. introduced room for both doubt and polemic regarding the efficacy of the Christian God over and against Roman might—a theodical problem which Bruce Longenecker has explored. Although Longenecker frames the problem in terms of a loss of honor, he addresses the “power” side of the equation, as I have framed things: since Roman might has destroyed the city and Temple which were the unique dwelling place of the God of Israel—the place where God chose to make God’s name to dwell—then the power of God becomes suspect, which in turn threatens that God should also suffer a significant loss of honor. A (putatively) ontological problem (concerning God’s power) becomes a social and political problem (concerning God’s honor). Adding considerable fuel to this flame, as Longenecker argues, was Flavian propaganda which broadcast their victory over the Jews, especially

---

82 As with any attempt to relate an ancient text to its usually only semi-accessible context, my reading of Luke’s theodical concern participates in a certain amount of circularity: my reading of Luke’s context as steeped in theodicy informs my reading of his Gospel, which in turn informs (along with other considerations) my identification of the theodicy-heavy period of the late first century as the appropriate context in which to situate Luke’s Gospels. As Anthony C. Thiselton insightfully notes, a certain degree of circularity is simply inescapable in assessing ancient texts and ancient contexts: “We cannot arrive at a picture of the whole without scrutinizing the parts or pieces, but we cannot tell what the individual pieces mean until we have some sense of the wider picture as a whole” (*Hermeneutics: An Introduction* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 13–15 [14]).

83 See the discussion of his essay (“Rome’s Victory”) in ch. 1.
through coinage—quite soon after Jerusalem’s fall, Vespasian had “Judaea Capta” inscribed on coins minted both in Rome and elsewhere in the empire, including in Judea\(^{84}\)—through triumphs and celebratory games, through literary works, and through triumphal arches, including the well-known Arch of Titus in Rome.\(^{85}\) Indeed, “the triumphal procession adorned by the venerable vessels and sacred furniture of the temple cult seemed to boast of victory over God himself.”\(^{86}\)

This international and very public problem was exacerbated by an attendant quandary of a more localized nature: the jarring reversal of Scripture’s many apparent indications that Jerusalem would be, not demolished, but beautified and restored. These hopes were painted especially and poignantly with the hues of Isaiah’s palette; indeed an abundance of Isaianic passages and promises seemed to point firmly in the direction of Jerusalem’s physical, political, and indeed eschatological glorification (e.g., Isa 2:2-3; 11:9-16; 52:7-10; 60; 61:1-7; 62; 65:17-25; also 56:7; 57:13; 65:11; 66:20). Isaiah had promised that “in the last days (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις)”—the very words which Luke applies to Pentecost (Acts 2:17)—the mountain of God would appear and the house of God would be raised above the hills, causing all the nations to flock to Zion (Isa 2:1-4).


\(^{86}\) Jones, Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 109. Indeed the Flavians displayed seized vessels from the Temple during Titus’ Roman triumph (Josephus, J.W. 7.161), as noted by Bauckham, The Jewish World, 235.
Within Second Temple Judaism, such passages could be taken to indicate a future restoral of Jerusalem’s glory, as in texts like Pss. Sol. 11 and 17 and probably Sir 48:24-25 (admittedly written before Herod’s rebuilding project). This is in line with the tendency of many Second Temple documents to read Isaiah eschatologically, as in some Qumran texts and Sir. 48:22-25. In the period between the revolts, Sibylline Oracle 5 may also draw on Isaiah for its vision of the restored Jerusalem with its Temple. Such hopes for Jerusalem’s restoration, forged especially from the visions of Isaiah, met a cataclysmic reversal with the failed Judean revolt, and while hopes for a new city and

87 Peter Mallen, The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts (LNTS 367; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 36–41. Michael Knibb argues as well that Sir 48:24-25 should be read in reference to the promise of Jerusalem’s eschatological re-glorification in texts like Isa 61:1-7 (“Isaianic Tradition in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition [ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A Evans; vol 2; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 649). See also (though it may be late) 3 En. 48A.10, which speaks of the gathering of Israel into Jerusalem in language evocative of Is 66:20 and 52:10 (per the marginal notes in OTP). As Anthony Le Donne, summarizing his work in The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David, puts it: “In sum, there were multiple ways that Second Temple Jews envisioned the restoration of Israel, but almost all of them included the Lord’s temple presence resting within the temple” (“The Improper Temple Offering of Ananias and Sapphira,” NTS 59.3 [2013]: 346–64 [350 n.23]). Petr Pokorný understands Jewish prophetic tradition to offer two eschatological visions in which Gentiles gather via pilgrimage to Jerusalem in order either to seek the Lord or to receive final punishment from the Lord (or both—as in Zechariah 14), and identifies numerous passages in Isaiah as demonstrative of the former (“Völkerwallfahrt”) option (Theologie der Lukanischen Schriften. [FRLANT 174; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998], 45).

88 E.g., George J. Brooke argues that 4Q174 undertakes an eschatological reading of Isaiah, for the purposes of communal self-definition (“Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts,” in Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition [ed. C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans; vol 2; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 613–15).

89 Note, for example, their shared belief in Jerusalem’s being raised up to the clouds and the nations seeing its glory (5.424-25; Isa 2:1-4; 52:10; 62:2), the centripetal force this will have across the globe (5.426-28; Isa 2:1-4; 11:10-16; 52:10), bringing promise of a utopian cessation of hostilities and suffering (5.429-31; Isa 11:9; 65:20-23). Note also that this oracle earlier draws heavily on Isaianic imagery for Babylon to denounce Israel’s new foe, Rome (5.162-78). On this, see Jones, Jewish Reactions to the Destruction, 225–26, although the oracle’s obviously composite nature must factor here as well.

90 Joseph Blenkinsopp writes that “the destiny of Jerusalem-Zion” is “a central if not the central theme of the pre-exilic prophet [Isaiah of Jerusalem]” and that this theme becomes prominent again in so-called Trito-Isaiah (chs. 56–66) (“The Servant and the Servants in Isaiah,” in Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition [ed. C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans; Vol 1; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 174).
new Temple continued in the period between 70 and 135 C.E., the dashing of these hopes likely helped raise theodical angst to its fever-pitch levels among some Jews.\textsuperscript{91}

Luke likely felt, or at least could sympathize with, such angst regarding Jerusalem’s dashed hopes, for he was himself an expectant reader of Isaiah, one whose thought and imagination was, by all indications, steeped in Isaianic phrasing, imagery, and hopes.\textsuperscript{92} Additionally, Luke seems to have been aware of the wider Jewish eschatological expectations regarding Isaiah\textsuperscript{93} and indeed was himself disposed to reading Isaiah eschatologically—since he saw in the lives of Jesus and the early church the long-awaited fulfillment of Isaianic hopes. Thus Luke’s Jesus inaugurates his own Galilean ministry with a reading of Isaiah followed by the affirmation: “Today this

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{91} Besides the evidence presented earlier in this chapter, see also Richard Bauckham, “Apocalypses,” 160. Bauckham notes that, although in the extant literature the destruction of Jerusalem challenged primarily those who had not already learned to define “Israel” in non-ethnic terms, the events of 70 C.E. may also have been problematic for others.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{92} Luke’s profound reliance on Isaiah is quite clear even on casual encounters with his Gospel. Not only does he quote Isaiah often and at length (Luke 3:4-6; 4:18-19; 8:10; 19:46; 22:37; Acts 7:49-50; 8:37; 13:34, 47; 28:25-27) and not only does he do so at key points in his writings (John’s mission; Jesus’ inaugural sermon; explanation of Jesus’ parables; description of the JT; characterization of Jesus’ crucifixion; criticism of the JT; characterization of Jesus’ suffering; Paul’s inaugural sermon [Davidic promise; worldwide salvation]; explanation of partial Jewish rejection), but Luke also alludes to Isaiah both at critical moments and quite frequently throughout Luke and Acts (Luke 2:25, 38; 7:22; 13:6-9; 23:29; Acts 1:8 [= Isa 49:6]; 3:8 [= Isa 35:6]; 8:26-39 [=Isa 56:3b]). Luke’s profound and thoroughgoing reliance on Isaiah means that Luke does not simply read from a short, select list of Isaiah proof-texts—perhaps pre-assembled in Christian testimonia—but rather draws broadly from Isaiah, such that he is likely to have noticed and meditated over the portions of Isaiah which refer to the re-glorification of Jerusalem. See Mallen, Reading and Transformation of Isaiah; and David W. Pao, Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus (WUNT 2.130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), who emphasizes Luke’s reliance on Isaiah’s New Exodus theme in constructing Acts, though he overstates his case. Allen Black (“‘Your Sons and Your Daughters Will Prophesy…’: Pairings of Men and Women in Acts” in Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay [ed. P. Gray and G.R. O’Day; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 193-206) argues that Luke intentionally pairs male and female disciples—as in Acts 1:13-14; 5:1-11, 14; cf. 2:17-18—in order to show the fulfillment of passages like Is 43:6-7; 49:22; 60:4 as part of his own theological agenda.}

scripture is fulfilled before your eyes” (Luke 4:18-21). Thus Luke paints Jesus’ ministry with further hues of Isaiah’s envisioned release (Luke 7:22), such that “Jesus’ gospel is essentially Isaiah’s gospel.”\(^9^4\) Thus, too, does the salvation once envisioned by Isaiah come to startling fruition in the life of the early church.\(^9^5\) Because of Luke’s own profound reliance on and eschatological reading of Isaiah, the apparently failed vision of Jerusalem’s restoration “in the last days” (Isa 2:1-4) would have had little less sting for Luke than for many of his Jewish contemporaries.

The Flavian propagandizing against the Jews and, by implication, their God and the reversed expectations regarding Jerusalem’s glorification would have only exacerbated matters if Luke already felt the need to address potential or real doubts regarding God’s fidelity in the face of the widespread Jewish rejection of Jesus, as Johnson claims. Luke thus likely faced something of a triple-headed monster, a hydra-esque threat to God’s fidelity and power, and consequently to God’s honor as well. While only two heads arose specifically from the Flavian conquest of Jerusalem, questions of God’s fidelity to his people pair quite naturally with questions of God’s fidelity to his city and house, since both questions ultimately arise out of concern that God should prove faithful to his own word, as given in Scripture.

**Conclusion**

The destruction of Jerusalem and its sacred Temple in 70 C.E. raised theodical angst to unprecedented levels among ancient Jews. Evidencing various levels of personal


distress, pious Jews both agonized over the question of whether a faithful and just God could allow such (4 Ezra I–III; Apoc. Ab. 27) and sought to reassert and reaffirm God’s power (2 Baruch; 3 Baruch; Sib. Or. 4, 5; Apoc. Ab. 29–31; possibly Josephus), in the process demonstrating the broad array of available theodical options—from deferred theodicy to the confident tandem of retribution theology and eschatological theodicy. In fact, in a single, rather remarkable work (4 Ezra), we see the author run this entire gamut!

Luke stands also within this world of theodical questions and concerns, as his writings show a concern for theodicy generally, especially on the side of questions regarding God’s faithfulness (as in Luke’s theodical parables), and for theodicy specifically with regard to the recent destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple. Likely standing behind Luke’s interest in theodicy were several intersecting factors: the Flavian propaganda machine that trumpeted its conquest of Judea and, by implication, the comparative weakness of Israel’s deity; eschatological hopes for Jerusalem and the Temple’s restoration, most prominently expressed in Isaianic prophecy; as well as, finally, Luke’s own concern to show the faithfulness of Israel’s God in the face of widespread Jewish rejection of Christianity.96

96 In light of the above discussion, some readers may ask: Granted that there is strong internal evidence for Luke’s concern with issues of theodicy, why should Luke alone among the Gospel writers have felt such a concern? Why doesn’t, say, Matthew show a similar preoccupation with theodicy, since he also likely writes post-70 C.E. and, unlike Luke, was probably a Jew?! My initial response to this question would be that I have focused my research upon Luke rather than Matthew and so am hardly prepared to answer such a query. But this is a viable query and must not be so simply skirted. A more reasonable response—though one that again side-steps the issue—is to acknowledge that any attempt at an answer involves one deeply in speculation, since the true answer may be unavoidably idiosyncratic: just as Jews varied in their responses to the tragedy, often for inaccessibly personal and psychological reasons, so undoubtedly too did Christians (whether Jewish or Gentile). Since speculation, however marginally productive it may be, is the only means by which I may avoid charges of diversion, I offer these as possible explanations for the conundrum (assuming that Matthew is indeed less concerned with questions of theodicy—a point on which I am not presently qualified to offer an opinion). 1) Being less metropolitan than Luke, who seems on the basis of Acts to have traveled widely across the Mediterranean world, Matthew was perhaps also less attuned to Roman imperial propaganda than was Luke. Such being the case,
In order to look ahead, it is helpful first to look backwards momentarily. George Nickelsburg offers a helpful summary of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and the Apocalypse of Abraham as raising two questions: “Why?” and “Whither?,” the first speaking to the issues of theodicy raised by the razing of Jerusalem and the second dealing with “reconstruction,” viz. “what will take the place of the temple as the people attempt to pick up the broken pieces of their life and their religion?” Though he likely would not frame things in quite this manner, Luke also will offer answers to these questions, however obliquely so. I will explore these answers in Part Two of this project.

He was plausibly less aware of, and less troubled by, Flavian propaganda that challenged the honor and power of Israel’s God. As noted above, the imperial processions were particularly provocative in this regard. 2) Additionally, if Matthew was indeed Jewish and wrote his Gospel primarily for an audience whose principal conversation partner/rival was Jewish, he would not have needed to address questions of God’s power or honor, at least insofar as he and his (or his audience’s) opponents were in the same boat. Luke’s probably greater openness to a Gentile audience made the question of God’s reputation a more pressing issue for him. 3) Matthew’s possible orientation toward, or even affiliation with, rabbinic types of Judaism would make it likely that he experienced less theological distress with the abrogation of Temple life than did those Jews who had greater difficulty conceiving of Jewish existence apart from the worship of the JT.

For those who find such speculations implausible, it will perhaps help to note that, even absent a compelling hypothesis, it is clear that Luke, in his treatment of Jerusalem and the Temple, takes a very different approach from that of not only Matthew but indeed the rest of the New Testament corpus—so much so, in fact, that grand summaries of NT treatments of Jerusalem and the Temple often fail to incorporate Luke’s very complex position. Whatever his reasons, within the NT canon Luke proves to be solidly an outlier when it comes to the question of Jerusalem and the Temple, and so it is unsurprising that he should also demonstrate comparatively greater concern for questions of theodicy than his NT peers.

Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 270.
PART TWO


My study turns now to a reassessment of Jerusalem and its Temple in the Gospel of Luke (Part 2), followed by a brief consideration of Acts (Appendix). Undergirding the analysis that follows are recognition that Luke has composed a *narrative* as well as attention to the various contextual factors which I have explored, especially Luke’s rhetorical milieu, teeming with sundry methods and means of initiating subtle communication, and the widespread angst among believers in the Jewish God following the destruction of Jerusalem and the attendant Flavian celebration. In this latter regard, Luke, like his Jewish contemporaries, faces a theological, and in particular a theodical, problem, and so we should expect him to provide theological avenues for addressing the problem—as, I hope to show, indeed he does. Consideration of the narrative dynamics of Luke’s Gospel has prompted me to break my analysis into chapters that correspond to the Gospel’s typical dividing lines: Luke 1–2 (ch. 4), Luke 3–9:50 and 9:51–19:16/27 (ch. 5), and 19:17/28–24:53 (ch. 6).¹

In my treatment of individual portions of Luke’s Gospel, I strive to be neither exhaustive nor even equitable: some scenes are simply more important for my thesis than others and will be treated as such. Luke 2:22–40—which serves, as I will argue, to set up so much of Luke’s handling and presentation of Jerusalem and the Temple—is as an

¹ While it might in some ways be preferable to examine the entirety of Luke’s Gospel in a single chapter (thus reflecting the narrative unity of the whole), such a gravid chapter would be entirely infelicitous on other grounds.
example of the former case, and I will give it appropriately disproportionate attention. My decisions regarding relative length and depth of examination should thus be taken neither as reflective of my assessment of a scene’s relative importance within Luke’s oeuvre nor as a virtual dismissal of its significance for my thesis. Each pericope that I discuss might well deserve monograph-length consideration even only for the purposes of my thesis.

The major strands of this Lukan tapestry painting the future, past, and late-first-century present of the Jerusalem Temple are, as I will attempt to show: 1) an interpretation of Jerusalem and its Temple in terms of the abandoned οἶκος of Shiloh (Luke 1–2; 13:35a); 2) a progressively realized eclipsing or transmuting of the JT’s sacerdotal functions with the arrival (Luke 2:22-40, 41-52) then ministry (Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19; 19:45-48) and finally death (23:45) of the Lord Jesus; 3) an accent on Jesus’ status as a prophet—though more than a prophet—and the fateful collision this entails with the city that is (in Luke’s thought) the murderer of the prophets (11:49-51; 13:31-35; 19:41-44; 23:27-31); and 4) related to Luke’s emphasis on Jesus as rejected prophet, an indictment of Jerusalem’s leadership for resisting God’s will, by rejecting the prophet and his message and through their general and persistent wickedness. These four strands Luke deftly weaves together, providing a theologically informed and theodically oriented answer to the riddle of Jerusalem’s demise.

---

2 A non-exhaustive list of the pericopes that, though discussed, receive short shrift in the pages that follow would include Jesus’ temptation (4:1-13), the Transfiguration (9:28-36), Jesus’ first lamentation for Jerusalem (13:31-35, minus v. 35a), the Kingship Parable (19:11-27) along with the Entry scene (19:28-40), 2nd lamentation (19:41-44), Jesus’ taking possession of the Temple (19:45–48), and the Parable of the Tenants (20:9-18).
CHAPTER FOUR
The Jerusalem Temple in Luke 1–2

Introduction

From a narrative-critical perspective, how an author begins a work, quite simply, matters. This is true not only of Luke’s famous Prologue (Luke 1:1-4), but also of the Infancy Narratives that comprise (with a little semantic flexibility regarding 2:41-52) the rest of Luke 1–2. Robert Tannehill has described these chapters as “previewing” or “foreshadowing” Luke’s larger purposes in Luke and Acts, especially regarding the theme of salvation. Such insights into the significance of narrative beginnings—already important for my discussion of methodology (ch. 2)—will also guide my discussion of Luke 1–2 below. Suffice it to say here that these scenes hold significance not only for the rest of Luke’s Gospel (and perhaps beyond) in general but also specifically for the city

---


3 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:20–21, 32.

and Temple which figure in them so prominently, and so I consider them at some length below.

_The Samuel Childhood Theme in Luke 1–2: Structure and Echoes_

Luke 1–2 tells, with occasional and inspiring lyricism, the story of the announcements, births, and, with varying degrees of taciturnity, early lives of Jesus and John. Virtually all commentators see intentional parallelism, sometimes labeled as a “diptych,” between Jesus and John as a dominant overarching structural feature of Luke 1–2, although the precise dividing lines are a point of debate.6

Before throwing my own hat into the arena of opinions on the matter, I will first consider Luke 2:22–52, the verses that concern me most in this study. This section of Luke’s opening chapters participates in the Jesus-John parallelism and synkrisis7 that is so prominent throughout Luke 1–2, although here, too, commentators are divided as to exact boundary lines. Some see 2:41–52 (or, less often, 2:40–52) as the parallel Jesus section to John’s depiction in 1:80,8 while probably the majority of commentators view

---


7 Throughout this section, I will refer to Luke’s pairing of Jesus and John with the language of “parallelism,” “diptych,” and “synkrisis,” for reasons both of style (in accordance with ancient rhetorical practice, modern ears generally find word variation more pleasant than the alternative) and of meaning: “parallelism” emphasizes the structural similarities, “diptych” reminds us of Luke’s skillful artistry, and “synkrisis” speaks to Luke’s intention—viz. to compare Jesus and John. In creating this Jesus-John synkrisis, Luke surely does not mean to denigrate John but rather employs a double-encomium in which one character is shown to be great through his superiority to another character worthy of great esteem; see Pseudo-Hermogenes, _Progymnasmata_ 19 (Kennedy, 84).

8 See Talbert, _ Literary Patterns_, 44; Green, _Luke_, 50.
2:41-52 (typically along with short segments of Luke 1) as an intrusion without parallel in the John material that thus breaks up the Jesus-John diptych. Another minority view maintains that the diptych is in fact broken by the entirety of 2:22-52, which thus form a final, Jesus-only capstone to the birth narratives. I side with the majority of commentators in seeing 2:41-52 as the major break in the Jesus-John parallelism, although I lean toward the minority reading of Serrano and others in one regard: I view the end of 2:22-40, viz. Anna’s appearance (vv. 36-38), as a sort of break in the diptych in a manner that is proleptic of the more formal break brought about by 2:41-52. Anna’s witness to Jesus (2:36-38) thus constitutes both a break in the Jesus-John parallelism and yet a strong marker in the Jesus-John synkrisis by clearly indicating Jesus’ superiority, since he is witnessed to by a male/female pair, whereas John receives witness only from his father.

Overall, my preferred breakdown of the Jesus-John synkrisis for the whole of Luke 1–2 follows roughly the lines mapped out long ago by Dibelius: John’s annunciation (1:5-25) paired with Jesus’ annunciation (1:26-38), with 1:39-56 as a sort of

---


interlude (although it may also be taken as an extension of Jesus’ annunciation); then, John’s birth (1:57-66) paired with Jesus’ birth (2:1-21), and John’s vocation and growth (1:67-80) paired with Jesus’ vocation and growth (2:22-40, with the dissenting vv. 36-38), with 2:41-52 as a second interlude, in some ways parallel to 1:39-56.  

Another important, and widely noted, feature of Luke 1–2 are the Septuagintal echoes which pervade this section of Luke’s writings, both in terms of content and style. Among the most prominent of these echoes is the Samuel Childhood story. Besides their native, deep resonances in this portion of Luke (discussed below), making these echoes especially prominent (and increasingly so on multiple readings of Luke’s Gospel and Acts) is the dearth of such echoes elsewhere in the Lukan corpus. Luke employs Samuel typology as a method of characterizing both John and Jesus in these early scenes.

The first reference to Samuel’s childhood comes at the end of the initial description of Elizabeth and Zechariah in Luke 1:5-7. Verse 7’s mention that Elizabeth was “barren” of course recalls a number of OT parallels, including Abraham/Sarah and


13 The “interludes” are parallel especially in terms of function: both demonstrate the superiority of Jesus over the estimable John. The first interlude (1:39-56) is the only scene in which Mary and Elizabeth (and Jesus and John) interact, and here Elizabeth’s in utero son leaps for joy at the sound of the voice of the mother of his “Lord” (1:41, 43), spurring Mary’s Magnificat. The second interlude (2:41-52) shows Jesus’ superiority via his proximity to God (his “Father”) and his precociousness and by its breaking of the Jesus-John diptych such that Jesus corresponds more fully than John to the Samuel typology.

14 Other echoes may in fact occur earlier than v. 7, for Green (Luke, 73) notes that, while the language of remembrance is “absent from this immediate literary co-text [in Luke 1],” a remembrance motif is in fact present, especially given Zechariah’s name (“God remembers”), thus echoing 1 Kgdms 1:11, 19–20. Nolland (Luke, 1:26) also notes a verbal similarity between the dative name introduction of Elkanah (1 Kgdms 1:1) and Zechariah (Luke 1:5).
Samson’s mother (Judg 13:2-7) as well as Hannah, mother of Samuel, but the ideal audience, having had multiple exposures to Luke’s Gospel, would take special notice of this as the beginning of the Samuel typology that produces so many deep resonances throughout Luke 1–2. Long before John himself enters the scene, then, Luke’s ideal audience has 1 Kgdms 1–4 firmly in sight (and within hearing). Given this initial framing, coupled with the prevalence of the Samuel childhood typology throughout Luke 1–2 (and thus in a sort of positive feedback loop), Luke’s ideal audience would be invited to detect even faint echoes of Samuel’s childhood in these early scenes and to interpret these as typological markers for John (and later, for Jesus).

This positive feedback loop suggests the propriety of a maximalist reading of Samuel resonances here, which seems to be in fact how many commentators read this scene. Thus Evans hears an echo of Hannah’s “words of devotion” in 1 Kgdms 1:11 and Mary’s self-description as the “Lord’s handmaid,” Brown notes the similarity between the Nazirite command in Luke 1:15-16 and Hannah’s Nazirite promise regarding Samuel in 1 Kgdms 1:9-15, and Green hears an echo of Hannah’s conception of Samuel

15 This is widely noted in the commentaries—e.g., Craig A. Evans, Luke (NIBC 3; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1990), 24; Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:317; C.F. Evans (St. Luke [Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990], 146) characterizes Hannah as “the scriptural model” for the righteous yet barren.

16 This need not mean the other echoes, of Abraham/Sarah and Samson’s parents, would be drowned out. Here Litwak’s notion of an “echo chamber” is helpful (Echoes, 31–32).

17 Alternately, those commentators who note a myriad of faint parallels between the stories may simply be participating in that learned “parallelomania” that some have lamented! Even if so, however, the parallels that they perceive, when valid and when plausibly audible to a first-century audience, work to support my typological reading.

18 Brown, Birth, 273.
(1 Kgdms 1:19-20) in the similar account regarding Elizabeth and John (Luke 1:24-25). I find these commentators correct both in specifics and in their general maximalist approach to Samuel echoes here. There are likely a number of further echoes, albeit quite faint, that are generally overlooked by commentators. The most important of these is an echo related to setting. Despite the fact that a number of commentators note parallels between the cultic contexts of each text, few have paid adequate attention to the extent of these parallels. Especially important is the fact that in both narratives the indication by a divine representative (Eli and Gabriel) that an otherwise barren couple will have a child comes while the member of the couple who has been praying for a child is worshiping in a cultic setting—the Shiloh tabernacle in 1 Kingdoms, the Jerusalem temple in Luke. As

---


20 Further echoes that perhaps warrant mention include the following. First, both couples receive a child in response to prayer, though 1 Kingdoms and Luke work the prayers into the narrative very differently. Hannah’s prayer receives explicit focus (1 Kgdms 1:10-11), while in Luke, Zechariah prays, and this fact is not narrated but announced later as an accomplished fact by Gabriel (Luke 1:13). Another echo lies in the verbal confusion associated with both Hannah and Zechariah: the former is thought to be blabbering-drunk (1 Kgdms 1:13-14), while the latter, because of his unbelief, is rendered mute until his son’s birth (Luke 1:18-20). St. Bonaventure (*Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* [trans. Robert J. Karris; Vol 1; St. Bonaventure, NT: Franciscan Institute: 2001]) notes further parallels (and it is unclear to me whether he considers these to be intentional references to the Samuel story, or whether he is simply noting parallels—perhaps the latter): he links Elizabeth’s statement that her reproach had been removed following the conception of John (Luke 1:25) to the reproach “Hannah” suffered from her rival in 1 Kgdms 1:6, among other parallels in the Jewish Scriptures (1:39); he also connects the people’s recognition that Zechariah had seen a vision in Luke 1:22 with the people’s acknowledgement of Samuel’s status as faithful prophet in 1 Kgdms 3:20. He also likens Luke 1:24 to 1 Kgdms 1:20 (1:37) and hears an echo of 1 Kgdms 1:6 in Luke 1:25 (1:39).

I will argue, this pairing of the holy sites at Shiloh and Jerusalem is a subtle but important feature of Luke’s use of Samuel typology in Luke 1–2.

Luke 1:26-38, the annunciation of Jesus, clearly parallels that of John (Luke 1:5-25)\(^{22}\) and contains relatively few echoes of Samuel’s childhood. In fact, Luke begins to craft Jesus’ story with significant echoes of Samuel’s childhood only in the next scene, the first interlude (1:39-56), in which Elizabeth and Mary (and thus John and Jesus) meet.\(^{23}\) The Samuel echoes in this scene are even more pronounced than in the scene of John’s annunciation and thus warrant consideration at some length.

Virtually no scholar contests Luke’s placing in Mary’s song explicit allusions to Hannah’s song (1 Kgdms 2:1-10).\(^{24}\) Luke Johnson claims that Hannah’s song supplies the framework for the Magnificat, although Luke fleshes out the song with allusions to various psalms.\(^{25}\) Others see the Magnificat as at least “modeled” on Hannah’s Song.\(^{26}\) Interestingly, Litwak downplays the significance of Hannah’s song, arguing that Pss 19, 85, 101, and others, are “a far better, and more likely source” because 1 Kgdms 2:1-10 has few verbal agreements with the Magnificat.\(^{27}\) He notes only a single verbal parallel

---

\(^{22}\) Indeed, many commentators rightly note a brief but strong synkritical positioning of Zechariah and Mary in these scenes, much to the latter’s favor, especially regarding the aftermath to each parent-to-be’s questioning of Gabriel in response to the promise of the seemingly impossible birth.

\(^{23}\) With skillful artistry, Luke sets up this meeting in the scene of Jesus’ Annunciation, when Gabriel tells Mary of Elizabeth’s unlikely pregnancy (1:36).


\(^{27}\) Litwak, *Echoes*, 108 n. 174. With this assessment, Stephen Farris (*The Hymns of Luke’s Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning, and Significance* [Sheffield, England: JSNT, 1985]) agrees; he claims that the Magnificat contains a wealth of themes not found in Hannah’s song, paralleling 1 Kgdms 2
(πεινοντες [1 Kgdms 2:5]/πειναντες [Luke 1:53]), along with the fact that 1 Kgdms 2:4-5, 7 parallels Luke 1:52-53 “in thought.” 28 Numerous additional verbal parallels in fact exist. Not only do both songs begin with καὶ εἶπεν (1 Kgdms 2:1; Luke 1:46), but there is also strong parallelism between the opening lines of the songs 29:

Table 2: The Songs of Hannah and Mary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kgdms 2:1</th>
<th>Luke 1:46-47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου εν Κυρίῳ,</td>
<td>Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύψωθη κέρας μου ἐν Θεῶ μου,</td>
<td>Καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῶ θεῶ τῶ σωτῆρί μου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπλατύνθη ἐπ’ ἐχθρούς μου τὸ στόμα μου</td>
<td>τὸ σωτηρία σου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐφάνην ἐν σωτηρίᾳ σου.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above, I underline parallel phrases and italicize a pair of phrases which are similar. These noteworthy similarities indicate that Luke here adopts both the style and the content of Hannah’s song, while shortening it by deleting the middle two clauses, though perhaps adapting a phrase from the third to include in his second line. The parallel structures are all the more striking in that Luke has retained virtually none of the original wording—and that even though in the very next verse (1:48) Luke quotes from an earlier prayer by Hannah almost verbatim. Thus Mary proclaims that God has “looked on the humble state of his servant” (ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δουλῆς αὐτοῦ;

only in the theme of divine reversal, which was nevertheless “a rather common motif in the ancient world” and which differs in the two hymns (116).

28 Farris, Hymns, 108. C.F. Evans sees a reverse-ordered parallel between the Magnificat’s themes of a) replenishing the hungry and b) depriving the rich and 1 Kgdms 2:5-8 (St. Luke, 176).

29 St. Bonaventure (1:88) notes the parallel between these verses (Commentary, 94), though doubtless working without the benefit of a Greek text. He also likens Luke 1:52 to 1 Kgdms 2:7-8 (1:97).
Luke 1:48), which matches nearly verbatim Hanna’s her earlier prayer requesting a son (ἐὰν ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν ταπεὶνωσίν τῆς δούλης σου; 1 Kgdms 1:11). Further similarities appear as Mary’s Song progresses: Hannah praises God’s salvation (σωτηρία σου; 1 Kgdms 2:1), while Mary praises God her Savior (σωτήρι μου; Luke 1:47); Hannah’s song twice uses the verb ὑψώω (1 Kgdms 2:1, 10), which occurs also in the Magnificat (Luke 1:52), with a similar meaning in context to the first use in Hannah’s song; both refer to the equalization of the poor/humble with rulers (δυνάστης) and their thrones (θρόνος; 1 Kgdms 2:8 vs. Luke 1:52); both use related words to refer to those with riches (πλουτίζω in 1 Kgdms 2:7 vs. πλουτέω in Luke 1:53). There are, then, a significant number of echoes between Hannah’s Song (and earlier prayer) and the Magnificat, which collectively demonstrate the range of Luke’s intertextuality, from direct verbal allusion to parallels that operate on the levels of theme and content (as in John’s annunciation).

After the Magnificat and a summary notice that Mary stayed three months with Elizabeth, Luke shifts to the next scene, John’s birth (1:57-80). This scene, which finally sees the reversal of Zechariah’s stilled tongue—and dramatically so in his prophecy of John’s (1:68-79), but also Jesus’ surpassing (1:76) greatness—again mutes echoes of Samuel’s childhood. Indeed the old narrative of the great child-prophet at Shiloh is

---


31 Green (*Luke*, 102) notes two prominent motifs in Mary’s song—God as warrior and God as “the merciful God of the covenant,” who lifts up the lowly, feeds the hungry, and remembers his promises. These motifs both resonate roundly with Hannah’s song. For potential echoes from other passages of Scripture, see Brown, *Birth*, 358–60.
entirely lost to sight and sound\textsuperscript{32} until the final verse of the scene (Luke 1:80), which summarizes John’s early career in clear imitation, though of style and content rather than wording, of the several summaries of Samuel’s early life (1 Kgdms 2:21, 26; 3:19). This verse plays the important role of solidifying a typological connection between John and Samuel while also providing grounds for further comparison between John and Jesus, again to the latter’s advantage, especially in its providing a clear structural link between John’s and Jesus’ early lives (cf. Luke 2:40, 52), in the telling of which Luke shows Jesus to be superior. Here, then, Luke employs structure and intertext as coordinated and interwoven components in achieving his rhetorical purposes.\textsuperscript{33}

After leaving John in the desert (1:80), Luke narrates the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ (2:1-21; cf. v. 11). As in John’s birth account, chords from Samuel’s childhood find little resonance here.\textsuperscript{34} They return emphatically in the scene that follows, however—and here we come to the focal passage(s) for this part of my study.

I will discuss this scene, the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:22-40), at greater length below, so it is necessary here only to highlight the vivid Samuel childhood echoes that enliven this penultimate episode of Luke 1–2. Several reliable commentators descry a connection between Luke’s upright Simeon and 1 Kingdom’s Eli, unless, that is, the “horn of salvation” in the house of David (v. 69) refers to 1 Kgdms 2:10. The expression matches the language and images of Ps 131:17 (LXX) more closely, however; see Mark L. Strauss, \textit{The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology} (JSNTSS 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 99–100, who also cites \textit{Shemoneh Esreh} 15 and Sir 15:12 as “striking parallels” to Luke 1:69.

Among these purposes are, again, establishing a typological connection between both Samuel and John and Samuel and Jesus while also creating a double-encomiastic synkrisis of Jesus and John.

especially because both are (emphatically) old men who, in the house of God, bless the parents of the child of promise being then dedicated to God (1 Kgdms 2:20; Luke 2:28). An even stronger, and complementary, connection exists between the prophetess Anna, who appears in Luke 2:36-38, and Samuel’s mother, Hannah. Not only do they share identical Greek names (a fact curiously overlooked by a number of commentators), but Luke composes his Anna with many of the thematic chords that sound in the Avva of 1 Kingdoms. Indeed, both women worship, fast, and pray in the House of God (cf. 1 Kgdms 1:7-8, 10-13, 16), with overtones of grief. After the story of Jesus’ presentation, Luke gives a summary of Jesus’ upbringing (Luke 2:40) that echoes both that of John (1:80) and those of Samuel in 1 Kingdoms. Once again, Luke reflects upon the story of Samuel’s childhood, though by copying themes and concepts rather than directly borrowing vocabulary, as this table makes clear:

---


36 Brown (“Presentation,” 5–6) notes that Simeon/Anna follow Zechariah/Elizabeth in their paralleling Eli/Hannah.


38 For a discussion of grief as it pertains to Luke’s Avva, see Green, Luke, 151. The grief of Samuel’s Avva is apparent throughout 1 Kgdms 1:6-16.

39 Another similarity which might profitably be added to the list is the absence of the women’s husbands. Luke explicitly portrays his Avva as a widow (i.e., a woman who no longer has a husband), while Samuel’s Avva suffers the dubious fate of being married to a polygamist, whose absence is often highlighted in the text (cf. 1 Kgdms 1:9-18, 21-23).
Table 3: “Anna” in 1 Kingdoms and Luke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fasted</td>
<td>οὐκ ἤσθιεν (1:7; cf 1:18)</td>
<td>νηστείας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayed</td>
<td>προσηξατο (1:10)</td>
<td>δεήσειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ηξατο εὐχήν (1:11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>προσευχομένη (1:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αἰτημά (1:17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worshiped</td>
<td>(προσκυνεῖν—1:3)⁴⁰</td>
<td>λατρεύσουσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Temple</td>
<td>οἶκον Κυρίου (1:7)</td>
<td>ιεροῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ναοῦ Κυρίου (1:9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated grief</td>
<td>(various)</td>
<td>(implied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the last episode of Luke 1–2, Jesus’ parents, after journeying to the JT to worship, mistakenly leave Jesus behind (2:41-52). Here Luke again draws on the Samuel childhood story thematically but with little verbal repetition: in 1 Kgdms 2:11, 18-21, as in Luke 2:41-51 the parents leave behind their oldest son at the Lord’s Temple, where he ministers,⁴¹ though obvious differences adhere (the intentionality of leaving the child; the nature of the service; etc). Luke ends the account with a summary statement of Jesus’ growth (2:52) that especially parallels that of Samuel in 1 Kgdms 2:26.⁴² Here, parallel phrases are underlined and italicized (the other summaries are given for comparison):

---

⁴⁰ This word is used for Elkanah, Avva’s husband, though the context implies the same for Elkanah’s wives.

⁴¹ Though Luke does not state Jesus’ ministry, vv. 49-50 clearly imply that Jesus’ behavior here is linked to his larger vocation, even if not clearly understood by his parents.

⁴² Although many modern commentators fail to draw a parallel between these scenes (but see Fred B. Craddock, Luke [IntS; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990], 42), at least one older commentator made this connection: St. Bonaventure links Jesus’ being left at the temple here to Elkanah and Avva’s leaving Samuel (Commentary, 2.94).
Also to be noted is Luke’s initial framing comment that Jesus’ parents would go annually to the Temple to worship (2:41)—a fact frequently highlighted regarding Samuel’s parents also (1 Kgdms 1:3, 21; 2:18). Bonaventure, in his commentary on Luke, looks back here on 1 Kgdms 2:18 and imagines Samuel to have been 12 years old when he began ministering before the Lord (2.99). Fitzmyer also notes that Jesus’ age (12) matches that of Samuel at the start of his prophetic ministry according to the tradition reported by Josephus (Ant. 5.10), but does not observe that this tradition (of which Luke is probably aware) plays into Luke’s painting of Jesus and John in terms of Samuel.43 Though faint, these echoes grow more audible when heard against the stronger chords of Samuel’s childhood that sound throughout Luke 1–2. Moreover, they gain deeper resonance in light of the fact that there are very few stories in the LXX relating a boy’s presence in the Temple of God. Thus, with ears previously attuned to Samuel’s story and

---

with virtually no interference from competing scores, ideal readers/auditors can easily
detect echoes of Samuel’s childhood here.

From the fact that Luke recalls the childhood story of Samuel in narrating various
parts of the announcements, birth, and upbringings of both John and Jesus, some
commentators infer that Luke does not intend, and presumably does not invite,
identification of these characters with Samuel in any sort of typological way.\footnote{44} Thus
Raymond Brown claims, with the shift of the Samuel references from John in Luke 1 to
Jesus in Luke 2 particularly in focus: “Luke’s method is not one of identifying figures in
the infancy narratives with OT characters; rather he uses the pigments taken from OT
narratives to color in the infancy narrative.”\footnote{45} In light of the burgeoning recognition of,
and considerable insights produced by, typological identification of Jesus with OT
characters, particularly other prophets, elsewhere in Luke’s Gospel (see ch. 2), this
conclusion may be premature.\footnote{46} In fact, Luke’s shift of Samuel echoes from John to

\footnote{44} There is no need to maintain—as I do not—that Luke’s typological use of Samuel for John and
Jesus (i.e., his creating a connection between them on a number of narrative and thematic levels; see ch. 2)
necessitates positing a typological relationship of equal communicative and symbolic weight between each
of the minor characters in Luke’s story who corresponds to a minor character from Samuel’s childhood.
Very often in Luke’s writings, the minor characters simply help establish the typological connection
between major characters, as with, I would argue, Anna/Hannah, Zechariah/Eli, Simeon/Eli, etc. Curiously,
and importantly, Luke does at times employ minor characters to correspond typologically to people groups,
especially people groups that are significantly impacted by the eschatological horizon of Jesus’ ministry, as
he does with the Gentiles/Naaman and hometown residents/Israelites in the Jesus/Elijah-Elisha typology of
of Election,” \textit{JBL} 106.1 [1987]: 75–83) argues that Luke employs echoes of Elijah-Elisha (along with
Deuteronomy) especially in order to treat the theme of election and thus to clarify who are included and
excluded from the kingdom, often with surprising reversals of fortune.

\footnote{45} Brown, \textit{Birth}, 451.

\footnote{46} The fact that Luke casts both John and Jesus as latter-day Elijah’s, after all, does not bar most
interpreters from taking this dual characterization as typological, and surely Luke does intend a typological
traditions in scripture, as argued by Croatto (“Jesus, Prophet,” 454–58) and even if Luke mutes aspects of
Mark’s typological portrayal of John as Elijah (see Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke}, 1:215), still this does not vitiate the
Jesus serves his broader synkritical purposes in Luke 1–2: it not only reinforces the structural parallels between their announcements, births, and upbringings (e.g., 1:80 and 2:40)—the basis of any comparison between the two—but also suggests Jesus’ superiority via his more thoroughly attaining to the pattern of Samuel, especially with the narration of the precocious beginnings of his ministry in the Temple (2:41-52), which parallels the inception of Samuel’s prophetic vocation in the house of God at Shiloh (1 Kgdms 3:1-19)—all while John remains in the desert (1:80, albeit in accord with its own prophetic precedence). Just as Luke shows Jesus’ superiority through the parallel yet disproportionate structure of Luke 1–2, so he shows Jesus’ superiority by the parallel yet disproportionate comparisons with Samuel. When read with narrative and typological sensitivity, then, the dominant Jesus-John parallelism tracks with and illuminates the function of the pervasive Samuel childhood echoes in Luke 1–2, which on the one hand pair Jesus and John but on the other show Jesus to be superior. So the shift of Samuel echoes from John (Luke 1) to Jesus (Luke 2) does not argue against, but rather strongly indicates, the appropriateness of a typological reading of the Samuel echoes in Luke 1–2 for both John and Jesus.

Moreover, and once again, one need not define (as Litwak does) typological readings as comprehensive correspondence between intertextually linked characters (such as John and Samuel, or Jesus and Samuel)—which is surely impossible for Luke 1–2—

---

but rather may and, in light of my analysis, should define typology only as a comparison on certain levels (see ch. 2). If this introduces an ambiguity into interpretation that some find distasteful, I suggest that the ambiguity is a product not of sloppy categories but rather of the multivalence of Luke’s own writings and, in particular, of his use of the Jewish Scriptures. This more chastened (and useful) definition of typological use of OT characters means that we must think not in terms of a strict dichotomy between mere aesthetic use of OT prototypes and, on the other side, comprehensive typologies in which characters correspond at every imaginable point, but rather of a spectrum, with varying modulations depending on the case, between these untenable extremes.

When understood typologically, Luke’s recalling of Samuel childhood in depicting the births and early lives of Jesus and John have, in my judgment, three primary functions. First, they likely alert the audience to the momentous shift in salvation history brought about by the arrival of John and Jesus—hence, Luke’s using them at the start of his Gospel. Luke himself seems to understand and elsewhere casts Samuel as a pivotal figure, the first of the prophets after Moses, who, not himself being the prophet like Moses, nevertheless points to the days of that prophet, Jesus himself (see Acts 3:22-26, esp. v. 24). This function corresponds to the casting of both Jesus and John—who together signal the shift in salvation history, John as forerunner, Jesus as Messiah—with notes from Samuel’s early years.48 Yet Jesus is greater than John, as Luke makes

---

48 The Samuel echoes may also indicate John and Jesus as ushering in a new era of prophecy, especially in light of texts like 1 Macc 4:46 and 9:27, and also Jer 15:1 and Ps 99:6, where Samuel is paired with Moses, the first and greatest prophet (see Johnson, Luke, 18–19; cf. Acts 3:22-23). Militating against this reading, however, are the many other characters in Luke 1–2 who prophesy, prior to John and Jesus’ ministries, especially Simeon (2:26, 34-35; but see also the discussion of Zechariah in Albert Vanhoye, “L’Interete de Luc pour la Prophetie en Le 1,76; 4,16-30 et 22,60-65,” in vol. 2 of The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck [ed. Frans van Segbroeck et al.; Louvain: Peeters, 1992], 1529–48), though each of these characters enjoys some connection to the two boys.
abundantly clear, and this emphasis points to the second primary function of the Samuel Childhood Typology.\footnote{I do not claim that these echoes are strictly limited to the three functions that I specify above, although I do view these as the primary functions. They also of course serve to cast Luke’s story as a continuation of sacred history, as Brawley, Green, and Litwak have noted, but that function is, to my mind, subsumed under the more specific functions I am highlighting. Thus I find myself thinking more along the lines of Kingsbury, who notes that Luke composes these scenes with abundant OT “atmosphere” for the purpose of showing that God is “undertaking a new action in the history of salvation” (Conflict, 37; emphasis added).} Indeed, this typology also begins to reveal the identity of Jesus, an identity that partially consists of his being like yet even greater than the prophets of old, yes, even Moses himself, and also begins to reveal the implications this supra-Mosaic identity has for God’s people.\footnote{On Jesus as the prophet like Moses, see Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:213.} I will continue to explore this function below, after which I will disclose what I consider to be the final major function of this Samuel typology.

\textit{Jesus Presented in the Temple (Luke 2:22-40)}

It is significant that these Samuel childhood echoes reach something of a crescendo in Luke 2:22-52 (now considered more fully), for here Luke begins to distance Jesus from John the Baptist—as seen in the architectonics of the passage, viz. the breaking of the John/Jesus diptych, realized in 2:41-52 but foreshadowed in 2:36-38—and thus begins to emphasize Jesus’ unique identity. This presentation of Jesus in the Temple is both a presentation of Jesus before God and a presentation of Jesus to the audience.\footnote{See Serrano, \textit{Presentation}. Brown also views the sacrificial rationale as secondary to the real emphases of the scene (Birth, 450–51; idem, “The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22-40),” Worship 51.1 [1977]: 2–11 [2–3, 5–6]).} Here, then, structure (the early cracks in the diptych) and content (the presentation of Jesus in the Temple) correspond and reinforce one another, each revealing
and punctuating Jesus’ unique identity. The Samuel childhood echoes thus constitute a
significant dynamic at play in Luke 2:22-40\(^{52}\) (and also 2:41-52), and I will discuss them
more fully after considering other important dynamics in this passage.

Serrano rightly notes that Luke 2:22-39/40 begins with one plot arch but then
shifts noticeably to another. In Serrano’s language, this scene begins with a “plot of
resolution,” in which Jesus must receive purification at the JT in accordance with the
Law, but shifts, upon the introduction of Simeon in v. 25, into a “plot of revelation,” in
which Jesus’ identity is revealed.\(^{53}\) Thus the original driving force of the scene—the
need for purification—takes a decided backseat to the revelations made about Jesus by
Simeon and Anna (vv. 25-38), only finding resolution, and summarily so, in v. 39’s
notice that they finished everything required by the “Law of the Lord.” And indeed,
within the flow of the narrative, Simeon’s Spirit-guided revelation (v. 27) serves as a sort
of intervention that actually interrupts Mary and Joseph’s fulfillment of the legal customs:
Upon the family’s entrance into the JT to fulfill their sacerdotal obligations (v. 27),
Simeon intercepts the family, simply taking Jesus into his arms (v. 28), and offers his
song of praise and promise, the *Nunc Dimittis* (vv. 29-32).

Two features of Simeon’s song are of particular importance for my study. First of
all, it is the first clear mention in Luke’s writings of the message, so important within
Lukan theology, that Jesus’ arrival means salvation for all peoples (vv. 31-32). In fact,
the universality of Simeon’s *Nunc Dimittis* (*ὁ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν

---

\(^{52}\) Note that Brown (*Birth*, 450) explains Luke’s apparent confusion in 2:22-24 regarding the two
separate rites, which he threatens to conflate into one, as largely a result of his desire to present the baby
Jesus at Jerusalem in parallel to the presentation of the baby Samuel at Shiloh.

λαὸν, φῶς εἰς Ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ; vv. 31-32) stands in contrast with the relatively ethnocentric tenor of Zechariah’s Benedictus in Luke 1:67-79. The contrast is probably not coincidental, given that Simeon’s Song parallels that of Zechariah’s within the Jesus-John diptych of Luke 1–2 and that in the figure of SimeonLuke recalls another priest also, now from sacred history, Eli. Also important to note is the strong Isaianic language of the Nunc Dimittis, which here serves to characterize Jesus’ Messianic vocation and the appearance of which is hardly surprising given Luke’s heavy reliance on Isaiah elsewhere for articulating the universality of salvation.

Curious on multiple grounds is what follows Simeon’s Song. After, and perhaps in response to, Mary and Joseph’s understandable bewilderment (v. 33), Simeon blesses the family and then addresses Mary somewhat ominously: Ἰδοῦ οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν Ἰσαρῆλ καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον—καὶ σοῦ [δὲ] αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία—ὅπως ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί (vv. 34b-35). Croatto, probably rightly, sees this as a shift from the emphasis on Jesus’ Messianic vocation in the Nunc Dimittis back to his role as “controversial prophet.” Among the traditional crux interpreta for this passage are the meaning of “the rising and falling of many in Israel” (πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν

54 E.g., Brown, Birth, 443.
56 Croatto (“Jesus, Prophet”) notes that “the soteriological function of this ‘Messiah’ [i.e., in the Nunc Dimittis] is the same as that which describes Yahweh’s Servant in Isa 42:1-7 and 49:1-9a” (452).
Ἰσαρῆλ), as well as the proper interpretation of the piercing of Mary’s heart. Perhaps the least unsatisfactory interpretation of the latter is that this is the sword of division that separates those who rise from those who fall and that demonstrates the reality that the demands of God on Jesus as divine Father supersede even those of his earthly family,\textsuperscript{58} sometimes to painful effect. Following Brown, I favor this reading especially in light of its applicability to the scene that immediately follows in Luke 2:41-52. This anticipated division within Jesus’ own family mirrors the division within all Israel which his life and vocation will bring about\textsuperscript{59}; this seems to be the general referent of the “rising and falling,” as well as “the sign that will be opposed” (σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον; v. 34). Whether one can determine more specific referents of this rising and falling (for there are “many”) is another question.

The language of rising and falling of course conjures up the theme of divine reversal so prevalent in Luke’s Gospel (e.g., 6:20-26), and already featured in Mary’s Magnificat (1:48, 51-53), and so Luke probably intends his audience to hear at least a general reference to, and indeed a somewhat paradigmatic statement of, this favorite theme. Still, the context of the phrase implies further meaning. First, it comes immediately after the decidedly more positive Nunc Dimittis announcing Jesus’ crucial role in bringing salvation to all. Second, the framing of the “rising and falling” as

\textsuperscript{58} See Brown, \textit{Birth}, 463–64; Brown sees the Lord’s discriminating sword of judgment from Ezek 14:17 as the relevant intertext here, as do Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke}, 1:429–30, and Danker, \textit{Jesus and the New Age}, 69. Serrano’s objection to this reading has some merit but is not decisive (\textit{Presentation}, 188 n. 140).

\textsuperscript{59} In this regard, Luke is following his usual pattern of letting sayings material interpret the narrative for his readers/auditors; see Johnson, “Kingship Parable,” 142. Simeon’s prophecy of division will resound again and again in the narrative of Luke’s Gospel and as such is thematically foundational for Luke’s Gospel.
primarily intra-national in scope, the note of opposition in v. 34, and the fact that Mary, who has already extolled God’s penchant for reversing the fortunes of low and proud alike, will not herself emerge unscathed in this “rising and falling,” suggest a meaning more than the straight-forward divine reversal featured elsewhere in Luke’s Gospel. Rather, the rising and falling seems to center around divided responses within Israel to Jesus’ (universal) mission. Note also that πτῶσις is commonly used in the LXX to refer to God’s judgment, sometimes on God’s own people.

Auditors familiar with Luke’s Gospel (or other early Christian interpretations of Jesus’ death, for that matter) will already know that among those who oppose Jesus most vigorously are the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem, most of whom had a power base centered around the Temple itself. Auditors hearing Luke’s Gospel post-70 C.E. will know that these same opponents subsequently suffered, as a collective, a most decisive downfall. That Luke’s narrative at this moment places the baby Jesus at the very epicenter of that downfall is perhaps not coincidental. Rather, it is likely that he intentionally places, with a keen sense of irony, this prophecy of rising and falling precisely at the location where Jesus’ fiercest and most lethal opponents will finally (the auditor knows) meet their collective doom.

---

60 Though some suggest a scope of division beyond Israel itself (e.g., Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:42–43), I side with those who view the division as exclusively or at least primarily intra-national (e.g., Johnson, Luke, 57; Marshall, Luke, 122; Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:422).

61 πτῶσις as term of judgment: Isa 17:1; Ezek 26:15, 18; 27:27; 31:13, 16; 32:10; Nah 3:3; Zech 14:12, 15, 18 LXX. πτῶσις with reference to judgment on God’s people: Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 6:15 LXX.

62 This is of course a special emphasis in Luke’s Gospel, as I will discuss later.

63 As his Gospel unfolds, Luke employs διαλογισμός and its related forms with reference to the Jewish leaders’ opposition to Jesus (5:21-22; 6:8), most trenchantly in the Parable of the Vineyard (20:14), and also with reference to his own disciples (9:46-47; 24:38); Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:43–44. See also the Parable of the Foolish Rich Man, in which God exposes the greedy man’s vain reasoning (12:17).
This interpretation is strengthened, I believe—and indeed elaborated—by the appearance of an additional, subtle reference to the Samuel Childhood story, one not yet noted and one which points to the final function of this Samuel typology. Perhaps because of a myopic focus on verbal allusions, commentators often overlook the narrative of Samuel’s childhood itself, which is, in its telling, thoroughly interwoven with another quite vivid story: the downfall of the house of Eli. Indeed, so interwoven are the two stories that the first prophetic act of the boy Samuel is to foretell doom for Eli’s house (1 Kgdms 3:11-15). From Hannah’s song of praise (1 Kgdms 2:1-10), after a summary of Samuel’s ministry (2:11), the text moves immediately to the sordid tale of Eli’s sons (2:12-17), back to Samuel’s ministry (2:18-21), then to Eli’s rebuke of his wicked sons (2:22-25)—interrupted by a summary of Samuel’s childhood (2:26)—and the prophecy of doom on Eli’s house (2:27-36), on to Samuel’s advancing ministry (3:1–4:1), the first act of which is to prophesy doom on the house of Eli, and concluding with the fulfillment of that prophecy with Eli and his sons all dying in a single day (4:2-18). Thus the two stories comprise a virtual fugue in the text of 1 Kings—a fact surely not lost on Luke and certainly accessible to Luke’s ideal audience—and Luke, rather remarkably, alludes to every single section of narrative depicting Samuel’s rise in 1 Kings.

Attention to these facts makes audible an additional, though faint, echo from the early pages of 1 Kings in this section of Luke 2. Simeon’s dour prophecy of


65 As Brawley sagely observes: “explicit allusions are often signals for readers to listen for more expansive voices from the context of the explicit allusions,” and “[o]vert references to scripture prompt readers who know the Septuagint to consider covert allusions to the larger context of scripture” (Text to Text, 5, 124). Also helpful is the notion of “internarrativity,” as elaborated by Jonathan Huddleston: “But
“rising and falling” (πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν) employs language common to the LXX. The verb forms of these nouns occur in close proximity as part of the announcement by the anonymous man of God of the imminent demise of Eli’s house: καὶ πᾶς περισσεύων οίκου σου πεσοῦνται ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἀνδρῶν. . . . καὶ ἀναστήσω ἰερέα πιστόν (1 Kgdms 2:33b-35a). Given the shift of forms (from verb [LXX] to noun [Luke]), as well as the frequent use of the nominal and verbal forms of these terms in the LXX, most auditors could hardly be expected, despite the abundance of Samuel echoes throughout this and its surrounding sections, to hear resonances of the prophecy against Eli’s house on the basis of these two words alone.

Amplifying these echoes, however, are four supporting chords. First is Luke’s strange use of the archaic ῥομφαία (“sword”) in 2:35, outside of Revelation used only here in the NT. By verbal cue, this curiously archaic word would quite intentionally transport Luke’s ideal audience once more into the world of Scripture. Among the swirling chorus of echoes such language might conjure is another equally dour prophecy, that of 1 Kgdms 2, in which the man of God prophesies that Eli’s house will fall

internarratival allusion [in distinction from intertextuality] sends interpreters back, not to the source text, but to the source story, with a different set of questions: What is the overall shape of the wider narrative, beyond the alluded-to narrative—and how does this narrative profile influence the alluding text?” (“What Would Elijah and Elisha Do?” 267). I would not characterize Luke’s appeal to the story of the fall of the house of Eli as internarrativity, however—for he does, as I will show, provide numerous actual verbal links in 2:33-35.

66 πίπτω occurs at the end of v. 33; ἀνάστημι, at the start of v. 35—a span of 27 words, including ῥομφαία and σημεῖον between them. Though it is perhaps more a matter of modern scholasticism than exegetical relevance, there may be something to the fact that the words for “fall” and “rise,” whether in nominal or verbal form, occur in close proximity with ῥομφαία infrequently in traditional LXX text forms and never more closely together than here: Judg 4:14-16 (81 words); 7:13-15 (57 words); 1 Kgdms 17:47-50 (63 words); 3 Kgdms 1:50-52 (51 words); Amos 9:10-11 (29 words); Jud 8:18-19 (45 words); cf. Josh 6:15-21; 1 Kgdms 21:9-14. Only in 1 Kgdms 2:33-35 do ῥομφαία, σημεῖον, and “rise” and “fall” occur together in close proximity.

67 C.F. Evans claims that these verbs are seldom paired together in the LXX (St. Luke, 218), but their pairing is hardly rare (see, e.g., Deut 22:4; Josh 7:10; 2 Kgdms 22:39; Isa 51:17; Amos 9:11; etc.).
(πεσοῦνται) by the sword (ῥομφαία) of men (v. 33). Strengthening this impression, secondly, in 1 Kgdms 2:35 the anonymous prophet’s pronouncement takes what would be for an early Christian audience a strongly christological turn: καὶ ἀναστήσω ἐμαυτῷ ἱερέα πιστόν, ὃς πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου ποιήσει· καὶ οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῷ οἶκον πιστόν, καὶ διελεύσεται ἐνώπιον χριστοῦ μου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας (2:35). Given the obviously christological nature of Simeon’s pronouncement, as well as its location in the JT, the promise of a faithful house and the ambiguous use of χριστός provide a strong connection with Simeon’s words. Thirdly, Luke invites an informed audience to hear an echo of the downfall of the Elide house through his suggestive use of πτῶσις, since this downfall reached its climax with the literal and quite memorable neck-breaking fall of Eli himself—again narrated with the verb πίπτω (1 Kgdms 4:18). Solidifying the connection, finally, is the prophet’s promise that Eli will receive the sign (σημεῖον) of the death of his two wicked sons (1 Kgdms 2:34) and the use of διελεύσεται in 1 Kgdms 2:35. These chords, faint in themselves, play together in harmony to conjure forth resonances of the prophecy against Eli’s house.

In sum, with allowances for noun-to-verb shifts in two instances, five words, including the quite rare ῥομφαία, appear in close succession in both Simeon’s ominous

68 To “fall” (πίπτω) by the “sword” (ῥομφαία) is a common idiom in the LXX (e.g., Judg 4:16; 2 Kgdms 3:29; Jer 51:12; Ezek 5:12; 6:11, 12; 11:10; 17:21; 24:21; 25:13; Hosea 7:16; Amos 7:17; 1 Macc 4:15; 7:38, 46) and occurs literally in 1 Kgdms 31:4-5.

69 This passage may be recalled, with reference to Jesus, in Heb 2:17. Albeit several centuries later, the early Church Fathers interpreted it as a prediction of Jesus (e.g., Eusebius, Dem. ev. 4.16.44-45; Didymus, Comm. Zach. 1.243.5; Hippolytus, Comm. Dan. 4.30.9).

70 Both Josephus and Pseudo-Philo follow the scriptural account in specifying the mode of Eli’s death by falling (Ant. 5.359; L.A.B. 54.5).

71 The appearance of καρδία in each passage may be the icing on the cake—or it may be simply coincidental, given its commonness (700+ uses in the LXX; 40+ in Luke’s writings).
words and the prophecy of Eli’s ruin in 1 Kgdms 2:33-36; the latter passage ends with a promise bearing strong christological resonances (vv. 35-36; italicized and bolded below), and Luke’s use of “rising and falling” finds vivid illustration in the particular method of Eli’s demise. In light of the prominence of Samuel echoes in close proximity to Simeon’s prophecy in Luke 2:34-35 and the interweaving of the Samuel-rise and Eli-fall narratives in 1 Kingdoms, Luke’s ideal audience is expected to detect the thematic and verbal links between Simeon’s words and 1 Kgdms 2:33-35 and so draw a connection between Eli’s rejected house and the Jerusalem priesthood of Jesus’ day.

Table 5: Echoes of Judgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Kgdms 2:33b-35</th>
<th>Luke 2:34b-35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ πάς περισσεύων οἴκου σου πεσοῦνται</td>
<td>ιδοὺ οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἄνδρῶν. καὶ τούτοι σοι τὸ σημεῖον, ὥς ἡ ἤξει ἐπὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς σου τούτους Οφνι καὶ Φινεες· ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ ἀποθανοῦνται ἀμφότεροι. καὶ ἄναστήσω ἑαυτῷ ἱερέα πιστόν, ὃς πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου ποιήσει· καὶ οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῷ οἶκον πιστόν, καὶ διελεύσεται ἐνόπιον χριστοῦ μου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας.</td>
<td>οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῷ οἶκον πιστόν, καὶ διελεύσεται ἐνόπιον χριστοῦ μου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though something of an aside, it is instructive to note how Luke’s recalling of 1 Kgdms 2:33-36 (and the surrounding context) in Simeon’s prophecy provides further illustration and clarification of his typological use of the OT in this section of his Gospel
The echoes serve to suggest a typological connection between major characters in 1 Kingdoms and the Third Gospel (Eli’s house = Jerusalem’s religious authorities), though without pairing together the referents of the specific verbal cues. Thus the “sign” in 1 Kgdms is the death of Eli’s sons, whereas Jesus himself is (it appears) the “sign” to be opposed in Luke 2:34. Similarly, while a “sword” will pierce Mary’s heart, it is the sons of Eli who will perish by the “sword”—and surely Luke does not intend to pair the mother of the Lord with the wicked sons of Eli! It is important to note that these facts do not obviate a typological reading here but instead merely preclude a typological reading that seeks an immediate and corresponding referent for each word echoed from 1 Kgdms 2. Rather, the passage must be heard in light of the larger intertextual connections of Luke 1–2, in which Luke pairs major characters such as Jesus and Samuel, intending a typological connection, while echoing minor characters in order to establish the typological connection of major characters but without necessarily intending a similarly typological connection (as with Simeon and Eli).

Luke’s recalling 1 Kgdms 2:33-35 here does not necessarily preclude his also referencing other parts of the LXX as well. Bovon claims that Isa 8:14-18 lies in the “background” of Simeon’s prophecy, especially his language of rising and falling, use of “sign” imagery, and employment of κεῖται, which Bovon links to the stone of offense from Isa 8 (Luke, 1:104; cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:429; Danker, Jesus and the New Age, 68). Fitzmyer and others see Ezek 14:17 as standing behind v. 35a (Luke, 1:429–30), with the sword thus as a “divine instrument for testing and refining [God’s] people” (Bovon, Luke, 1:105; cf. Danker, Jesus and the New Age, 69). These echoes may work in tandem with the echoes from 1 Kgdms that I have identified, with, e.g., the “sign” of opposition from Isa 8 adding depth to the potentially christological “sign” language in 1 Kgdms 2 and the sword as a divine instrument for refining adding nuance to, while not overpowering the meaning of, the sword of destruction from 1 Kgdms 2. Note that the verbal links to 1 Kgdms 2:33-35 are far stronger than the links proposed for Isa 8:14-18 and are far more encompassing than the links to Ezek 14:17.

Still, he does sometimes invite a typological association between characters from Scripture and groups who are affected by the salvation-historical implications of Jesus’ life and ministry. As noted earlier, I draw this implication especially from the typological connection between those who received aid from Elijah/Elisha and Jesus’ ministry to those outside of his hometown (Luke 4:24-27).
Here Luke uses these verbal clues to direct his audience to the context of 1 Kgdms 2:33-36. On the basis of the rest of Luke 1–2, the audience will already associate Jesus and Samuel and on the basis of the text of 1 Kingdoms itself will know the interrelatedness of the stories of Samuel’s rise and the fall of Eli’s house. In fact, this passage clarifies and pushes the connection further: it is the Lord’s faithful priest, who is ambiguously but inescapably linked to his anointed, who stands to gain at the great expense of the house of Eli (1 Kgdms 2:35-36). The audience familiar with Luke’s Gospel will know, as argued above (and see also below), that on opposite sides of the division within Israel brought about by Jesus’ life and ministry are Jesus himself and the religious authorities whose seat of power is in Jerusalem. By recalling this scene from 1 Kingdoms, then, Luke invites, even teases, his auditors to contemplate a typological connection between the rejected priesthood of Eli and the religious authorities (including the priesthood) of Jesus’ day. Just as Samuel’s ministry corresponded to the end of Eli’s house, so Jesus’ ministry, Luke hints, will bring to an end the priesthood of Jesus’ day.\footnote{Here I am in line with, again, Hays’ reading of echoes of Jer 7–8 in Mark 11. According to Hays, the typological connection between Jesus and Jeremiah extends beyond those figures and includes also “outward-rippling implications” (“Can the Gospels Teach Us?” 408). Here the primary “outward-rippling implication” is a typological linking between Eli’s house at Shiloh and the religious authorities at Jerusalem.}

The historical similarities of the two group’s positions would further strengthen the connection: Just as Eli’s house and the cultic center around which it was based (Shiloh) stood on the precipice of a great fall in the early chapters of 1 Kingdoms, so the Jerusalem authorities and cultic structures of Jesus’ childhood would soon meet their end, as Luke’s post-70 C.E. audience knows quite well.
In this regard, it is important to consider that Luke, as well as his ideal audience,
would have little difficulty drawing a connection between Eli’s downfall and Shiloh’s
demise, since Shiloh’s downfall had long-since become axiomatic (Jer 7:14; 33:6, 9 LXX)
and since the two were firmly connected as a centerpiece of Samaritan theology,
regarding which Luke appears to be both knowledgeable and interested. One should
note also the explicit connection drawn between Shiloh and Eli’s house in 1 Kgdms 14:3
and 3 Kgdms 2:27. Moreover, the Jerusalem-Shiloh link continues and gains additional
force in Luke 2:41-52—but more on this below.

---

75 It is widely accepted that ancient Samaritan theology considered Shechem to be the original
and still-legitimate cultic site, though it was in practice eclipsed when Eli established the illegitimate and
schismatic cultic site at Shiloh. See John MacDonald, The Theology of the Samaritans (NTL; Philadelphia:
Westminster, 1964), 16–17; R.J. Coggins, Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism
Reconsidered (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), 120; Reinhard Pummer, The Samaritans (IconRel 28.5;

76 Consider especially Luke’s pointed interest in Samaritans in the central section of his Gospel
(e.g., Luke 9:52-56; 10:30-37; 17:11-19), his insinuations (discussed in the next chapter) that the Jerusalem
cult was an obstacle to the proper in-gathering of God’s people, especially Samaritans, and his affinities for
Samaritan traditions in Acts 7—when discussing the Temple, no less!

Examples of Samaritan tradition or theology in Acts 7 include: (1) Luke’s assertion that Abraham
did not leave Haran until the death of his father Terah (v. 4), which agrees against the MT and LXX with
the rendering of Abraham’s age in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Gen 11:32), among other Jewish traditions
(viz. Philo, De Migracione 177); see F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (NICNT; Grand
unprecedented claim that the patriarchs were buried not in the cave of Machpelah but in Shechem (v. 16; cf.
Gen 23:17-20; 33:19; 50: 13)—thus placing the patriarch’s burial place at the Samaritan holy site!
Discussing—and attempting to refute—further points at which Acts 7 may rely textually on the Samaritan
Pentateuch are W. Harold Mare, “Acts 7: Jewish or Samaritan in Character?” WTJ 34.1 (1971): 1–21; and
Though Bruce also warns against overplaying the evidence here (esp. Luke’s locating the tomb at Shechem,
“Stephen’s Apologia,” 41), one should also be wary of underplaying the connection. The point is not that
Luke has relied textually on the Samaritan Pentateuch (Richard’s concern) or that Acts 7 discloses the
historical Stephen to be a Samaritan or that Luke is putatively endorsing Samaritan theology wholesale
(Bruce’s concern: “Stephen’s Apologia,” 40), but rather this: acknowledging that Luke seems to drop hints
of Samaritan tradition at the precise moment when he, through Stephen, levels his strongest critique against
the Temple, we must consider whether these hints may be intentional and, if so, what are Luke’s possible
motives for giving such hints. One plausible motive is that Luke views the JT, and indeed the entire
Jerusalem power center, as a key obstacle to reconciling the Samaritans with the rest of God’s people—an
obstacle removed by Jesus’ life and ministry (see comments on Luke 9:51–19:27; 23:45)—and wants to
conjure up this dynamic in Stephen’s speech.
Before moving on, we must attend to Anna and especially to her “speaking about Jesus to all those who were awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem” (2:38). The apparent use of either *synecdoche* or *metonymy*77 here of course parallels the earlier description of Simeon as one who “was awaiting the consolation of Israel” (2:25b), and the straightforward meaning is simply that of 2:25b. Still, the mention of a woman spending her life in the JT awaiting “the redemption of Jerusalem” redounds with irony for a post-70 C.E. audience, in a way not easily felt by modern commentators. While we possess cognizance of the fact that Jerusalem was destroyed roughly 70 years after the time being depicted, for Luke’s ideal audience, this was a jarring, vivid recent event—far more world-shattering for some among his likely audience than even September 11 or the assassination of John F. Kennedy for many American contemporaries. Moreover, this event was depicted widely and propagandistically, in Luke’s day, on the boastful *Judea Capta* coins of the Flavian emperors and eventually on the Arch of Titus (see ch. 3 above). Finally, λύτρωσις itself had a powerfully political meaning for many Jews of this time, implying freedom from foreign oppression—as seen, above all, in its use on Jewish coins during the Bar Khokba revolt.78

Therefore, although most commentators pass by the phrase with little hint of pausing,79 if Luke, writing after 70 C.E. and otherwise sensitive to issues of theodicy,

77 Which technique is at play depends on whether one interprets Jerusalem as a part of the whole of Israel (*synecdoche*) or whether one sees it as a cipher for another, closely associated thing (*metonymy*), presumably Israel. Commentators usually opt for *synecdoche* (e.g., Bovon, *Luke*, 1:106; Marshall, *Luke*, 124; Green, *Luke*, 152).


does not use *metonymy/synecdoche* here purposefully, and with deeper meaning, then this turn of phrase is an infelicity of jarring proportions.\(^8\) Furthermore, that it comes shortly after Simeon’s dolorous prophecy about divisions and rising and falling within Israel—which, unlike in 2:25, is now divided, even if only rhetorically (i.e., via *synecdoche/metonymy*)—suggests a potential meaning more ominous than the plainest sense of the phrase. I view this, then, as a further, and even paradigmatic, example of Lukan subtlety, along the lines mapped below.

Though widely recognized, Luke’s use of Isaianic language both in introducing Simeon and in the *Nunc Dimittis* itself is perhaps worth recounting, even in abbreviated form, here. Luke’s initial description of Simeon as one “awaiting the consolation of Israel (προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ)” (2:25) loudly and definitively strikes the chords of the latter half of Isaiah, including Isa 40:1 and 66:12-13.\(^8\) The tones are even stronger in the *Nunc Dimittis*, which is a “pastiche” of passages from Isaiah (Isa

---

\(^8\) Hopes of seeing a politically restored and liberated Jerusalem/Israel continued after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. (see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:432), and Luke may here be warning against the vanity of resurrecting or persisting in such hopes, though this is by no means clear.

\(^8\) See Brown, “Presentation,” 6–7; also, Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas* (ZNW 112; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 78–85. Note that Isa 40:1 and 66:12-13 specifically reference Jerusalem, strongly inviting informed auditors to hear Anna’s later description (esp. v. 38) in Isaianic terms.

Further strengthening the Isaianic flavor of the entire scene is Isa 59:9, which sets “consolation” and “redemption,” in their verbal forms, as parallel. Thus the parallel descriptions of Simeon, awaiting the consolation of Israel, and Anna, awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem, form not only a Lukan but also an Isaianic pair. Given the Isaianic flavor of the scene as a whole, and the jarring comment regarding Anna in particular, members of Luke’s audience seeking a deeper meaning than the brutally ironic straightforward sense of Anna’s and others’ “awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem” might look to Isaiah, particularly what we now know as Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, for interpretive clarity.

Among the interpretive options there is Isa 63:4, in which occurs the only use of the noun form of λύτρωσις in (Rahlf’s) Isaiah (although the verb occurs somewhat frequently). Here, God as divine warrior speaks of having exercised judgment on the nations during the “year of redemption (ἐνιαυτὸς λυτρώσεως).” “Redemption,” then,
allows for multiple and divergent meanings, and Luke may be exploiting this fact. Although the theme of judgment on the nations might seem to offer little hope for re-interpretation of the irony-laden expectation of Jerusalem’s “redemption” in Luke 2:38, the larger context of the passage, which pleads for God to renew and rescue his people, also speaks of God’s fighting against his own people because of their rebelliousness (Isa 63:10). Isaiah 63, then, indicates that “redemption” may mean bloodshed rather than peace and that God the warrior does himself fight against his people in the face of their rebellion—a meaning Luke may imply, via metalepsis, in 2:38.

Whether Luke had in mind or intended his audience to hear reference to Isa 63 here is probably beyond all knowledge, and the connection to the sole noun occurrence of λύτρωσις in Isaiah is no unassailable basis for a positive conclusion, despite the deep reverberations of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah in Simeon’s prophecies. Still, the unbearable irony of the description of Anna stands as a cue to the audience that Luke intends in the surrounding scenes more than meets the eye, teasing his hearers into contemplating precisely what sort of “redemption” this might be. It also alerts Luke’s audience, more generally, to his use of subtle communication as a facet of his treatment of Jerusalem and

---

86 As argued in ch. 2, exploiting the double meanings of words was a common means of subtle communication in the ancient world.

87 The theme of God as opponent to his own people of course occurs in much of the prophetic tradition and features prominently in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. As I will argue below (following C.A. Evans), Luke frames Jesus’ march to Jerusalem with strong overtones of judgment via allusion in Luke 9:51 to traditions in Jeremiah and Ezekiel of God’s opposing his own people. An audience aware of those echoes would be even more likely to hear in Anna’s “awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem” an echo of the similarly-themed Isa 63.

88 Potentially strengthening the connection between the passages are the several mentions of God’s trampling (καταπατέω) the nations in Isa 63 (v. 3 [twice], 6) and then the description of the nations’ trampling God’s Temple (v. 18); Luke (uniquely) employs a variant form of the verb (πατέω) to describe the Gentile’s trampling Jerusalem (Luke 21:24). This raises the likelihood, however slightly, that Luke points toward Isa 63 for understanding the events of 70 C.E.
the JT. Only by attending to this irony-forged cue and noting the parallelism between Samuel-Jesus and thus also Shiloh-Jerusalem is the audience prepared for the later, otherwise surprisingly harsh pronouncements against Jerusalem beginning in Luke 13.  

A final point requires comment. It is significant that this scene is the first time in Luke’s writings that Jesus appears in the JT. Earlier in this Gospel, Luke has not shied away from acknowledging, even emphasizing, the sacerdotal activities of the JT, especially with Zechariah (1:8-11) and, to a lesser degree, in the early-going here (2:22-24, 27). A marked shift occurs in Luke’s Gospel, however, (and continues into Acts) away from presenting the JT as a sacerdotal cultic center. The shift consists not of an

---

89 See, e.g., Walker, Jesus and the Holy City: “In light of Jesus’ reference to the Temple as ‘his Father’s house’ (2:49), the next two references to the Temple [4:9 and 13:35] come as a dramatic surprise” (61); and 13:35 “is a solemn first pronouncement intended to shock. The story takes a violent twist, rudely disrupting the placid atmosphere created in the opening chapters.” While appealing, this interpretation simply ignores not only the discordant notes of Luke 1 and 2 but also the other menacing storm clouds in the first half of Luke’s Gospel, including the agonistic dynamics which I will highlight below. Alternately, the “dramatic surprise” of subsequent episodes, esp. 13:31-35, might point less-than-ideally-informed auditors back to the earlier episodes of Luke’s Gospel in search of answers.

90 As Serrano rightly notes (Presentation, 219, 276–77).

91 Although I will not discuss the Zechariah scene at length, note that Zechariah is administering the twice-daily Tamid service (see Marshall, Luke, 54; Green, Luke, 68; Nolland, Luke, 1:28, 33; m. Tamid 5–7) and that Gabriel’s rendering Zechariah silent thus prevents him from completing the service by speaking the blessing over the people upon exiting the sanctuary (see m. Tamid 7; Nolland, Luke, 1:33). So the interruption of the Temple’s sacerdotal function, while most clearly elaborated with Simeon’s appearance, finds a precursor in the Zechariah scene.

92 The difference between the emphasis in the scenes consists mainly, it seems to me, in 1) Luke’s free use of ναός in the Zechariah scene (but absent here), and 2) Luke’s actually narrating cultic activity in the Zechariah scene (1:8-10), while merely mentioning the need for such here and then passing over the narration of that activity summarily in 2:39.

93 Throughout, I will speak of the JT’s “sacerdotal cultic functions” in order to differentiate this aspect of the Temple’s cultic role from the other kinds of worship which in Lukan theology (as I read it) remain relevant to the Temple following Jesus’ birth, ministry, and finally death. The “sacerdotal cultic functions” which I have in mind are any activities in the Temple which require the ministration of a priest or priestly class—as opposed to the prayer and instruction which come to characterize Jesus’ and his disciples’ activity in the JT. Prayer and instruction are “cultic” in the sense that they express religious devotion; see, e.g, the definition in Roland De Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions (trans. John McHugh; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997): “By ‘cult’ we mean all those acts by which communities or
outright denial of the legitimacy of priest-led worship in the JT but rather in a pointed and consistent de-emphasis on that aspect of temple life within the Lukan narrative(s), and the shift begins, at least most emphatically, in this very scene—with Simeon’s interruption of Joseph and Mary’s intention to fulfill the customary rites in 2:27-28. Thus, when the present pericope shifts from “plot of resolution” (centered on the need to fulfill the cultic service) to “plot of revelation,” it undergoes a shift that carries across throughout the rest of Luke’s writings, away from the JT as sacerdotal cultic site. As the Lukan narrative unfolds, the proper function of the JT is no longer sacerdotal, or even cultic, beyond its utility as a place of instruction and prayer; rather, it serves, when properly used, as a means of pointing to Jesus himself—as it does in the present scene. This shift provides context, for those in the know, for Luke’s puzzling use of ναός—positively in the opening scene with Zechariah and thereafter only in contexts which reject identifying the divine presence within a particular locale (Luke 23:45; Acts 17:24; 19:24).

individuals give outward expression to their religious life, by which they seek and achieve contact with God” (271).

94 Taylor (“Jerusalem Temple,” 472) identifies this shift away from the JT as a cultic center as beginning in Luke 1, with the arrivals of John and Jesus, as evidenced in the Third Gospel’s move away from ναός as a description of the JT’s cultic function: after featuring in 1:9, 21, 22, it occurs again in Luke’s Gospel only at the rending of the veil in 23:45, and then appears in Acts 17:24 and 19:24, both times in reference to idols! I agree that the shift in some senses begins with the births of John and Jesus and with the interruption of the Tamid offering in 1:9-22 but that Luke gives his strongest cue via the interruption of the flow of the narrative in the Simeon and Anna pericope. Thus Luke gives multiple indicators of the shift (including the simple de-emphasis on the cultic role of the JT starting here and the shift in his use of ναός after the Zechariah scene) that are complementary and that surround the births of John and Jesus. In this regard, Luke 1–2 once again preview and interpret the narrative that is to follow.

95 Serrano (Presentation, 202 n. 190) seems potentially to detect, and resist, this implication.

96 So Holmås, “‘My House Shall Be Called a House of Prayer,’” 406–9.

Thus, regarding the present scene, the cultic requirements, the initial driving force behind this little story, receive only cursory mention as fulfilled (2:39), and likewise the following pericope, despite mention of the family’s observance of Passover (v. 41), features the JT primarily as a place of instruction (2:46-50).

*Jesus’ Presence in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52)*

The final scene of Luke 2, the twelve-year-old Jesus’ surprising appearance in the Temple, offers a number of exegetical challenges, including the meaning of Jesus’ curious response in v. 49. A full analysis is neither possible nor desirable here, and I must instead focus on those aspects of the scene which are most pertinent to my study.98

Note, first of all, that, despite the notice that Jesus’ parents went yearly to Jerusalem to attend the Feast of Passover (v. 41) and despite the fact that this supplies the context for the present scene (v. 42), Luke otherwise gives no attention to the Passover—i.e., he does not specifically attend to or elaborate the sacerdotal or other cultic activities that this would have entailed.99 This muting of the sacerdotal and cultic aspects of the Passover stands in stark contrast to the activity of the boy Jesus in the Temple—questioning, learning, teaching (vv. 46-47). Thus a Passover pilgrimage is, in Luke’s

---

98 Some will object, perhaps rightly, to my foot-noted treatment here of Jesus’ ambiguous expression in v. 49: ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου. If commentators are correct in preferring “in my Father’s house” over the less-specific “about my Father’s affairs” (so Marshall, *Luke*, 129; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:443), then it likely has bearing on my thesis, although I confess to being unsure how much (and precisely what kind of) weight to grant it. Reading v. 49 as “in my Father’s house” hardly dislodges any major aspects of my reading, especially since God abandons the JT only gradually as Luke’s narrative progresses, and in fact the puzzling absence of the noun “house” here may foreshadow God’s eventual abandonment of the Temple in Luke’s narrative (see my comments on 13:35a below). Note, moreover, that in Luke’s Gospel Jesus does not claim to be the active cause of, and certainly does not celebrate, the eventual demise of the Temple—which is, rather, a result of its abandonment by God, granted partially in response to the treatment of Jesus by the Temple’s powerbrokers.

narrative, co-opted for other purposes, namely in order to reveal Jesus’ precocious wisdom and unique relationship to the Father (v. 49). Much like in the previous scene, then, a sacerdotally-oriented cultic imperative provides the backdrop for the scene, yet it is other, non-sacerdotal activity to which Luke gives center stage. Thus to speak generically of “Temple piety” here is off the mark¹⁰⁰: such language obscures Luke’s use of sacerdotal cultic worship as a plot device (perhaps even as a foil) while giving actual attention to the non-sacerdotal activity within the Temple, specifically to revelations regarding Jesus’ identity.

Also important for this study is to note how this passage strengthens the above reading of the prophecies of Simeon and Anna. As noted previously, there are strong, if subtle, typological connections between Jesus’ presence in the JT and Samuel’s early ministry in the Shiloh house of God. Even Luke’s mention of Jesus’ age likely strengthens the connection, as there was Jewish tradition, known to Josephus at least, which understood Samuel to be twelve years of age when beginning his ministry at the Shiloh holy place.¹⁰¹ Yet ominous tones everywhere surround Samuel’s presence there, since his first received prophecy, in the house of God no less, announces the end of the house of Eli, which, as argued above, was easily linked to Shiloh’s demise as cultic site. Indeed, following the capture of the ark, which occurs in concert with the overthrow of Eli’s house, Shiloh enters the narrative of Kingdoms only twice more—once tangentially (1 Kgdms 14:3), the second time in fulfillment of the prophecy against Eli’s house (3

Kgdms 2:27)—before the establishment of the Jerusalem cult. Shiloh is remembered elsewhere in scripture as a place made desolate, rejected by the Lord. Most significantly, Jeremiah prophesies doom for Jerusalem and its cult, promising it will be made like Shiloh (Jer 7:14; 33:6, 9 LXX). Thus, the typological connection between Samuel’s incipient ministry at Shiloh and Jesus’ presence in the JT here would bring into view for a post-70 C.E. audience the truths both that the JT—here populated by the surprising twelve-year-old Jesus—no longer in fact remains and that, just as Luke has paired the two cultic sites via the Jesus-Samuel connection, so also Jeremiah long before interpreted Jerusalem’s fall in light of Shiloh’s hoary demise.

This unstated, insinuated typology is best viewed as a rather skillful example of what Richard Hays terms *metalepsis*, in which “a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text” and yet “the figurative effect of the echo . . . lie[s] in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts.”

Although Luke clearly alludes to Samuel’s childhood in depicting the childhoods of Jesus and John and although he also alludes, more subtly, to Eli (in the figure of Simeon), he gives only the faintest of references to the fall of Eli’s house and never so much as mentions desolate Shiloh, despite its dominant role as the setting of Samuel’s childhood. Even so, he dances all around this side of the story—by alluding to every pericope of its complementary piece, the Samuel childhood story, by conjuring up (so faintly) the prophecy of Eli’s fall, and now by placing the twelve-year-old Jesus in the Temple,

---

102 See Ps 77:60; Jer 7:12, 14; 33:6, 9 LXX.

precisely the point in the corresponding Samuel narrative at which the two sides of the story merge: Samuel’s rise meets Eli’s fall.

On my reading, then, Luke 2:22-52, which continues the Samuel childhood echoes from Luke 1, takes the typological implications of those echoes in a surprisingly ominous direction, by establishing links between the Jerusalem priesthood of Jesus’ day and Eli’s house and, correspondingly, between Jerusalem and the fallen Shiloh. Although modern commentators have roundly overlooked them,104 these typological implications are consonant with, and in fact anticipate, the first explicit discussion of Jerusalem’s fate in Luke’s Gospel, Luke 13:33-35, which otherwise—i.e., on a purely favorable reading of the JT in Luke 1–2—comes out of the blue as a dire warning with little apparent precedent in Luke’s narrative (cf. 11:49-51). Faint echoes of Shiloh’s demise, moreover, may also haunt Jesus’ pronouncement in Luke 13, as I explore below.

Summary of Analysis on Luke 1–2

Above I have argued that Luke draws a typological connection between first John and then Jesus and the great prophet of old, Samuel, and does so in a way that emphasizes Jesus’ superiority over John, while still elevating the latter. I have also argued that in the final two pericopae of this section, Luke begins to drop ominous hints of the future demise of Jerusalem and the JT: 1) by subtle communication via his ironic

104 That scholarship has overlooked (or perhaps, “under-heard”) the typological import of these echoes is likely attributable to a series of interrelated limitations: 1) the relatively late scholarly acknowledgment of Luke’s status as a theologian or even independent sculptor of the text, coupled 2) by the relatively recent efforts to unravel his complex and multifaceted use of the Jewish Scriptures (including the only partial recognition of the Samuel echoes by previous studies), along with 3) the crucial post-70 C.E. context in which Luke wrote and the theodical questions which were endemic to that context, as well as 4) the frequent use of subtle communication among those with at least moderate rhetorical education in the first century.
description of Anna as “awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem” (2:38), 2) by subtle allusion to the story of Eli’s fall and thus, via metalepsis, by insinuation of Shiloh’s fall, and 3) by effecting, in these scenes so dominated by the presence of the JT, his de-emphasis on that structure as a sacerdotal cultic site and re-presentation of it as, properly used, pointing toward Jesus. The reason for this shift may be, as some have claimed, that Luke has shown in these early scenes what the proper function of the Temple is—viz. to lead and point to Jesus—and yet, as Luke’s Gospel unfolds, opposition to Jesus becomes concentrated within the power structure of the Temple—i.e., they misuse the Temple.105 This view is, I think, partially correct, as Jesus’ opponents do have the Temple, and indeed Jerusalem more broadly, as their base on power, but this view nevertheless makes the mistake of downplaying the deeply rooted immorality which Luke also places on the heads of the Jerusalem leadership. Although from here Luke leaves behind the Samuel typology which was the basis for an association between Shiloh-Jerusalem and Eli-Jerusalem’s religious authorities in Luke 1–2,106 echoes of Shiloh, as well as Luke’s use of subtle communication and his de-emphasizing of the sacerdotal functions of the JT, continue as important features of his Gospel as the story of Jesus’ life, ministry, and passion unfolds.

105 See, above all, the incisive discussion in Holmås, “‘My House Shall Be Called a House of Prayer,’” 406–9.

106 Fitzmyer claims that the connection between Jesus and Moses, Elijah, and Elisha helps establish Jesus as “an eschatological prophet” who “pours forth” the eschatological giving of the Spirit (Luke, 1:214–15). This explains, in my view, why Luke drops the Samuel echoes after Luke 1–2, as they would potentially obscure the other prophetic typologies that Luke wishes to highlight with Jesus’ adult ministry. The Samuel connections are appropriate to Jesus’ childhood precisely because it was Samuel’s childhood and not adult ministry that was associated with the fall of the Eliade priesthood, so by linking the childhoods of John and Jesus with Samuel Luke draws a typological connection between Jerusalem-Shiloh and the Jerusalem authorities—Eli’s house, while not interfering with the typological associations that he wishes to employ regarding Jesus’ (and John’s) adult ministry.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Jerusalem Temple in Luke 3–19

Introduction

Here I examine the place of Jerusalem and its Temple in the two middle sections of Luke’s Gospel: John’s ministry and Jesus’ Galilean ministry (3–9:50) and the Jerusalem Journey (9:51–19:27). The thematic continuity between these scenes suggests treating them together.

Setting the Stage (Luke 3–9:50)

Luke 3–9:50,1 which covers John’s ministry and Jesus’ early ministry in Galilee, will occupy comparatively little of our time, as it contains, to my mind, only two pericopae that are significant for my thesis, and these only moderately so (in themselves, at least). Still, given my emphasis on a narrative reading, I cannot neglect to give some indication of by what terrain the auditor gets from Luke 1–2 to the later parts of Luke’s Gospel.

Luke follows Mark and either Q or Matthew in giving attention to the ministry of John, although he elaborates his John scene (3:1-20) by his historiographical introduction to the scene (vv. 1-2a), by quoting Isa 40 at greater length (vv. 5-6), and by expanding John’s message (vv. 10-15); he also omits the description of John’s appearance and

---
ministry (cf. Matt 3:4-6; Mark 1:5-6). Luke’s prior introduction of John also represents a significant departure from the other Synoptics regarding John. In Luke’s world, John is not only Jesus’ forerunner but also the son of the priest Zechariah. As such, his ministry in the desert, apart from the strictures of Jerusalem and its Temple, may represent something of a rival ritual system, though it is unclear how far the evidence should be pushed here.  

After describing John’s ministry and imprisonment (3:1-20) and then Jesus’ baptism and genealogy (3:21-38), Luke narrates Jesus’ temptation in the wilderness (4:1-13), which I address more fully below. Thereafter, Luke takes a significant departure from Mark’s order (which he otherwise generally follows) to inaugurate Jesus’ public ministry at a synagogue in Nazareth (4:14-30), doing so by having Jesus describe his vocation as the fulfillment of Isaianic prophecy (esp. Isa 61:1 and 58:6), a vocation expressed primarily in terms of liberation for the oppressed (4:18-19) and one that almost immediately earns him the disapproval of his townsfolk (4:28-30), largely because of his self-attribution of Elijah-Elisha typology in a way calculated to enfranchise outsiders at the expense of his own kith and kin (4:24-27).

This inaugurating scene sets forth several important Lukan features, including three worth noting here. First is the description of Jesus’ ministry by explicit quotation of Isaiah, which is matched by later explicit (e.g., Acts 8:32-33) and implicit (e.g., Luke 7:22) references to Isaiah for describing Jesus’ life and ministry and which follows through on the promise of the Isaianic echoes in the Nunc Dimittis. Second, Luke here begins the Elijah-Elisha typology by which he characterizes Jesus at various points in

---

Luke 4–9 (see ch. 2) and which thus continues to elaborate Jesus’ prophetic characterization, first under the mantle of Samuel. Third, here begins in earnest the division-lines brought by Jesus, as predicted in Simeon’s second oracle.

Much of the rest of Luke 4–9 is in some sense an elaboration of Jesus’ Isaianic vocation to release the oppressed—as made explicit in Luke 7:22—as he goes about healing those afflicted with ailments or even who are dead, teaching (e.g., 4:31-33, 42-44; 5:3, 36-39; 6:20-49; 8:4-18), and performing other miracles (5:4-7; 8:22-25; 9:12-17). In the process he draws large crowds (e.g., 6:17-19), despite his penchant for seeking solitude (4:42-44; 5:16; 9:10-11), and gathers disciples, including the Twelve (6:12-16) and including from among undesirables (5:27-32; 8:1-3). After establishing the nature of his own mission, he sends out the Twelve, giving them power to continue his ministry of liberation (9:1-6). He also earns the ire, and soon the focused enmity (cf. 6:6-11), of various members of the religious elite, particularly over his association with undesirables (5:30-32; 7:33-35, 36-50), his self-attribution of the power to forgive sins (5:20-21; 7:48-50), and his shirking of strict Sabbath observance (6:1-5, 6-11). This continues and deepens the lines of division promised by Simeon. This line soon stretches also to include Jesus’ own family (as anticipated by Simeon’s comment on the sword’s piercing

---


4 John’s ministry anticipated these divisions as well (see Luke 3:7-9, 18-20; cf. 7:29-30).

5 He heals those who are demon-possessed (e.g., 4:33-37; 8:26-39), leprous (e.g., 5:12-16), crippled (5:17-26), and otherwise sick (e.g., 4:38-41; 8:43-48); he also raises the dead (7:11-17; 8:40-42, 49-56). See also 6:17-19; 7:1-10.

6 Jack Dean Kingsbury (“The Plot of Luke’s Story of Jesus,” in Gospel Interpretation: Narrative-Critical and Social-Scientific Approaches [Harrisburg, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1997], 160) probably rightly reads these scenes as part of the larger drama over “the crucial question of who rightfully rules God’s people Israel: Is it Jesus, Israel’s Messiah, or the authorities?”
Mary’s own heart), whose relationship to him becomes marginalized in equalizing preference for all who hear and obey God’s word (8:19-21).

This opposition reaches something of a climax in Luke 9:18-22, when Jesus asks his disciples who the crowds (but then also they) say he is; after Peter announces him as the Messiah of God, Jesus warns them to keep quiet and then foretells his own suffering and death at the hands of the religious leaders, including the Jerusalem elite (viz. the elders and chief priests; v. 22).7 From here, Jesus begins to teach them of the implications of following him (9:23-27) and then leads only three disciples, Peter, John, and James, up to a mountain to witness the divine revelation of his glory—the Transfiguration (9:28-36). After a few intervening episodes, including an infamous discussion among the disciples of their relative status (9:46-48), Jesus, with the day of his “ascension” drawing near, “set[s] his face to Jerusalem” (9:51).

Though unstated, these lines of division are largely rooted in Jesus’ subtle challenge to the concentric circles of sacredness that emerge from the JT itself.8 Divisions emanating outward from the Holy and Holies and dictating appropriate social and cultic boundaries based on gender, cleanness, and ethnicity are challenged here by Jesus’ association with “sinners,” women, and other undesirables. Also problematic for those whose symbolic world flows out of the Temple is Jesus’ self-attribution of the

7 Luke is of course here simply following Mark 8:31 (as did Matt 16:21), on traditional source-critical conclusions.

8 These concentric circles had the JT, and the Holy of Holies in particular, as their center and flowed (outward) from the assumption—firmly rooted in the OT—that the JT was the unique dwelling place of Israel’s God. See Green, “The Demise of the Temple,” 508–9. Conflict in Luke’s Gospel also emerges based around Jesus’ apparent shirking of Sabbath requirements, which are less obviously related to the concentric circles of purity emanating from the JT.
power to forgive sins—a power generally reserved for God\(^9\) and strongly associated with
the sacerdotal activities of the Temple (Lev 4:20-35; 5:10-18, 26; 19:22; Num 15:25-28;
3 Kgdms 8:30 LXX). It is probably no accident that Luke sets up the scene in which
Jesus forgives the paralytic (5:17-26)—to great consternation—with a note that Jesus was
surrounded by Pharisees and law-teachers from Jerusalem (v. 17).\(^{10}\) Thus Jesus, in
Luke’s subtle portrait, not only ruffles the feathers of those whose symbolic universe and
base of power emanates from Jerusalem but also begins to provide narratival clarification
of the narratival shift away from the JT as sacerdotal center: Jesus is beginning to
encroach upon the sacred space once reserved for the JT.\(^{11}\) This presentation takes on
much starker dimensions with the theophanic imagery of the Transfiguration, which
suggests that God’s presence, traditionally associated most closely with the JT, is now
(rather) tied to Jesus.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^9\) The problem almost certainly lies in Jesus’ apparent claim to absolve sins as such (instead of, say, sins committed against oneself, etc.), a claim implied by his use of the passive: “Your sins are forgiven” (5:20; 7:48). See P. Ellingworth, “Forgiveness of Sins,” Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels (ed. J.B. Green and Scot McKnight; Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1992), 241–43 (241)

\(^{10}\) Cf. Green, Theology, 14.

\(^{11}\) Luke may attempt to provide a partial precedent for this sort of encroachment via Jesus’ story about David, who enters “the house of God” (τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ) and eats the bread meant only for the priests (Luke 6:1-5). The authority of Jesus is made more emphatic in this passage by Luke’s omission of the gnomic expression from Mark 2:27: τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον.

\(^{12}\) Baltzer long ago observed the linguistic and theological connection between kabod and δόξα (“Luke,” 266–70, 275); note the latter’s appearance in Luke 9:31, 32 (cf. Acts 7:2, 55). Note also the theophanic imagery of the overshadowing cloud (ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς; v. 34), as discussed by Hutcheon, “Temple,” 32–33. Still, Luke probably does not include anything like the “Temple Typology” which Evans and Novakovic see as present in Mark’s Gospel (“Typology,” 990); note especially Luke’s omission of Mark 12:6 (“something greater than the Temple is here”). The most we could say is that Luke leaves room for interpretive movement in that direction, without actually making clear to what degree that is his own preferred trajectory.
Jesus’ Temptation (Luke 4:1-13)

Only brief comment is needed on Luke’s well-known rearrangement of the final two of Jesus’ infamous temptations. Most scholars agree that Matthew’s ordering of the temptations is original, whether original to Q or original because Luke made use of Matthew (ala the Farrer Hypothesis). The question is, Why did Luke make the change?

The majority of commentators seem to be in agreement that the change has little to do with the second temptation (on Luke’s order) and everything to do with the third: the point was to make the temptation at the JT last, even if the import of doing so remains unclear. Luke likely makes the change in order to emphasize the final temptation and the fact that it occurs in Jerusalem. Although Conzelmann surely overstated his case regarding the cessation of temptations (and by implication Satanic activity) in proximity to Jesus, still there may be something to Luke’s leaving Satan in Jerusalem, where he later re-emerges for the first time in full force by taking possession of Judas (22:3). Luke may be hinting at Jerusalem’s role as a habitat for Satan, perhaps also implicating the religious authorities who find their power base there, although the matter is by no means clear. At the very least, then, we may say that Luke changes the order of the temptations for the purposes of highlighting Jerusalem—possibly to polemical end.

---


One of the early healings which Luke narrates comes in Luke 5:12-16, Jesus’ healing of a leper by touching him and then commanding him to do several things (discussed below). Several points warrant comment. First, Rowe has argued cogently that Luke’s second use of the vocative “Lord,” found here, should be read in light of and with the same import as its first and immediately prior occurrence in the Third Gospel, Peter’s divine vocative in 5:8. The point is not that the leper, as a character, is stating his own recognition of Jesus’ divinity but rather that Luke makes use of the native ambiguity of κύριος to attribute to Jesus, on a narrative level, this higher sense of “Lord.” I find Rowe compelling on this point, especially in light of 5:12’s propinquity to Peter’s confession and in light of commonalities which Rowe notes between the two scenes. Luke highlights the fact here, then, that it is not only the human Jesus but also the divine Lord who touches and heals this leper.

In light of this, and secondly, it is intriguing that Jesus instructs the man to tell no one but rather to go and 1) show himself to the priest and 2) to offer the things

16 It is widely noted that the modern disease known as leprosy (Hansen’s disease) does not match the description of those diseases in the Pentateuch and thus almost certainly also those diseases labeled as such in the NT. Nevertheless, while “skin-disease” or perhaps even “scale disease” is perhaps more accurate (and seems to be preferred in OT studies), I will usually employ the more-popular designation “leper,” for the sake of practicality. For a helpful discussion, see John E. Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas: Word Books, 1992), 187–89.

17 Rowe’s reading of κύριος, then, supplies yet another clear example of Lukan subtlety, again by exploiting the double meaning of a word; also, Marguerat, “Luc-Actes,” 74–79. See comments on 2:38 above.

18 See Rowe, *Narrative*, 89–92, esp. 90.

19 That Luke has apparently taken the key section of this pericope for my purposes (5:14) almost straight from Mark 1:44 does not negate its significance for my thesis, on the grounds that 1) Luke, after all, makes the choice to retain Mark’s wording εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς despite changing other details in the passage, 2) Luke frames the entire pericope differently by his use of κύριος in v. 12 (following Rowe), and 3)
commanded by Moses for his cleansing (see Lev 14), 3) as a witness to them (εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς). Jesus’ command here is arguably the only acknowledgment in Luke’s Gospel, after Luke 1–2, of an ongoing sacerdotal role for the JT. As such, it would appear to go against the Gospel’s general trend of downplaying the JT’s sacerdotal cultic functions post-Luke 2. One should not overlook, however, Jesus’ rationale for offering the sacrifice: it is to be a testimony to them. Despite the disagreement in number, the obvious antecedent for αὐτοῖς (“to them”) is the earlier τῷ ἱερεῖ (“the priest”) and so, via *constructio ad sensum*, indicates a testimony to the priestly caste as a whole.

But what is the exact nature of the testimony? Is it simply the witness that the former leper is now clean and thus can offer the sacrifices in order to regain full status as a member of the Jewish people? Standing against this reading is the fact that the auditors of Luke’s Gospel would likely hear this phrase differently in light of other Lukan distinctives (e.g., Luke’s use of the μαρτυρίας word group). Given point 2 above, Luke’s meaning need not be constrained by the meaning of the phrase (which I leave for other interpreters) as it appears in Mark.

---


21 The logic is simple enough: the man would show himself to the on-duty priest (singular), but his non-leprous presence via contact with Jesus would serve as a witness to the larger body of priests (plural). Or Luke may simply retain the singular τῷ ἱερεῖ from Lev 13:49, as suggested by Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 218.

Moreover, in Acts especially, yet already at the end of Luke, Luke employs the word group of “witness” to special effect: as the disciples’ testimony to others of Jesus’ unique mission and identity (Luke 24:48; cf. Acts 1:8, etc). Given this, and in light of the ambiguously divine overtones of the vocative for “Lord” in 5:12, it is likely that members of Luke’s ideal audience would have understood “testimony” here to refer to the man’s witnessing to the priests of Jesus’ ability to heal lepers, which the audience knows is part of Jesus’ larger Isaiah-shaped vocation (see 7:22). The audience, then, knows at least something of the (christological) implications to draw from Jesus’ power to heal lepers—even if the priests do not.

---

23 Cf. Johnson, Luke, 92. Moreover, Jesus has already shirked ancient standards of purity simply by touching the man. Note the heightening of prohibitions against skin-diseased persons in some of the writings of the Qumran community. For example, 4Q396, Col 3-4 (=4Q394, Frag 8, Col 2) commands that the skin-diseased must neither enter a holy place nor stay in a house but must remain in isolation and goes on to carp against skin-diseased persons who enter houses and eat holy food after the 1st Day rites of Lev 14 (specifying only the shaving and washing) but prior to the 7th. Finally, the text says that one contaminated with skin disease may not eat any holy food until the sun sets on the eighth day (4.1). This scroll extends, then, the period of ceremonial impurity, moving it from the completion of the 8th Day rites (per Lev 14) to sunset on the eighth day. This extension of impurity until sunset on the eighth day of purification is common to the legal materials of the Dead Sea Scrolls; see Charlotte Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” in The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery (eds. J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, A. Pinnick; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 77.

24 My own strong suspicion is that Luke borrows, with his own modifications of course, this term from Isaiah, and thus his use of this word group, particularly μαρτύς, constitutes part of his pervasive, often subtle, reliance on Isaiah for shaping his narratives, especially Acts. For more on the significance of “witness” within Lukan theology, see Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:243.


“Witness,” understood in this way, thus places conditions on Jesus’ command for the man to present himself to the priests: He is to fulfill his cultic obligations according to Moses’ commands, not for their own sake but rather as a means of witnessing to the more important reality of Jesus’ identity and vocation. This passage continues, then—although auditors likely would not detect it on the first several hearings of Luke’s Gospels (see comments of 17:11-19)—the downplaying of the JT’s sacerdotal cultic functions, here secondary and indeed subservient to the need to witness to Jesus. Again, Luke references the Temple cult not as an independently valid institution (within Luke’s narrative) but as one intended to bring about proper recognition of Jesus.

There is one further ambiguity which the passage admits. What is the precise meaning of αὐτοῖς? Although I have taken it as simply “to them” above, it may of course also carry the advantage-linked sense of either “against them” or, on the positive side, “for their advantage.” This sense of the pronoun, heard in context, may imply, then, so significant a meaning as to hear the witness of Jesus’ vocation and life as either an indictment against the priesthood and their ongoing sacerdotal duties or else an invitation to them to recognize Jesus’ identity as Messiah and Lord. Even if Culy, Parsons, and Stigall are right in viewing this as a dative of advantage (which seems likely at least

---


prima facie), still Luke leaves room for the informed auditor—who knows that the leaders of the priestly class will play a key role in securing Jesus’ crucifixion—to see this testimony, because its hearers ultimately reject it, as also a witness against them.


As we have seen, despite hints that Jesus’ ministry to the marginalized, his claim to forgive sins, and the theophanic revelation on the mountain begin to encroach upon the symbolic world emanating from the JT, Luke’s emphasis on Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke 1–2 finds only modest continuation in this section of his Gospel. This is largely a by-product of Luke’s placing Jesus in Galilee, which allows the Lord, after kicking off his ministry there, to turn, dramatically and fatefully, toward Jerusalem itself. Two key exceptions to Luke’s general ignoring of Jerusalem and its Temple in this section are his placing the JT temptation last instead of second in the account of Jesus’ temptations and Jesus’ instructing the healed leper to offer sacrifices in the Temple. The meaning of this latter encounter grows more significant as Luke’s Gospel shifts to the journey toward Jerusalem.


29 There is also of course a reference to the Jerusalem elites in Jesus’ initial prediction of his death, which specifies the chief priests and elders (along with the scribes) as his persecutors (9:22). As noted above, Luke is here following the language found in Mark’s Gospel. Still, it is of some significance from a narrative (and also a redaction-critical) perspective that Luke chooses to retain Mark’s text here.
authorities,\textsuperscript{30} with “the crowd” floating somewhere in between.\textsuperscript{31} Once again the conflict generally plays out obliquely, i.e., not as direct confrontations.\textsuperscript{32} The division lines with Israel foretold by Simeon not only continue here, however, but grow even deeper and more irreparable as Jesus fatefully makes his way to Jerusalem, especially after Jesus’ denouncing of the Pharisees and scribes (11:37-54, esp. 53-54), and they eventually reach fever pitch, after the “Triumphal Entry” with Jesus’ ministry in the Temple (19:47–21:38, esp. 19:47).\textsuperscript{33} Not only through his actions and ripostes but also by self-disclosure (12:49-53) does Jesus embrace the divisive role foretold by Simeon, and Luke makes explicit the import of the dividing lines brought through Jesus’ ministry: those who side with Jesus side with God (9:48; 10:16; 11:23). This recalls John the forerunner’s warning against the perilous assertion of blood descent from Abraham as the basis of one’s status as a member of God’s people (3:8-9). Nothing less than true membership within Israel is at stake, and Jesus himself utters mysterious parables that suggest the final members of God’s people may not include the likely suspects (14:15-24).

The conflict, though fundamentally rooted in the authorities’ rejection of Jesus, has several specific faces, some of which played into the framing of their conflict with Jesus in Luke 3–9:50, including the authorities’ rejection of the repentant “sinners” whom Jesus accepts (15:1-3, 11-32), and their binding up heavy burdens (11:48),

\textsuperscript{30} Kingsbury (Conflict, 105) rightly notes that Luke often takes the religious authorities stereotypically as a single group.


\textsuperscript{33} Kingsbury, Conflict, 27.
especially via strict Sabbath observance (13:10-17). But they are also hypocrites, Luke informs the auditor (11:37-44; 12:1-3), and indeed money-lovers (16:14)—hence, their rejection of Jesus’ difficult teachings on the proper use of possessions. Perhaps most shocking of all—and most relevant to my thesis—is the revelation that the religious authorities are the heirs of those who murdered God’s prophets of old (11:48), an ominous and telling disclosure indeed given Luke’s casting of Jesus in the mantle of the great prophets of old.

While Jerusalem finds frequent mention in this section, references to the Temple are sparse. Jesus does draw auditors there through his instructions to ten lepers (17:11-19)—discussed below—and by telling a Temple-set story of Pharisaical self-justification (Luke 18:9-14). But the latter story portrays not sacerdotal cultic activity but instead prayer (v. 10), and indeed the man who earns Jesus’ praise (v. 14) is he who stands at a distance, in contrast to the Pharisee who proceeds boldly forward (v. 13). The men are justified, or not, on the basis not of proper Temple worship but rather of their succeeding or failing to adhere to the ethic of humility which Jesus commends here (and elsewhere).

Given the overarching theme of escalating conflict as Jesus makes his way to Jerusalem, the intertextual background of the pivotal initiating verse, 9:51, is significant.

34 Here the synagogue ruler seems to be lumped together with the religious authorities who oppose Jesus’ ministry.

35 Luke later explicitly links their greed and hypocrisy (20:46-47). Matera summarizes the conflict of this section as being over “the presence of the kingdom of God, the need for repentance, the correct use of possessions, and ritual purity” (“Jesus’ Journey,” 76).

36 Even if there is merit to Hamm’s identification of this scene as portraying the Tamid service (“Tamid Service,” 223–24), it is telling that Luke includes in the scene only mention of the men’s prayers—completely omitting references to the activity of the priests. Hamm’s efforts to fill in the Lukan “vacuum” of the scene (to which he objects) is misguided (223).
Craig A. Evans has argued at some length that the phrase τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν (Luke 9:51)\(^\text{37}\) most likely echoes the use of τὸ πρόσωπον as the object of στηρίζειν in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the only books of Scripture in which this combination appears.\(^\text{38}\) Evans notes that each such phrase occurs, without exceptions, “in contexts threatening judgment.”\(^\text{39}\) Supporting Evans’ reading of this echo in Luke 9:51 are the larger agonistic features of Luke’s Gospel—namely the conflict that carries over from Luke 3–9:50, escalates in the Journey section, and reaches its climax in Jerusalem (and the Temple) itself—as well as Jesus’ words of judgment while on the journey (13:31-35) and upon reaching the Temple (19:41-44). Thus this notice of Jesus’ “setting his face to Jerusalem” serves also (again in an interpretive feedback loop) to frame the conflict which marks the Journey section.

Significantly, this echoed refrain from the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel sometimes announces judgment on God’s people and even does so with particular reference to Jerusalem.\(^\text{40}\) Thus Luke shapes Jesus’ march toward Jerusalem for judgment according to prophetic precedent, and through this framing echo, Luke also summons, however vaguely, the entire prophetic tradition, particularly embodied in Jeremiah and

\(^{37}\) The textual variations cited in NA\(^2\)\(^\text{27}\) for this phrase do not, even if preferred, frustrate Evans’ argument, since the variants still retain the crucial combination of τὸ πρόσωπον as the object of στηρίζειν.


\(^{40}\) This is the case with Jer 21:10; Ezek 21:2 (parabolically), 7; and 38:2 LXX. It is also used generally of God’s people in Jer 3:12, of the women of God’s people in Ezek 13:17, and against the idolatry of God’s people in Ezek 6:2.
Ezekiel, announcing doom on the holy city.\textsuperscript{41} Jesus’ approach is nothing less than God’s own reckoning with the holy city which had made itself inimical to God’s messengers—as Luke’s Jesus himself makes clear (11:49-51; 12:57-59; 13:34-35; 19:41-44). If correct, this reading strengthens my interpretation of Luke 2:38 (above).

Just as earlier Luke appealed to the tradition of Shiloh (perhaps as interpreted through Jeremiah) as a potential model for Jerusalem’s demise, so now Luke addresses the underlying theodical problem by drawing on a different but complementary strand of prophetic tradition. Later in this same section we will see that Luke appeals to yet another prophetic tradition, namely, Jerusalem’s reputation as killer of prophets (13:31-35; cf. 11:49-51), in order to explain its eventual judgment. Thus Luke has begun to marshal diverse but not incompatible prophetic traditions—some subtly, some plainly expressed—as the essential pattern to his patchwork explanation for Jerusalem’s destruction.

Luke also introduces another element into the agonistic plot which he is constructing. Immediately after Jesus sets his face toward Jerusalem (9:51), Jesus attempts to enter a Samaritan village—and is repelled (9:52-53). Luke explains that the Samaritans’ reason for rejecting him was that his face was set for Jerusalem (9:53), playing to well-known Jewish-Samaritan enmity at this time. When James and John ask

if they should (like Elijah) call down fire to destroy the village, Jesus rebukes them and moves on (9:54-56).\(^{42}\)

Although it thus appears that the Samaritans are firmly aligned as additional enemies of Jesus, Luke takes pains to rehabilitate them at two later points in this central section of his Gospel: the story of the Good Samaritan (10:30-37)\(^{43}\) and the healing of the Ten Lepers (17:11-19; see below). Auditors familiar with his Gospel thus know that the Samaritan village’s rejection of him is not representative of Samaritans as a whole. They also know, in fact, that the village rejected Jesus specifically because of his heading toward Jerusalem, which already foregrounds in the audience’s mind the issue of a proper cultic site, since Jesus’ arrival in (and thus presumably his departure for) Jerusalem would put him there in time for Passover.\(^{44}\)

Thus, with the ominous chords of Simeon’s last prophecy humming in the background, Luke’s Jesus marches toward Jerusalem amid a redounding symphony of conflict, division, and judgment.\(^{45}\)

---

\(^{42}\) Some readers see in this a syncretical comparison between Jesus and Elijah, to Jesus’ advantage: having greater power than Elijah, Jesus also possessed greater restraint.

\(^{43}\) The story of the Good Samaritan, which is often taken to be and probably is a parable, rehabilitates Samaritans not by giving a positive story about a Samaritan that is understood to be “historical” or factual within the world of Luke’s narrative, as with the Ten Lepers. Rather, it creates a positive narrative about a Samaritan which introduces the theological possibility that a Samaritan should inherit life by fulfilling the chief commandment (10:25-29), where a Jew, even a Levite or indeed a priest, had failed.

\(^{44}\) Samaritans opposed pilgrimages to Jerusalem not only out of general enmity but especially also because it was not, in their eyes, the proper worship site; cf. Dennis Hamm, “What the Samaritan Leper Sees: The Narrative Christology of Luke 17:11-19,” *CBQ* 56.2 (1994): 273–87 (282).

\(^{45}\) Another agonistic line which Luke maps, although less strongly than the division between Jesus and the religious leaders (with “the people/crowd” often in view), is the conflict between Jesus and Satan, an inevitable result of Jesus’ ministry of liberation (10:17-20; 11:14-26; 13:16). Given these lines of conflict, it is little surprise that the religious leaders’ eventual assault on Jesus occurs with Satanic collaboration (22:1-6, 53).
Less than halfway into his Gospel’s central section but after already establishing many of the significant features of that section, including the escalating conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders (11:37-54; 12:1-3, 49-59) and Jesus’ concern for proper use of possessions (12:13-21), Luke has unknown members of the crowd elicit comment from Jesus by referencing Galileans whose blood Pilate mixed with their sacrifices (13:1). This scene immediately follows Jesus’ self-proclamation of his divisive role (12:49-53) and his warning that this divisive role means that Israel should rightly judge the times, seeking peace before it is too late (12:54-59)—and so should probably be understood in light of this earlier scene. Jesus’ response to the unknown members of the crowd is that these Galileans were no worse sinners than any other Galileans of their day (13:2-3a). Then he turns the table on these unknown inquirers, commanding them to repent lest they suffer a similar fate (13:3b). Jesus goes on to tell the story of the eighteen people who died when the Tower of Siloam fell and reaffirms the same point: his hearers (“all of you,” second person plural) must repent or likewise perish (13:4-5). Beyond the emphasis on repentance (a Lukan leitmotif) and the attendant rejection of strict retribution theology, the precise meaning of this passage is difficult to determine. Many commentators—rightly, in my view—see at least a hint here of Jerusalem’s dire

---

46 Numerous are the times that Luke has members of the crowd, disciples, and religious authorities prompt Jesus in this way—11:27-28 (woman in crowd), 11:45 (lawyer), 12:41 (Peter), 14:15 (unknown person), etc.

status as an imminent recipient of divine wrath, a view very likely given the multiple references to Jerusalem in the passage, the immediately preceding warning about reading the signs of the times (12:54-59), and Jesus’ lament over Jerusalem shortly thereafter (13:31-35).

The parable that immediately follows points in this direction as well: A fig tree (συκη) planted in a vineyard (πεφυτευμένη ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι) failed to yield fruit for three years, and so the owner commanded the vine-dresser (ἀμπελουργός) to cut it down; but the vine-dresser interceded on behalf of the fig tree, asking for one more year in which to dig around and fertilize the fig tree (σκάψω περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ βάλω κόπρια), after which, should it still fail to produce, it would indeed be cut down (13:6-9). As many have noted, this parable has a beginning and middle but ends before concluding, and so remains open—an openness that dovetails with its invitation to repentance.

This parable is unique to Luke, although it strongly resembles a story in Ahikar. It also recalls the Parable of the Tenants found in all three Synoptics (Mark 12:1-12; Matt

---

48 E.g., Caird, St. Luke, 168–69; Danker, Jesus and the New Age, 259.

49 Note the oblique (and muted?) reference to past sacerdotal worship in the JT by mention of the sacrifices.


51 See Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 259.

52 It is in this sense closely akin to the Parable of the Two Sons (Luke 15:11-32).

53 Green emphasizes the element of clemency in Luke 13 as a key difference from the parallel in Ahikar 8:35 (Luke, 515); also, Martens, “‘Produce Fruit Worthy of Repentance,’” 171.
Each of these parables in turn echoes the poignant song depicting Judah as a vineyard which produced thorns instead of grapes in Isa 5:1-7a. Isaiah 5 goes on to specify the “thorns” of God’s people as their unjust, oppressive dealings with one another and their general backwardness of perspective—which God will ultimately right (vv. 7b-30). The indictment of God’s people, including specifically the residents of Jerusalem (Isa 5:3), for their injustice and wrong-headed rebelliousness strongly matches the overarching dynamics of Luke’s Gospel, especially 9:51–19:27 (see above).

Several verbal parallels point to Isa 5:1-7 in Luke 13:6-9 as well. Isaiah 5:2 mentions a tower (πῦργος) in the midst of the vineyard. Although no such tower appears in Luke’s parable, the occurrence of the same word in Luke 13:4 (the “Tower of Siloam”) as the lead-up to the parable may have suggested Isa 5 to Luke, and may signal his ideal audience there as well. Both parables feature a vineyard (ἄμπελος), although, while the vineyard stands for Judah in Isa 5, a mere fig tree within the larger vineyard appears to fill this role in Luke 13 (see below). In both Luke 13 and Isa 5, God plants (φυτεύω), although, again, it is a vineyard in Isa 5 and a fig tree in Luke 13 which God plants. Finally, in Isa 5:6 God refuses, because of the vineyard’s fruitlessness, to cultivate (“dig,”

---


55. This passage has strong resonances with Luke’s own favored theme of divine reversal (e.g., Isa 5:15 and the Magnificat), and the overtones of economic injustice of course strike a Lukan chord as well.

σκάπτω) it, whereas the vine-dresser aims to do this as part of the last-ditch effort to save the fig tree from its own fruitlessness (Luke 13:8). Though potentially viewed as evidence that Luke does not intend a strong connection to Isa 5 here, the changes Luke has made to Isa 5’s song are, rather, instructive.

Before elaborating the instructive nature of Luke’s changes, there are a number of odd omissions which require comment. Luke curiously omits here several key words from Isa 5 which occur in the Parable of the Tenants in Mark (and also Matthew). The omission of πύργος from the parable may be such an omission, although I view it instead as obviated by its appearance in Luke 13:4. Still, this prevents Luke from following Mark (and Matthew) in describing God’s also building a tower in the vineyard (ὡκοδόμησεν πύργον) as in Isa 5:2 (Mark 12:1; Matt 21:33). Note also Luke’s failure to mention God’s setting around (περιτίθημι) the vineyard a hedge/fence (φραγμός), drawn straight from Isa 5:2 and appearing in both Mark 12:1 and Matt 21:33. Finally, Luke leaves out God’s initially digging a winepress in his vineyard (προλήνιον ὤρυξα in Isa 5:2 vs. ὤρυξεν ὑπολήνιον in Mark 12:1 and ὤρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν in Matt 21:33).

It is curious and probably significant that Luke also omits from his version of the Parable of the Tenants (Luke 20:9-19) each of the above omissions from his Parable of the Fig Trees. Where Mark and Matthew have in quick succession God’s building a tower, hedging a fence, and digging a winepress, Luke’s Tenants Parable has, in the layout of the Synopsis, only blank space. The omission is all the more striking given that it is the second largest omission Luke makes to Mark’s text in this passage (although he
makes numerous modifications, mostly stylistic). The likely solution to the riddle is that Luke intentionally omits these words and concepts, apparently taken directly from Isaiah by Mark, in order to de-emphasize a connection between his Parable of the Tenants and Isa 5. Although Luke may have had any number of (largely inaccessible) reasons for muting a connection between the Parable of the Tenants and the song of Isaiah 5, one noticeable effect of this decision is the amplification of the connection between his Parable of the Fig Tree in Luke 13 and Isa 5: by removing interference from his later parable, Luke effectively increases the odds that his audience would hear Isa 5 here.

Moreover, the omission of those features of Isa 5 that appear in Mark’s and Matthew’s Parable of the Tenants is explainable on Luke’s emphasis here not on the entire vineyard but rather on the fig tree: Luke is telling the story of a fig tree within the vineyard, and so to mention the fence and grape-press would be simply beside the point, since these are features of the vineyard as a whole. Given his mention of cultivation via digging (σκάπτω, Luke 13:8; cf. Isa 5:6) and the larger pervasive echoes of Isaiah in Luke’s writings, there is strong evidence that Luke recalls Isa 5 here and does so in a way that members of his ideal audience would likely have detected (as have, e.g., the editors of NA27).

But what is the import of Luke’s alluding to Isa 5 here? One thing this allusion does is to prepare the audience, along with the hints of Luke 1–2 and 13:1-5, for the harsh

---

57 The largest omission is Luke’s leaving off Mark 12:11, which is 10 words long, versus the 9 words Luke omits from Mark 12:1.

58 Danker sees Isa 5 as a background text here but argues for Mic 7:1 as the key intertext, based on Luke’s apparent citation of Mic 7:6 in 12:53 (Jesus and the New Age, 260). Though Luke does likely allude to Mic 7:6 just earlier—a fact that helps connect 13:1-9 with the preceding pericope—Isa 5 has far stronger thematic and verbal parallels to 13:6-9 than does Mic 7:1 and so provides the dominant LXX background.
pronouncement against Jerusalem in Luke 13:31-35, for it conjures Isaiah’s vivid portrait of God’s coming judgment on his people, with Jerusalem in particular focus. The context of the parable, namely the hints and then clear pronouncement of Jerusalem’s demise in 13:1-5 and 13:31-35, respectively, lead to a likely allegorical association of the fig tree with Jerusalem or probably with Israel in general (since Galilee also features prominently in 13:1-5 and since his audience would know that the Flavian assault would bring destruction on the entire region, not just Jerusalem).\(^{59}\) It is also possible to side with Kenneth Bailey in seeing the reference to the fig tree as an indictment of the Judean leadership and not the entire nation.\(^{60}\) Though appealing, however, this reading does not

\(^{59}\) Contra: Wolter, Das Lukasevangelium, 477: “Ein spezifischer Israel-Bezug gehört nicht zur vorgegebenen Semantik der Feigenbaum-Metaphorik.” Modern interpreters, haunted no doubt by the spirit of Jülicher, often strongly resist allegorical readings of Jesus’ parables. Yet here the connection to Isa 5, which is clearly allegorical, suggests just such a reading. See C.A. Evans’ assessment that “it is probable that Luke’s contemporaries would have understood” a reference to Israel with the fig tree, citing Jer 8:13; Mic 7:1 (Luke, 206); also, David L. Tiede, Luke (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 247; Kinman, “Lucan Eschatology,” 675, and references in 670–71, 675 n. 25; and Snodgrass, Stories with Intent: “From OT and Jewish texts on fig trees, the symbolism of the fig tree for Israel is obvious” (263). Supporting this allegorization further is the apparent equation of Israel with the fig tree in the parallel parable in the Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse of Peter (ch. 2; see Richard Bauckham, “The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter,” JBL 104.2 [1985]: 269–87), although Bauckham argues that this parable comes not from Luke but from “independent gospel tradition” (283); Apoc. Pet. also explicitly equates God with the owner. Fitzmyer also allows for an “allegorical thrust” in the parable: “It should be recalled that a fig tree often stood in the OT as a symbol of Judah or Israel” (Luke, 2:1005, 1008). (Nolland, however, contests this claim [Luke, 2:718]). Moreover, the allegorical readings of patristic and medieval interpreters—Jülicher’s boogeyman—generally went far afield from the allegorical elements I am highlighting here (see Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 260; but cf. Cyril of Alexandria, Commentary on Luke, Homily 96).

\(^{60}\) Kenneth E. Bailey, Poet and Peasant through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to Parables in Luke (comb. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 2:82. Bailey argues for this by noting the allusion to Isa 5:1-7 here and noting its specific application to the leadership in Luke 20:9-16. He addresses the apparent disjuncture this creates between 13:1-5 and 13:6-9 by claiming they are “closely related” “units of tradition” pairing a call for the people to repent (vv. 1-5) with a statement of the leadership’s “need [for] forgiveness” (vv. 6-9) (Poet and Peasant through Peasant Eyes, 2:87). Craig Blomberg agrees with Bailey’s taking the fig tree as allegorical of only Israel’s leadership but notes that “the principle of judgment on those who do not repent obviously applies universally (Lk 13:3, 5)” (Interpreting the Parables [Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1990], 269). Likewise, Green muses: “Does the narrator hope that his audience will hear Isa 5:1-7 in the background of this parable? If so, an identification of Israel with the vineyard is likely, with the further identification of the fig tree as Israel’s barren leadership also conceivable” (Luke, 515 n. 126). Among the potential pay-offs of identifying the fig
seem adequately to prepare for the harsh tones of 13:31-35 directed toward all of Jerusalem, already foreshadowed in the verses leading up to this parable (13:1-5). An Israel-fig tree connection is strengthened by the shared language between this parable and John’s earlier warning against self-assurance on the basis of ethnic lineage (Luke 3:7-9). From a theodical angle, Luke may be inviting his audience to consider that just as God previously visited his people with destruction for their immorality (and note the emphasis on economic injustice both in Isa 5 and in the central section of Luke’s Gospel), so God has done so again; this would constitute a clear appeal to retribution theology.

In this way, the parable supplies a theologically satisfying answer to the dominant theodical issue of the day, again by appealing to prophetic tradition, but it does so with an additional wrinkle. Unlike in Isa 5, where God rejects the people, here God’s intention to reject them (again taking the fig tree as a reference to God’s people) is rebuffed by the vine-dresser, an undisclosed intercessor, who gains for (this segment of) God’s people a brief reprieve. The presence of an intercessor indicates that God’s eventual judgment on the people was not only just, as in Isa 5, but was in fact delayed through mercy. Although there is a strong modern allergy to allegory regarding Jesus’ parables, the connection to Isa 5 suggests an allegorical reading, and Luke’s presentation of Jesus as would-be intercessor for Jerusalem in 13:34 (and also 19:41-44) suggests the vine-dresser may represent Jesus himself. This would not be the last time Luke presents Jesus in an

---

61 The shared words are ποιόν, καρπός, and ἐκκόπτω (cf. Green, Luke, 515 n.125); both passages also refer to trees, though with differing vocabulary (δέντρον, συκῆ), and both emphasize repentance.

62 See Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 476. Snodgrass, who advises that allegorical readings, even when valid, must only be taken so far, shows some willingness to equate the vine-dresser with Jesus,
intercessory role (see Luke 22:31-32). Given the not infrequent intercessory function of Israel’s prophets, that Luke so poignantly casts Jesus as a prophet throughout Luke and Acts further supports such an identification, as does the fact that Jesus’ tenor when addressing Jerusalem’s fate as the Gospel proceeds are decidedly pathos-laden: the compassionate vine-dresser of Luke 13:6-9 becomes the doleful Messiah of Luke 13:34-35; 19:41-44; and 23:28-31. The theodical import of the passage is clear: Not only does God judge Israel (especially Jerusalem) for its unrighteousness justly and according to prophetic precedent (Isa 5), but God would have, except for the intercessor, judged the city long before. Thus God proves not only just and faithful but even merciful—but the window for repentance is limited and is, within the narrative timeline of Luke’s gospel, quickly closing.


63 Referenced by Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 171.

64 Prophets as intercessors: Moses (Ex 32:11-14, 30-34; 34:9; Num 14:13-19; Jer 15:1); Samuel (1 Kgdms 12:17-18; Jer 15:1); Jeremiah (e.g., Jer 7:16).

65 Jesus’ grief over Jerusalem is muted only in 21:20-24. Many of course rightly note a shift in tone from this parable, in which judgment is suspended, to Jesus’ subsequent announcements of Jerusalem’s fate, in which judgment is more certain (e.g., Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent*, 264). No hard line of separation need be enforced, however, given the natural progression from warning to pronouncement, which corresponds to this parable’s appearing prior to Jesus’ pronouncements in Luke’s Gospel.

66 See Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 476.

Here, following numerous hints and insinuations, and roughly halfway into his Gospel, Luke finally announces in the clear words of Jesus the imminence of Jerusalem’s demise. This ekphrastic scene comes shortly after the Parable of the Fig Tree and so (as argued above) colors interpretation of that passage (and, via the hermeneutical circle, vice versa). Intervening between the two are a scene of conflict with a synagogue ruler over Jesus’ healing a Satan-bound “daughter of Abraham” on the Sabbath (13:10-17), two parables on the kingdom of God (vv. 18-21), a geographical notice highlighting the movement toward Jerusalem (v. 22), and a question and response about who will be saved, with the rejection of many who would seem to be first in line (vv. 23-30).

Luke 13:31-35, which parallels Matt 23:37-39 with considerable accuracy even in terms of word order,⁶⁷ offers much grist for rumination, but central for my study are v. 33, which establishes a connection between Jesus and Jerusalem, and especially the enigmatic v. 35a. I will consider these shortly.

The appearance in v. 31 of “some Pharisees” who tell Jesus to flee because Herod wants to kill him is a typically Lukan “interruption,” which appears “to change the subject” but which actually provides opportunity to elaborate the theme of judgment discussed in 13:22-30.⁶⁸ Despite the ominous nature of the report,⁶⁹ Jesus dismissively

---

⁶⁷ On this see Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 72, although I disagree with his overall reading of this pericope in Luke.

⁶⁸ See Green, Luke, 534–35, who also notes how the temporal reference of v. 31 (“at that very hour”) ties the two scenes together, as does the geographical notice of Jesus’ approach to Jerusalem in v. 22; also, Nolland, Luke, 2:738.

⁶⁹ John A. Darr (Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization [JSNTSS, 163; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 170) observes that, because Herod has already killed John the
refers to Herod as a fox (v. 32), but then he cryptically acknowledges his own fate: he must continue his work of exorcising and healing “today and tomorrow” until he “finishes” his work on the third day (v. 32)—very likely implying his death—because it is impossible for a prophet to die outside Jerusalem (v. 33). This clearly recalls Jesus’ harsh description of Jerusalem as murderer of God’s prophets (Luke 11:49-51) and unmistakably affirms Jesus as a prophet who is marked by divine necessity (v. 33) for a prophet’s death.

The reminder of Jerusalem’s status as prophet-killer leads to Jesus’ mournful words about Jerusalem’s unwillingness to be gathered to him (v. 34). Jesus’ description of Jerusalem’s impenitence here, and his furthering the charges against it (“who stone those who are sent to it”), recalls the fruitlessness of the fig tree in 13:6-9, and Jesus the intercessor now appears to despair of the city’s fate.

This brings us (rather quickly) to v. 35, the first sentence of which (ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν) is crucial. This short and enigmatic sentence raises several questions

---


71 See Green, Luke, 538. Attempting to clarify Jesus’ mysterious statement that it is impossible for prophets to die outside of Jerusalem—against the clear scriptural evidence to the contrary—Green takes “Jerusalem” as synecdoche for all of Israel here (Luke, 538). If correct (and I remain on the fence), this would strengthen my reading of Anna’s reference to Jerusalem in 2:38 as a double entendre both utilizing synecdoche (or metonymy) and intending the obvious referent—the city itself.

72 Luke may also allude to the execution of the prophet Zechariah by stoning (2 Chron 24:17-22); see Fisk, “See My Tears,” 158.
for commentators: What, first of all, do the constituent pieces of the verse mean—what is the meaning of ὁἶκος, and what is the import of ἀφίεται ὑμῖν? What light, moreover, is brought by Matt 23:39, which is identical to Luke 13:35a, with the perhaps telling addition of ἔρημος at the sentence’s close?73 And what light do the intertextual echoes of this short verse—if any—shed on these basic questions?

I will tackle the second question first: What do we make of Luke’s non-inclusion of ἔρημος? The question is of course complicated by the nebulous status of text-critical questions (at least for some) regarding Matthew and Luke. If we follow most scholars in assuming Matthew and Luke’s mutual borrowing from Q and further follow those who have so boldly reconstructed this hypothesized document, then ἔρημος is a Matthean addition, and Luke has simply recorded what he found written in his (now-immaterial) source.74 In this case, it is Matthew’s addition, rather than Luke’s non-inclusion, that is significant.75

On the Farrer(-Goodacre) Hypothesis, however, Luke knew and used the text of Matthew, and so he actively omitted ἔρημος, presumably to significant effect—though to what degree remains to be seen. If Luke did use Matthew and thus omitted ἔρημος (assuming, as we must, that he did not do so by accident or whimsy), then there are any

---

73 The manuscripts of Luke’s Gospel that do, according to NA27, include ἔρημος are likely later attempts to harmonize with Matthew. Cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, 2:1036.


75 Playing Luke off against Matthew here, Weinert claims that Luke’s non-inclusion of ἔρημος shows that he “has no particular wish to stress the desolate state of Jerusalem’s abandoned house” (“Abandoned House,” 73), but this is by no means the case on traditional source-critical grounds (which Weinert assumes) and is not necessarily so even if Luke knew Matthew, as I explore below.
number of conjectures one might make. Perhaps Luke simply intended to tone down Matthew’s expression while retaining his basic meaning. Or perhaps Luke intended something entirely different from Matthew—and here we have a whole new range of options. Given the condemnatory words about Jerusalem which Luke attributes to Jesus in passages connected to and both preceding (11:49-51) and following (19:41-45) this one, as well as the tones of judgment in the scene (13:22-30) that immediately precedes and that Luke himself links (cf. 13:31) to this one, whatever else he may mean, Luke surely means that “the house” (somehow linked to Jerusalem, but for a fuller discussion of its meaning, see below) is forsaken, left, given up—i.e., something along the lines of desolation.76 Moreover, the omission of the harsh ἔρημος may accomplish several other things: 1) leaving more room for the possibility of Jerusalem’s eventual renewal (cf. 21:24), and 2) not interrupting the progression within his Gospel from the deserving possibility of Jerusalem’s destruction (13:6-9),77 to the likelihood of such (here), and on to the near-certainty (19:41-45) and, finally, inevitability (21:20; 23:28-31) of its devastation.

More relevant to my thesis are two points. First, by omitting ἔρημος or, alternately, by not including it (apart from any putative knowledge of Matthew or Q), Luke allows for polysemic possibilities for ἀφίεται: Luke retains/connotes the meaning of desolation but also leaves room to highlight the (passively referenced) action by which

76 Weinert’s interpretation of ἀφίημι in 13:8 as “a temporary respite” misses the point: this so-called “respite” stands under certain destruction if it does not prove a fruit-bearing reprieve (“Abandoned House,” 73 n.16).

77 I have interpreted this parable as a reference to greater-Judea, but that certainly includes Jerusalem as well.
that desolate end comes about—i.e., God’s leaving.\(^{78}\) This abandonment aspect of ἀφίεται provides an important interpretive framework for the rending of the Temple veil in Luke 23:45 and for Luke’s de-emphasis on the Temple as a sacerdotal cultic site, and in fact it helps to connect the two (as discussed in ch. 6). While some take the verb as “future present,”\(^{79}\) it is perhaps circumspect to leave room also for a present progressive sense: the abandonment has begun and is in process—as Luke has indicated beginning with the births of Jesus and to a lesser degree John.\(^{80}\) Second, the non-inclusion of ἔρημος mutes potential echoes of Jer 22:5 (εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται οἱ οἶκοι οὗτος)—a fact insufficiently appreciated.\(^{81}\) These points, which are the most significant implications for my thesis of Luke’s ἀφίεται without a trailing ἔρημος, fortunately do not hinge on a particular source-critical decision.

\(^{78}\) Thus the passive here, as often in Luke and Acts, is a reference to divine action.

\(^{79}\) E.g., Fisk, “See My Tears,” 163. Johnson leaves room for either sense, although he does not observe that Luke may employ both senses (Luke, 219), thus fleshing out the (likely) parallel meaning of οἶκος as both a reference to the people—who are being left to their own devices (present progressive)—and to the Temple—which is being abandoned (progressive) and will be made positively desolate (future).

\(^{80}\) Contra Nolland, who strangely assumes the present tense “suggests a fate already sealed,” despite the wide syntactical possibilities of the Greek present tense (Luke, 2:742).

\(^{81}\) Cf. Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 76; also, the editors of NA\(^{27}\). Bock, Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, 117: “There is the declaration that her (Jerusalem’s) house is now desolate, following the pattern of Jeremiah (Jer. 12:7; 22:5)” (emphasis added); likewise, Marshall claims v. 35a “alludes to” Jer 12:7 and 22:5 (Luke, 576); Nolland: “Jer 22:1-8 provides the closest background here” (Luke, 2:742); also, Pao and Eckhart, “Luke,” 336. This tendency to identify Jer 12 and especially 22 as the primary background for Luke 13:35a, to the exclusion of Jer 33 (LXX), is somewhat puzzling. Both Jer 22 and 33 (LXX) employ the verb form of ἔρημος (22:5; 33:9), along with numerous uses of οἶκος (ἔρημος, however, is almost certainly a harmonizing scribal addition to Luke 13:35a). Thus Jer 22, despite its preferential treatment by many scholars, enjoys no better verbal parallels with Luke 13:35a than does Jer 33. While preferential treatment of Jer 12:7 might be justified based on its use of ἀφίημι along with οἶκος, in Jer 12:7, it is not the οἶκος but the “inheritance” that is “abandoned” (ἀφθήκα). Moreover, and most decisively, the narrative dynamics of Jer 33 (LXX) match the narrative dynamics of Luke’s Gospel far better than do those of either Jer 12 or Jer 22; see further discussion below.
Regarding the meaning of οἶκος, Francis Weinert has argued at length that οἶκος should not be taken “primarily” as a reference to the Temple but rather to “Israel’s Judean leadership, and those who fall under their leadership.” He does this in part by appealing to Jer 22:1-9 as “the most probable OT background for Luke 13:35a,” and intertextuality is indeed crucial for determining the meaning of οἶκος here. Generally, I find myself in company with those who hold that Luke 13:35a echoes a number of scriptures, especially prophetic warnings.\(^{82}\) As noted just above, Weinert’s proposal of Jer 22:1-9 is unlikely as a primary background, especially since the single best basis for linking the passages verbally (ἔρημος) is precisely the word that Luke leaves out.\(^{84}\) Is Weinert correct, then, in identifying οἶκος as a reference to the Judean leadership?

Because of the proximity to the Parable of the Fig Tree (Luke 13:6-9), as well as the conceptual connection between the warning there and Jesus’ lament here, members of Luke’s audience may have heard in οἶκος at least some reference to Isa 5:7: ὁ γὰρ ἀμπελὼν κυρίου σαβαωθ οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ ἐστίν καὶ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα νεόφυτον ἠγαπημένον. If this is the case, οἶκος likely entails a reference to the residents of Judea

---

\(^{82}\) Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 76. Weinert’s first two arguments for his interpretation of οἶκος are unconvincing: 1) that Luke conceives of Jerusalem’s “house” in “personal” rather than “spatial” terms, and 2) that Luke rarely employs οἶκος for the JT (true enough) and, when he does, associates it with God—maintaining this only by tenuous logic particularly regarding Luke 11:51 (Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 75).

\(^{83}\) E.g., Green, Luke, 539.

\(^{84}\) But this is true not only because of Luke’s non-inclusion of ἔρημος. Weinert’s case for Jer 22 seems to rest largely on the conclusions reached in Marshall’s NIGTC commentary. Weinert’s own logic for preferring Jer 22:1-9 over other options, especially other prophetic options, is fuzzy (see “Abandoned House,” 75). He leaps from the claim that Luke generally characterizes the leaders of Israel as opponents to Jesus, with the people as more friendly (which is basically correct), to Jer 22:1-9 as the appropriate background because Jer 22 calls for heeding of the prophet by the kingly household, the people, and all the royal court: where, then, is the opposition? Thus this passage does not in fact appear to match the agonistic dynamic which Weinert (rightly) sees at play in Luke’s gospel.
as a whole, with Jerusalem particularly in focus (cf. Isa 5:3). Use of οἶκος in this way as a reference to a geographically or ethnically specified group is common in the LXX (e.g., Isa 7:13, 17; 8:14, 17, 18; 14:1; etc).

But we need not conclude that this passage plays off of a single intertext. Jeremiah 33 (LXX) also has strong resonances, partly because it presents Jeremiah the prophet’s issuing a trenchant warning to Jerusalem\(^{85}\) and because it, like this section of Luke’s Gospel, highlights the possibility of averting disaster through repentance (33:2-3, 17-19)\(^{86}\) and particularly because the heightened conflict of that passage (largely absent in Jer 22:1-9) and the intra-Judean divisions caused there by the prophet (cf. Jer 33:8, 10-12, 16-19 LXX) match the dynamics at play in Luke’s Gospel.\(^{87}\) Indeed, Jer 33 (LXX) presents a conflict between the priests and false prophets who oppose the prophet Jeremiah on the one side, and, on the other side, the rulers (οἱ ἄρχοντες) who ultimately acquit him—with the people (ὁ λαός) caught in the middle (cf. esp. vv. 7-9, 11, 16). The opposition of the priests combined with the nebulous position of the people in Jer 33 thus strongly resembles Luke’s characterization of the priests and people throughout this

---

\(^{85}\) As Fisk, “See My Tears,” notes “For Jesus to utter *any* lament over the city of Jerusalem would thus be to invite comparisons with the Weeping Prophet [Jeremiah]” (162), although, in discussing Luke 13:35a, Fisk focuses on potential echoes of Jer 22, to the exclusion of Jer 33 (LXX). Virtually all of the evidence which Fisk adduces to support a connection to Jer 22 apply also to Jer 33 (LXX).

\(^{86}\) Just as the characters in Jer 33:19 (LXX) look back on God’s relenting in punishment because of the people’s repentance, so Jesus in Luke 13:31-35 seems to look back on Jer 33—though, sadly, here the predecessors did not of course ultimately repent.

\(^{87}\) The incredulity of the priests, false prophets, and people in Jer 33:8-9 (LXX) that God would have instructed Jeremiah to utter words against the holy city—an incredulity likely based on their assured belief that Jerusalem and its Temple were God’s unique dwelling place and thus enjoyed God’s protection—of course also matches the now theodically-challenging beliefs of many of Luke’s contemporaries, including perhaps members of his audience.
section and into his Passion Narrative, and the pro-prophet stance of the rulers is perhaps recalled in Luke’s reference to Herod, who, despite his reported threat here, will ultimately acquit Jesus (23:6-12), as Luke’s ideal audience knows. Given these strong similarities between the overarching features of Jer 33 (LXX) and Luke 13:31-35, the fact that Jer 33:1-19 frequently employs ὁ ἱκος (eleven times), and in every case but one (v. 10) refers to the JT, indicates that Luke intends, and his ideal audience would have heard, a reference to the Temple here.

Moreover, the background probability of a reference to the JT here, even apart from Luke’s alluding to Jer 33 (LXX), is quite high: not only does any use of ὁ ἱκος in combination with Jerusalem almost automatically conjure an image of the JT for auditors with ears attuned to the LXX, but Luke’s frequent interest in Jerusalem and the Temple, especially as the destination of Jesus’ journey, also bolsters this reading. Here, then,

88 Luke adds to the charges by the religious leaders found in Mark the accusation that Jesus misleads the people/nation (Τοῦτων εὑρεμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος; 23:2), thus going against his tendency to exonerate the people vis-à-vis the religious leaders (compared to Mark) by having ὁ λαός eventually join the chief priests and leaders (23:13) in calling for Jesus’ death (23:18, 23-25)—perhaps in order to show the leaders to be guilty of the very crime with which they charge Jesus (misleading the nation). He omits the charge that Jesus putatively threatened the Temple itself (Mark 14:58) in order to reserve it for the trial of Stephen (Acts 6:13-14)—precisely the point in Luke’s writings at which he levels his strongest, baldest critique of the Temple (see my Appendix).

89 A potential obstacle for my reading here is Luke’s occasional references to οἱ ἀρχοντες as included among Jesus’ opponents. Note, however, that I am not contending that Luke intends Jer 33 (LXX) to resound throughout his entire presentation of Jesus’ conflict with the Judean leadership, that this use of ἄρχον inhers only beginning in Luke’s Passion Narrative (23:13, 35; 24:20; but cf. 14:1) and perhaps with reference to another Scripture (viz. Ps 2—see Acts 4:25-26), and that, with regards to Luke 13:31-35, any reference to a ruler here must be first and foremost to Herod, with the ambivalent Pharisees as the next likeliest candidate (esp. in light of 14:1). Moreover, the ruling authorities behave ambivalently toward God’s prophets in Jer 33:20-24 (LXX).

90 See Walker, Jesus and the Holy City, 61.
Luke is again striking a polysemic note: οἶκος refers both to the residents of Judea, perhaps specifically Jerusalem, and to the Temple itself.  

In fact, Luke has good reasons for connecting the two. Although Weinert rejects οἶκος as a reference to the Temple in large part because Luke describes it not as the “house of the Lord” (as is common in the OT) but as ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν, Luke’s use of ἦφιστα ὑμῖν suggests that Luke specifically wishes to highlight God’s abandonment of this οἶκος. While Luke will narrate God’s abandonment of the JT most strikingly with the tearing of the Temple veil (Luke 23:45), Luke has been indicating this abandonment in subtle ways throughout his Gospel, especially via the downplaying of the Temple’s sacerdotal cultic function beginning with Luke 1-2. It is completely appropriate, then, that Luke should reference the Temple as ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν here, since God is in the process of leaving the JT to Jerusalem’s impenitent inhabitants, and, given this, it is appropriate that we should hear also in his phrase (ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν) a reference to the people of Jerusalem/Judea—for they are, in Luke’s eyes, in the process of being left on their own.

---

91 Compare Bar 2:26—a single verse—which employs οἶκος three times, first in reference to the JT and then in reference to the people of Israel and Judah; it also attributes the Temple’s demise to the wickedness of the inhabitants. Included on the list of those who take the “house left desolate” line as a reference to Jerusalem and the JT is Dale Allison, “Matt. 23:39 = Luke 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy,” *JSNT* 18 (1983): 75–84 (76) (although Allison, in this early article, refers to the putative Q saying divorced from its context in Luke), despite his emphasis on Jer 12 and 22, to the exclusion of Jer 33 (LXX). Fisk (“See My Tears,” 159–64) takes it as a reference to the Temple specifically, though noting that this also of course means the desolation of Jerusalem itself (164). Fitzmyer notes that “[w]hether ‘house’ is understood as a reference to the Jerusalem Temple or in a broader sense of God’s people resident there . . . the message of judgment is ominously the same” (*Luke*, 2:1035).

92 Note, besides, that Jeremiah also bound together the fate of the Temple with the lives of the (immoral) residents of Jerusalem (Jer 33:6, 9 LXX).

93 So also Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 494. Cf. Garland’s comment: “If Jesus does refer to the temple [and Garland remains on the fence], then he no longer regards it as God’s house, but already as a den of robbers (cf. 19:46)” (*Luke*, 560); also, Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City*, 62: “Normally one might expect a reference to ‘his house’ (i.e. God’s house) rather than ‘your house,’ but this is precisely the point at issue: it is no longer ‘God’s house.’” Commenting on 13:35a, Nolland highlights God’s abandonment of Jerusalem, connecting 13:35a to Luke 21 (*Luke*, 2:742–43).
Simply put, when God abandons the Temple, God also leaves the people who control that institution—not for better but for worse—to their own devices.\(^{94}\)

Luke’s probable recalling of Jer 33 (LXX) here also connects this passage to Luke’s (more subtle) warnings in Luke 1–2, for Luke thus again appeals to a Scripture that recalls the fateful downfall of God’s one-time holy site, Shiloh. In Jer 33:6 (LXX) the prophet warns that “this house” (in context, clearly the JT) will be made like Shiloh, and the Shiloh warning is repeated in v. 9. Jeremiah 33 (LXX) thus serves as an important hub for Luke’s treatment of the Temple: it connects the Shiloh thread of Luke 1–2, which establishes the scriptural precedent for God’s abandoning a cultic center, with the rejection-of-prophets rationale, which argues for God’s (reasonably) punishing his people, especially Jerusalem, for rejecting both the prophets and their message of justice (thus Luke 11:49-51 and the Fig Tree Parable)—all while also incorporating the theme of conflict within Israel. Thus Luke 13:31-35, especially through its recalling of Jer 33 (LXX), connects the seemingly disparate strands that Luke has put forward to this point and, by weaving them together, establishes the basic thread-pattern of Luke’s theodical vision regarding Jerusalem and its Temple.

---

\(^{94}\) This still admits a good deal of potential confusion regarding the precise moment at which God abandons the Temple. The rending of the veil is the most climactic, most significant, and probably culminating moment of God’s abandoning the Temple for Luke, despite the fact that God’s people continue to frequent and even to worship within the Temple thereafter (Luke 24; Acts 1–5). This latter worship is after all not qualitatively different from the kind of worship offered in Christian homes in Acts or indeed different from the kind of worship offered in synagogues, and the Temple’s somewhat central placement in the early third of Acts is explainable in light of Jerusalem’s role as launching pad for the Christian mission. The same narrative de-emphasis on the Temple’s sacerdotal functions observed in Luke’s gospel, however, occurs in Acts 3, when Peter and John go to the Temple at the afternoon Tamid offering but then their healing of a man interrupts the offering by causing a minor riot (see Acts 3:11), and also in Paul’s trip to Jerusalem in Acts 21–22. These later scenes are probably best understood as echoes of the narratival shift away from the Temple as sacerdotal cultic site in Luke’s Gospel and thus also as reminders of God’s rejection of the JT.
The final sentence of the pericope, Luke 13:35b, serves to anticipate Jesus’ arrival in the city at the “Triumphal Entry” (Luke 19:28-40)\(^95\) and connects this lament to the lament there (Luke 19:41-44), in which the status of Jerusalem has grown more dire still.

*The Leper Healed, Redux (Luke 17:11-19)*

Toward the end of Jesus’ infamous journey toward Jerusalem (and highlighting in 17:11 the journey’s movement, or rather lack thereof\(^96\)) comes the story of Jesus’ encounter with ten lepers at the border between Samaria and Galilee. Unlike Luke 5:12-16, this scene is unique to Luke’s Gospel, and unlike the leper of Luke 5, these ten stand at a distance, crying out for help (vv. 12-13). In v. 14, Jesus commands them to go and show themselves to the priests in language highly reminiscent of that used to issue the equivalent command to the leprous man in Luke 5, drawing auditors’ ears and attention to the earlier scene.\(^97\) As they go, they are cleansed (ἐκαθαρίσθησαν) and one of them, seeing he has been healed (ἰάθη), returns to Jesus and falls at this feet praising God (vv. 14-16a). Only then does the text famously reveal this man to be a Samaritan (v. 16b). Jesus then inquires (vv. 17-19), “Were not ten made clean? But the other nine, where are they? Was none of them found to return and give praise to God except this foreigner?”

---


\(^96\) Hamm helpfully observes, “For the reader who has been attending to the progress of the journey, this note [17:11] comes as both a surprise and as a trigger of memory. The surprise is that, at least geographically, either the journey has made no progress at all or it has made the curious progress of circling back to Galilee” (“Samaritan Leper,” 282). In addition to setting the stage for the motley nature of the group of lepers this geographical notice also serves to recall the earlier rejection of Jesus by the Samaritan village (9:52-55), suggesting again the issues of Jewish-Samaritan hatred and of the question of a proper cultic site. Nolland notes the strong echo of 9:51 in 17:11 (*Luke*, 2:845).

(NRSV), and the scene closes with Jesus’ commanding the man to rise and go, assuring him that his faith has healed/saved him (v. 20).

Although the primary emphasis of the passage centers on the status of the man as a Samaritan foreigner who responds properly to the healing he receives, unlike the other lepers—some or all of whom are implied to be Jews—most crucial for this present study are the questions of vv. 17-19. These queries unmistakably imply that, despite their following Jesus’ earlier command, these nine should have returned to Jesus to give glory to God. Although Jesus does not thereby necessarily preclude their later presenting the purification offerings prescribed by Lev 14, he clearly relegates the purification rites to secondary status, implying that proper response to God’s healing leads one not to the cultus of the JT but to the source of that healing, Jesus himself. Note also that 1) when Jesus commands the Samaritan to go (v. 20), he does not repeat the command to go to the priests but rather states that the man’s faith has saved him, which goes so far as to imply that any need to go to the priests has in fact been obviated, and 2) Luke describes the man’s return to Jesus in language that is explicitly evocative of worship: he falls at his feet (cf. Acts 10:24), thanking him (εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῶ). Moreover, the eventual revelation that the man is a Samaritan problematizes Jesus’ earlier commandment to the ten to present themselves “to the priests” (v. 14)—i.e., it is narratively significant that Luke reveals the man’s ethnicity only after the command to

98 See Green, Luke, 626.
99 See Hamm, “Samaritan Leper,” 284. Nolland, despite in my opinion muddying his discussion with fruitless speculation regarding the potential impact of hypothetical sources on the final shape of the pericope, nonetheless rightly observes “the theophanic nature of the encounter with Jesus” (Luke, 2:847).
go to the priests has been issued and shirked. The audience, now aware of the conundrum, is invited to ask: To which priests exactly were the ten—who turn out to be this motley crew including both Jews and Samaritans—to present themselves, the priests in Jerusalem or near Mt. Gerizim (or both)? This ambiguity, combined both with Jesus’ later praising the one who returned at the expense of the nine and with the worship language employed in the man’s falling at Jesus’ feet and giving thanks, strongly suggests that Jesus solves with his person and ministry the problem of the rival Samaritan-Jewish priesthoods: Jesus himself is the proper locus for God’s saving activity. Thus, Green rightly notes that Luke here “presents Jesus in the role of the temple—as one in whom the powerful and merciful presence of God is realized and before whom the God of the temple (whether in Jerusalem or Mount Gerizim) can be worshiped.”

---

100 Contra Marshall, who claims that the mention of plural priests in v. 14 anticipates the later-disclosed diversity of the group (Luke, 651).

101 Because of the fragmentary and late nature of the sources, it is difficult to get a firm handle on Samaritan institutions at this time and thus is difficult even to confirm positively that Samaritan priests existed in either Jesus’ or Luke’s day (for a rather skeptical take on ancient Samaritan cultic institutions, see Ingrid Hjelm, The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis [JSOTSS 303; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000], 235–36). Despite the destruction of the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim more than 100 years prior, commentators (e.g., Green, Luke) take the existence of Samaritan priests at this time for granted, and in light of the apparent existence of such priests in the second century (e.g., Justin Martyr may have witnessed the offering of the Samaritan Passover on Mt. Gerizim—see Reinhard Pummer, Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism [Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002], 23), it is reasonable to assume the priesthood continued, with whatever normal interruptions, vagaries, and vicissitudes, from John Hyrcanus’ destruction of the Temple through the days of Jesus and the early church.

Jacob Jerrell (Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972) solves the problem in an entirely unsatisfactory, and hardly Lukan, manner, claiming that “Luke considers the Samaritans as belonging to the Jewish cult. . . . With Luke’s understanding of the law and the cult, it is inconceivable that he could have directed the Samaritan to a specifically Samaritan cult” (121). Jerrell has muddled things by overlooking the dynamics of the story itself: within the story, the Samaritan goes to no cultic site, since Jesus’ healing, and the praise and worship which it evokes, obviates the need to go to any temple—(narratival) facts which certainly must be taken to have considerable bearing on “Luke’s understanding of the law and the cult.”

Luke began the Journey section by narrating Jesus’ rejection by a Samaritan village on account of his heading toward Jerusalem, which the otherwise odd geographical note in 17:11 recalls.\textsuperscript{103} Despite Jesus’ potentially derogatory description of the healed man as ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος, it is a theological necessity within Luke’s world that the Samaritans, at least in part, become a reconciled part of God’s people.\textsuperscript{104} By implying that Jesus may fulfill the cultic function boasted, prized, and bitterly contested by rival Jewish and Samaritan holy sites, Luke thus powerfully hints at a solution to the Jewish-Samaritan hatred which he highlighted at the beginning of this section of his Gospel: in Jesus the enmity is removed. Indeed, auditors of Acts, hearing his Gospel again, would know that this is precisely how things were to play out in the Lukan world (Acts 8). Luke thus adds another weapon to his theological arsenal for interpreting the destruction of the JT: its existence, obviated by the person of Jesus, was in great need of obviation, since it stood as an otherwise insuperable barrier between Jews and Samaritans.

Summary

Following, but sharpening, the Galilee-to-Jerusalem geographical shift found in Mark and Matthew, Luke’s Jesus embarks on his fateful journey to Jerusalem with a poignant expression (“he set his face,” 9:51) that likely recalls God’s judgment upon God’s people in the prophets of old, especially Ezekiel. This sets the stage for the escalating conflict throughout that journey, reminding those with ears to hear of Simeon’s prophecy over the infant Jesus (2:34-35).

\textsuperscript{103} See Hamm, “Samaritan Leper,” 282.

This rising conflict in turn sets the stage for revelations about Jerusalem’s fate. Both through its location immediately after warnings to repent that also hint of danger in Jerusalem and through its appropriation of imagery and language from Isa 5, Jesus’ Fig Tree Parable (13:6-9) threatens destruction against the holy city. Jesus makes the threat explicit shortly thereafter (13:31-35), warning that God will abandon Temple, city, and residents alike—an abandonment already indicated narratively by Luke’s diminution of the JT’s sacerdotal cultic functioning in Luke 1–2. Jesus’ warning likely alludes, among several echoed passages, to Jer 33 (LXX), which recalls Shiloh, the one-time holy place, and portrays the prophet Jeremiah amidst conflict that corresponds generally to the agonistic environment within which Jesus’ own ministry operates in Luke’s Gospel. Luke thereby establishes a connection between the Shiloh and rejection-of-the-prophets rationales for Jerusalem’s destruction.

The scene with the ten lepers (17:11-19) furthers Luke’s criticism of the JT by drawing into focus the issue of cultic conflict between Samaritans and Jews—a problem raised at the inception of the Jerusalem Journey. In this latter scene, Jesus in himself solves the problem of a proper cultic site by serving as the locus for healing and worship. This theme dovetails with, and provides clarification of, the Lukan narratival diminution of the JT as a cultic site. It also helps to frame for members of Luke’s ideal audience an earlier scene in which Jesus heals a leper (Luke 5:12-16). There Jesus instructed the healed man to go, show himself to the priest, and to offer sacrifices “as a testimony to them” (εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς). This scene thus stood in some contrast with Luke’s overall muting of sacerdotal activities of the JT post Luke 1–2. Hints within that early scene aid Luke’s ideal audience in interpreting the scene as coherent with these Lukan emphases.
(esp. the qualifying mention that the man is to go to the priests in order to provide a witness to or against them), and those hints receive firm punctuation here as Luke depicts Jesus, rather than the Temple (and pointedly so), as the proper locus of God’s healing and salvific activity.
CHAPTER SIX
The Jerusalem Temple in Luke 19–24

Jesus, the Kingdom, and the Jerusalem Temple (19:11-48)

Although Luke 19:11-48 consists of four distinguishable scenes, they are tightly bound together in theme, in meaning, and in narrative time, and so I will treat them together. While I have above followed the majority opinion in setting the end of the Journey section at 19:27, this need not imply an unbridgeable chasm between Luke’s Kingship Parable (19:11-27)\(^1\) and the subsequent scenes.\(^2\) Several indicators, in fact, link the scenes together. Not only do numerous verbal links connect the scenes (i.e., notes of advancement toward Jerusalem at v. 11 and v. 28, repetition of ἔμπροσθεν at the close of the parable in v. 27 and the subsequent geographical reference in v. 28, as well as the backward looking καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα at the start of v. 28),\(^3\) but so does Luke’s emphasis on the contested nature of the kingship within the parable and the uniquely Lukan emphasis


\(^2\) Some treat Luke 19:28-44 as the capstone or denouement of the Journey section; see Adelbert Denaux, “The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke,” in The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism (ed. Camille Focant; BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 359–92. Even if a single “map” of this section of the Third Gospel were possible, it is certainly unnecessary. Note that even Denaux is willing to downplay the significance of defining the precise bounds of the travel section’s close: “The problem of the end of the travel narrative is secondary in comparison with that of its very existence” (Studies in the Gospel of Luke: Structure, Language and Theology [TTS 4; Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2010], 39).

\(^3\) See Denaux, “Parable of the King-Judge,” 43–44, also 55–57. I remain unconvinced, however, that the parable ends at v. 28, as Denaux contends.
on kingship in the Entry scene (see below). Thus separating the parable from its subsequent co-text obscures, rather than clarifies, the meaning of each, and so I have chosen to treat the parable here along with the usually partitioned-off 19:28–48.

In recent decades, interpreters have noted that, despite the *parousia*-minded interpretations of the past, within the Lukan world, the occasion of Luke’s Kingship Parable is in fact the belief of some that the kingdom would appear co-temporally with Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem (v. 11). Luke Johnson, pointing to the kingship language of the subsequent Entry as well as in Luke 22:28–30 and elsewhere, takes the parable as confirming, not refuting, this expectation. Allowing for an allegorical meaning yet without insisting on a thoroughgoing correspondence between points in the parable and in Luke’s narrative world, Johnson reads the nobleman as Jesus, the opponents as the religious leaders, and the servants as the apostles who receive Jesus’ kingdom (22:28–29). I confess that I find Johnson’s reading more persuasive than others’, though even

---

4 As Denaux, “Parable of the King-Judge,” 43, notes.

5 “The standard view, that the parable seeks to explain the delay of the Parousia, does no justice at all to the link between the expectation of immediacy and the arrival of the historical Jesus” (Nolland, *Luke*, 3:913). See the helpful discussion and summary of previous scholarship on this point in Denaux, “Parable of the King-Judge,” 46–49; also, Johnson, “Kingship Parable,” 139–41, 143–53. Green, *Luke*, on the other hand, takes the parable as shifting the question from when the kingdom will arrive to “the issue of faithfulness in anticipation” (674–75). This would not be the first time Luke’s Jesus attempted to use a parable to reorient a wrong-headed question (see Luke 10), and so Green has a point, although Johnson’s view remains compelling, especially in light of the strong kingly resonances which Luke places in the Entry scene and in Luke 22.


8 Francis Weinert (“Parable of the Throne Claimant (Luke 19:12, 14-15a, 27) Reconsidered,” *CBQ* 39.4 [1977]: 505–14), reading the nobleman’s opponents as Galileans who continued to oppose Jesus’ activity, rejects most allegorical aspects of the story while building his case largely around a stringently allegorical reading of select details within the parable (e.g., the personal nature of the attack and the distanced nature of the opposition); his emphasis on developing authority—which matches Jesus’ agonistic relationship to Israel’s religious authorities leading up to the crucifixion—is more helpful, I think (510–11).
his reading leaves numerous difficulties. Among these are the slaughtering of the king’s opponents (not readily recognizable in Luke’s narrative), the generally cruel, ferocious, and exploitative nature of the king, and, relating the complete hegemony of the eventual king versus the less obviously exercised sovereignty of Jesus within the Lukan world (e.g., the continued persecution of Jesus’ followers by the persecutors of Jesus in the early chapters of Acts). It is also important not to overlook the fact that there is more to Luke’s Kingship Parable than mere confirmation: it clearly also nuances, even subverts, the expectations of Jesus’ audience regarding the kingdom. Verse 11 implies that these expectations—elusive though they otherwise may be—center on the timing and location of the kingdom’s arrival, yet Johnson’s reading speaks mainly to the issue of the kingdom’s timing and sheds little light on the issue of the kingdom’s relationship to Jerusalem.

Those who, like Johnson, reject readings of the parable that front the delay of the \textit{parousia} as the chief instigating force behind it rightly draw our attention away from Luke’s (purported) audience and to the parable’s function within the gospel narrative.

---

Green seems to object to an allegorical reading like Johnson’s largely on the basis of the king’s cruel vindictiveness in v. 27, as well as potential charges of anti-Semitism which this might entail (\textit{Luke}, 676). Regarding the portrait of Jesus, Green certainly has a point; as is often noted (though still frequently underappreciated), allegorical association need not entail a full identification between characters, and Green may be on the right trail, given Jesus’ humbly “kingly” entry in the next scene, in suggesting a “parodic or ironic” portrait of Jesus’ kingship here (676). Parsons notes that this parable makes use of a well-known topos, the cruel tyrant (\textit{Luke}, forthcoming), which likely suggests an intentional contrast between—rather than identification of—Jesus and the parable’s king. On the issue of the cruelty of the tyrant, see Brian Schultz, “Jesus as Archelaus in the Parable of the Pounds (Lk 19:11–27),” \textit{NovTest} 49.2 (2007): 105–27 (111–12). Schultz highlights the geographical significance of Luke’s placing this parable when Jesus is near Jericho, since Archelaus (whom the tyrant seems to mimic) built a palace there after receiving the kingship (Josephus, \textit{Ant.} 17.340).

One possibility is that Luke vividly describes the tyrant’s cruelty in order to play up the Archelaus connection, specifically because of Archelaus’ well-known slaughtering of the 3000 Passover pilgrims (Josephus, \textit{Ant.} 17.213–18, 237, 240–43, 313)—thus tinging his tale with hints of violence in Jerusalem. In this case, the point would be both ironic and prophetic: ironic because Jesus the king would himself meet slaughter as a Passover pilgrim, and prophetic because it warns of eventual violence in Jerusalem for those who reject the would-be king.
itself, especially as a response to expectations of some of those surrounding Jesus. Yet the precise make-up of this audience is by no means clear, which is all the more surprising given Luke’s usually careful attention to specifying Jesus’ audience during the Journey section.\(^\text{10}\) Though some take this as implying that Jesus speaks to all likely audience members—i.e., disciples, crowd, and opponents\(^\text{11}\)—it is wildly unlikely that Jesus’ opponents at least would be expecting the imminent arrival of the kingdom in connection with Jesus’ close proximity to Jerusalem (διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλήμ αὐτὸν; v. 11). The ambiguity of audience within Luke’s gospel, then, may point us—cautiously indeed—toward seeking also a meaning that would speak primarily to Luke’s audience. This hint is further strengthened by the allegorical parallaxes between the parable and the events of Luke’s narrative (noted above).\(^\text{12}\)

As noted in ch. 3, many strands of Second Temple (and pre-Bar Kokhban) Judaism strongly associated Jerusalem with God’s eschatological purposes\(^\text{13}\)—a belief to which Luke alludes (ironically, I have argued) in 2:38. Luke has an observable tendency to link Jesus’ messianic and kingly statuses,\(^\text{14}\) and so members of Luke’s audience might be expected either to hear in Jesus’ approach to Jerusalem echoes of Jerusalem-centric

\(^{10}\) As perceptively noted by Johnson, “Kingship Parable,” 145.

\(^{11}\) So Johnson, “Kingship Parable,” 145; and, endorsing Johnson but with equivocation on the “crowd,” Denaux, “Parable of the King-Judge,” 49.

\(^{12}\) It seems to me these parallaxes—i.e., points at which the parable does not readily cohere with the events and characters which they represent from Luke’s narrative—offer reasonable grounds at least for surmising that Luke may have in some sense forced this parable into his narrative or else forced it into its current form, framed as it is, and orienting largely around, the editorial v. 11.

\(^{13}\) See Denaux, “Parable of the King-Judge,” 50.

eschatological hopes or to attribute such beliefs to the “expectant ones” mentioned in v. 11. In this case, Luke may be playing off of, and even to some degree playing up, this expectation. While there is indeed a connection between the kingdom’s arrival and Jesus’ going to Jerusalem (as Luke seems to indicate), the audience knows that Jesus will be ill-treated and murdered in Jerusalem, and so the parabolic rejection of those who oppose the future king—i.e., those whose center of power is Jerusalem—places the city’s role in the eschatological drama in a tenuous position.\textsuperscript{15} It is perhaps not going too far, then, to claim that (on this view) Luke, by framing the parable against the question of Jerusalem and the kingdom of God (v. 11), serves to “loosen . . . the link between the Kingdom of God and Jerusalem, while strengthening that between God’s Kingdom and Jesus’ Kingship.”\textsuperscript{16} Just how much this framing serves to “loosen” the connection between Jerusalem and the kingdom remains open to question, and Luke here, as elsewhere (viz. Acts 1:6-8), seems to offer little more than vague insinuation. It may be significant in

\textsuperscript{15} My reading of the import of this parable for Jerusalem has some similarities to the conclusion of Jack T. Sanders that “[The] parable of the Pounds . . . makes it clear why Jerusalem has been rejected as the place of the appearance of the kingdom of God,” though largely superficially so (“The Parable of the Pounds and Lucan Anti-Semitism,” TS 42.4 [1981]: 660–68). I think Jerusalem is rejected as site of the kingdom only in one sense, and not in another: the kingdom is conferred to Jesus and first makes its earthly home in Jerusalem, but the kingdom cannot be made coterminous with Jerusalem in part because of the rulers’ rejection of Jesus. Moreover (and quite significantly), Sanders, in his essay, overlooks Luke’s penchant for separating the rulers from the people and thus is (gravely) mistaken in taking the king’s opponents in the parable as a reference to the entire Jewish people (667–68). More helpful, if only partially correct, is Sanders’ assertion that “Jerusalem is the key; the point is geographical, not temporal” (666); the point here is likely both geographical and temporal, but Sanders rightly emphasizes Luke’s geographical emphasis.

\textsuperscript{16} Denaux, “Parable of the King-Judge,” 50. Here, then, I see this parable potentially operating in a manner similar to Johnson’s description of the Parable of the Good Samaritan: it appears “to subvert the implicit understanding of” those whose expectations spur the parable (“Kingship Parable,” 147). He is subverting not only their expectation of the kingdom’s imminent appearance (and this may be a problem of both time and manner) but also what is the basis for that incorrect assumption, their belief in Jerusalem as the inevitable hub of that kingdom. Unfortunately—in my view—Johnson does not, in his early essay on this parable, consider “subversion” as a possible purpose of the Kingship Parable. In this regard, it may be instructive to view Jesus’ response to what some of those around him thought (δοκεῖν) here along with the disciples’ mistaken surmises (δοκεῖ) relative to the kingdom in 22:24-27.
this regard to note Luke’s subsequent ironic description of Jesus’ kingship, from the humility of the so-called “Triumphant” Entry to king Jesus’ poor treatment during his “trial” (23:2, 38). In this case, the surprising nature of Jesus’ kingship matches the surprising nature of the kingdom: as with the king, so with the kingdom. The kingdom’s advent may be surprising not only because of its timing and nature (cf. 22:24-27) but also because of its location and eschatological scope.

This brief interlude, while hardly unraveling the twisted and multiple threads of the Kingship Parable, at least lays groundwork for what follows.

Thus Luke’s Jesus, having drawn near to (19:11) and then undertaken the ascent toward Jerusalem (19:28), meets with the fanfare of his disciples while he descends the Mount of Olives (v. 37), and thus, as the Jerusalem Journey reaches its climax, Jesus enters the Temple (v. 45, 47; cf. 20:1).

The Entry scene offers several Lukan distinctives which commentators generally take as significant for its interpretation. One such distinctive is Luke’s emphasis on Jesus as king, especially through a number of scriptural references: allusions to Gen 49:11 and Zech 9:9 (LXX) via the description of Jesus and the colt (vv. 28-36), and the quoting of Ps 117:26 (LXX) and highlighting its overtones of royal entry through (likely) insertion of ὁ βασιλεὺς and omission of the palm branches (cf. Mark 11:8), which point to the

---

17 Johnson detects this tension, resolving it by taking the parable not as a refutation but a confirmation of the belief in 19:11 (“Kingship Parable,” 150–51). I agree with Johnson that Luke, especially in the chapters that follows, presents Jesus as king, though I think this serves as an ironic refutation, or at least a subversion, of the expectation of 19:11: Yes, Jesus is king, but this does not mean for Jerusalem what some thought it would mean, least of all because the leaders of Jerusalem are precisely those who reject the rightful king!

Feast of Tabernacles and thus away from the one-time royal context of the psalm.\(^{19}\) The Kingship Parable, then, gives way to Jesus’ humble yet kingly entrance. Just as the now and future king of the parable faces both support and opposition, so Jesus also (and once again) encounters favor mixed with hostility—and note Luke’s insertion of the Pharisees’ rebuke (vv. 39-40), unparalleled in Mark. Jesus—as prophet, Messiah, savior, and throughout Lord—has encountered opposition since the beginning of his ministry and, despite the overall favorable reception, finds hints of that opposition now when, heralded as king, his journey to Jerusalem reaches its climax.

This scene gives way immediately to a uniquely Lukan vignette: Jesus’ second lament over Jerusalem (vv. 41-44), juxtaposed between Jesus’ “kingly” arrival and his entering the Temple.\(^{20}\) Broadly speaking, the inserted, uniquely Lukan scene indicates the Third Evangelist’s considerable interest in Jerusalem’s fate. Here Luke clearly recalls Jesus’ earlier lament over Jerusalem (13:31-35, esp. v. 35b), even while upping the ante: Jerusalem’s disaster, somewhat obliquely referenced there, is now spelled out in vivid color—its enemy will surround it and assail it from all directions so that its children will


If Ps 117 (LXX) was indeed sung inside the Temple pre-70 C.E. (so Solomon Zeitlin, “The Hallel,” *JQR* 53 [1962]: 22–29 [25]), then its appearance here as Jesus makes his way toward the Temple may offer (tenuous) support for my claim that Luke’s Gospel presents Jesus’ ministry as entailing the abrogation of the JT as cultic center.

\(^{20}\) Some may view Luke’s omission here of Mark’s intercalated fig tree scene (Mark 11:12-14, 20-25) as significant for determining the place of Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s Gospel. I see the omission instead as primarily incidental. To leave the fig tree intercalation would interrupt both Jesus’ arrival to “cleanse” the Temple as the climax of the Journey section and Jesus’ ongoing presence in the Temple as he instructs and debates there throughout Luke 20 and 21 (see below). Removing the otherwise awkward intercalation (for Luke’s purposes), then, Luke relocates and re-purposes it in Luke 13—where Mark’s tones of judgment due to barrenness are fully present, even if there hope for repentance, however small, still remains. Luke inserts his own tones of judgment here via the dolorous 19:41-44.
be crushed, and even its stones demolished (vv. 43-44). The cause of this devastation is the city’s failure to come to terms of peace (v. 42) because it does not recognize “the time of its visitation” (τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου; v. 44).

Jesus’ use of the language of “visitation” clearly references his long-awaited arrival in Jerusalem (so carefully crafted by Luke) and also has rich resonances in the LXX. Frequently in the LXX, ἐπισκοπή, and to a lesser degree the related verbal form ἐπισκέπτομαι, indicate God’s visiting or attending to human beings, sometimes benevulously but often for judgment.21 In both Isaiah and Jeremiah, these words make reference to God’s judgment on Jerusalem (Isa 29:6; Jer 6:15; 51:13 LXX). In Ezek 7:22, ἐπισκοπή seems to refer to the Temple itself, which the residents of Jerusalem have profaned.22 The ambiguity of Luke’s construction here aids in the creation of its meaning; σου is surely an objective genitive,23 leaving open the subject of τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς (thus “the time of [blank]’s visiting you”). The Septuagintal background points strongly to God as

---


22 Ezek 7:22: καὶ ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ μανοῦσιν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν μου καὶ εἰσελθοῦσιν εἰς αὐτὰ ἀφρολάκτως καὶ βεβηλώσουσιν αὐτὰ. If Luke was aware of Ezek 7 (which is very likely) and understood ἐπισκοπὴ there to refer to the JT itself (which is plausible, even likely), then his ambiguous construction here (τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου) might open further avenues of meaning: namely, that Jesus’ arrival here (ἐπισκοπὴ) entails not only judgment (the common connotation which ἐπισκοπὴ carries in the LXX) but also the arrival of the true Temple itself (ala Ezek 7:22). I of course find this possibility intriguing, given its coherence with (and also heightening of) my overall reading of Jerusalem and its Temple in Luke’s Gospel, but the minority report of Ezek 7:22—which Luke may or may not have had in view here—can hardly bear so weighty a claim: Subtle though I believe Luke’s message occasionally to be, I must admit that, were he in fact this subtle (or obscure), his hints almost certainly elude the detective possibilities of modern interpreters—hence, we have arrived at what Hays’ calls the “vanishing point” with this potential echo. Thus I pass over this tantalizing possibility with nothing more than so non-committal a note.

the actor behind ἐπισκοπή, while Luke’s narrative itself makes clear that this phrase applies also to Jesus’ arrival at the JT (with Jerusalem in view). These colliding factors strongly suggests that this “visitation” refers not only to the arrival of the prophet who weeps for Jerusalem but also to the very arrival of God—and so Jesus’ arrival at the Temple is rendered, by Lukan ambiguity, theophanic.24

The scene that follows, Jesus’ so-called “cleansing” of the Temple, is marked by a number of further Lukan distinctives. Jesus enters the temple and drives out “those who were selling” with an amalgamated citation of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11 (19:45-46), then he commences to teach in the Temple daily, so that the chief priests and scribes attempt to drive him out, though the people’s favoring Jesus prevents their plan from gaining traction (vv. 47-48). Thus Luke’s scene, especially vv. 45-46 (the “cleansing” proper) is considerably shorter than the parallel text in Mark 11:15-19 (cf. Matt 21:12-13). Also unlike Mark, Luke makes the Temple scene the climax of Jesus’ journey, emphasizing its culminating force partly by removal of Mark’s cursing of the fig tree.25

---

24 See Evans, Luke, 290–91; Rowe, Christology, 165–66, 200–201; James A. Sanders, “A Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118 in Luke’s Entrance Narrative,” in Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts (ed. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1993), 140–53 (151). Kinman, “Parousia,” rightly notes that “Luke alone among the Evangelists . . . makes explicit the connection between the entry and God’s judgment on the city” (280). There may be merit to Kinman’s argument (“Parousia”) that the Entry, as narrated by Luke, is an insult and affront to Jesus the king, especially because of the Pharisees’ wrong-headed response and the failure of the city’s elite to come out and welcome him properly. In this case, however, the subsequent lament (vv. 41-44) is not in response solely to that affront, as Kinman claims (“Parousia,” 290), but also sums up the consistent rejection of Jesus throughout Luke’s Gospel by Israel’s religious leaders, even while foreshadowing the sharpening nature of that rejection after Jesus’ entering the JT.

25 By removing Mark’s fig-tree cursing scene (Mark 11:12-14), Luke has Jesus’ entering the JT occur not on the day following the “Triumphant Entry” (cf. Mark 11:12) but rather in immediate succession from Jesus’ entry and lament: Luke’s Jesus journeys to Jerusalem in order, firstly, to take possession of the Temple.

Kinman, “Lucan Eschatology,” suggests that Luke 19:41-44 replaces Mark’s “Cursing of the Fig Tree,” perhaps largely because the latter might seem to imply “the complete end of God’s dealings with Israel” (678).
Luke’s abbreviated “cleansing” scene kicks off a prolonged teaching ministry by Jesus in the JT (Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ; v. 47). In the chapters that follow, Luke emphasizes Jesus’ location in the Temple with some frequency (20:1; 21:1-2, 5-6, 37a), and neither Luke’s Jesus nor Luke’s narrative shifts from the Temple environs until the notice of Jesus’ daily commute between the JT and the Mount of Olives in 21:37. Thus James Dawsey is surely right in noting the unhelpful disjunction which many commentators (and translations) place between not only vv. 45-46 and vv. 47-48 but also between 19:45-48 and the chapter(s) that follows.26 These considerations have of course led many scholars to speak of Jesus’ “taking possession of, or residence in, the Temple” in Luke’s Gospel.27

The crucial questions that remain are, What is the point of the initial cleansing (vv. 45-46), and how does it relate to Jesus’ subsequent teaching in the Temple? In answering these questions, there are several important bits of evidence to consider. First of all, this is the first time Jesus appears in the JT since his precocious appearance there in Luke 2:41-52. Also, Jesus’ subsequent teaching in the Temple (Luke 19:47–21:38) occurs within and as part of a sustained and heightened conflict between Jesus and Jerusalem’s

---

26 I have attempted to recognize the hermeneutical connection between 19:45-49 and what follows in Luke’s narrative by locating them within the same (present) chapter. See James M. Dawsey, “Confrontation in the Temple: Luke 19:45–20:47,” PRST 11.2 (1984): 153–165 (155). Dawsey argues that Jesus’ cleansing of the JT in Luke is not a sort of “one-off” in which he drives out the money-changers and sellers of goods; rather, it is a prolonged “cleansing” that includes as an essential element Jesus’ teaching within the Temple and which continues until Luke 21:38. While Dawsey is certainly right to note Luke’s emphasis on Jesus’ ongoing presence in the JT and thus the connection between Jesus’ initial activities in the Temple and his subsequent teaching, “taking possession of” the Temple describes this behavior at least as aptly as Dawsey’s preferred “cleansing.”

religious authorities,\textsuperscript{28} with Jesus enjoying the people’s favor (cf. 19:48; 20:1, 6, 9, 19, 45; 21:38) as he instructs them and denigrates the religious authorities. Finally, Luke makes several omissions to Mark’s account: he considerably shortens the ordeal of Jesus’ forcibly removing the wares handlers and curiously omits πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν from Jesus’ citation of Isa 56:7.

That Jesus teaches the people in the JT, with the religious leaders ever scheming, ever working, to break his influence over the people, suggests that the point of Jesus’ behavior centers on questions of the JT’s proper function and of the identity of Israel’s proper leader(s).\textsuperscript{29} Just as Jesus amazed the teachers in the Temple as a child (2:47), so now he confounds them as adult (20:7, 20-26, 27-38, esp. 40, 41-44). Thus Luke makes clear that Jesus, and none of the religious authorities, is the proper teacher within God’s house. Jesus has consistently challenged his audience regarding proper use of possessions, and Luke has long-since characterized the Pharisees as lovers of money (16:14). Within Jesus’ Temple-instructing, Luke will remind his audience that the criticism of greed and unscrupulousness applies also to the scribes (20:45-47; cf. 11:43). In light of this, Luke’s shortening of Mark’s Temple cleansing—removing any mention of people buying in the Temple, the tables of money changers, the seats of those selling animals, or those trying to carry implement through the JT (Mark 11:15-16)—may indicate that he intends his audience to hear in Jesus’ simply “driving out those who were selling” (ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας) primarily a reference to the well-known greed

\textsuperscript{28} Green, \textit{Luke}, for example, labels the section 20:1–21:4 as “Conflict with the Jerusalem Leadership.”

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Green, \textit{Luke}, 731: “At stake is the question of legitimate authority: Does Jesus bear the divine imprimatur or does the Jerusalem leadership?”
(within Luke’s narrative world) of the religious leaders—i.e., those who controlled the Temple. In this case, Jesus’ actions in v. 45 represent a judgment both on their greed and on their leadership. The logic of Luke’s thought seems to run: Instead of using the Temple as a source of personal prestige and wealth acquisition (v. 46b), these religious leaders should have set it aside as a house of prayer (v. 46a); because they failed to do so, they have lost control of the Temple, in the narrative and perhaps proleptically as well.

Luke’s reference to Isa 56:7 gives the clearest explication of Luke’s theology of the Temple after Jesus’ arrival: it is to be a house of prayer—as it will be for the early Christians in Acts. The coming of Jesus means the arrival of the kingdom, and so the eschatological promise of Isa 56:7 now applies: the JT now has a new role, as a house of prayer. Granted, Luke will subsequently add to this role the apparently complementary function of serving also as a place for instruction by those who stand in proper relationship to God’s purposes—first Jesus (Luke 19:47–21:38) and then his commissioned apostles (Acts 3:11-26; 5:20-26; cf. Luke 22:28-30). When Luke’s Jesus calls the JT a “house of prayer,” designated as such by God, he indicates both what the Temple now is and what it is not: that it is now properly a house of prayer casts doubts on its ongoing sacerdotal functioning. Luke’s omission of πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν here does not

30 “His purpose is to purge his Father’s house (2:49) of all unsuited service of mammon. Recall his words in 16:13d, ‘You cannot serve both God and mammon’” (Fitzmyer, Luke, 2:1266).


32 The meaning of Jesus’ action in casting out those who were selling surely relates to the prophetic texts which Luke has Jesus cite, since they are linked by the genitive participle λέγων (v. 46).

33 Given the resonances with Isa 56 (esp. vv. 4-5) that Luke places within the story of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8, it is safe to conclude, I think, that Luke read Isa 56 eschatologically.

34 The JT also remains a place for praise and worship (cf. Luke 24:53), although it can hardly be said to be unique in this regard (e.g., Acts 4:23-31).
indicate that Luke does not after all read the passage eschatologically; rather, Luke is simply pointing to the new (reduced) role which the Temple fulfills within the eschaton, hinting at but not yet disclosing the import this has for the nations—which would mean, for Luke’s Jesus, a premature disclosure, ruining the surprise of Acts (for the disciples), and would mean, for Luke, failing to narrate things in proper sequence (καθεξῆς). This is true especially since the Temple will serve as a house of prayer (as Acts plays out) exclusively for Jews.

The reference to Jer 7 recalls the prophet’s harsh criticism of Judah for its avarice and injustice (vv. 6, 9a)—strengthening the likelihood that Luke’s audience would have heard in Jesus’ driving out those who were selling (Luke 19:45) a reference to the authorities’ greed and unscrupulousness. Although Luke clearly inherited this material from Mark, one feature of Jer 7 gains startling poignancy in light of Luke’s overall treatment of Jerusalem: immediately after accusing the nation of treating God’s house as “a den of robbers,” Jer 7 likens Jerusalem’s imminent rejection to God’s abandonment of Shiloh (v. 12, and again in v. 14). While Luke certainly does not play up the connection

---


36 I find the well-known segregating of Luke’s Jesus from Gentile contact instructive in this regard.

37 Simeon’s early prophecy of the universality of salvation is just that—a prophecy. Luke’s Jesus, too, obliquely references that hope here—since Luke, as noted earlier, clearly read Isa 56 eschatologically.

38 The charge that Paul has brought Gentiles into the Temple is precisely what precipitates the riot in Acts 21:28.
here, his earlier references to Jerusalem-Shiloh typology would increase in “volume” via the reference to Jer 7 here. 39

To sum up my discussion of vv. 45-48, then, Luke abbreviates Jesus’ Temple “cleansing,” referring only to “those who were selling,” probably in order to (re-) emphasize the leaders’ greedy, avaricious, and status-seeking behavior—which is, after all, a key source of their conflict with Jesus in Luke’s Gospel—and quotes Isa 56:7, which, taken eschatologically, states for Luke’s audience the proper role of the Temple in light of the kingdom’s arrival. As hinted throughout his Gospel, the JT is no longer a sacerdotal cultic center but is, within Lukan theology, now properly a place of prayer. It serves also as a place of instruction, though only those who stand in proper relationship to the God of the Temple, Jesus’ “Father” (cf. 2:49), may do so. This scene serves as a bridge between Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem and the heightened conflict that characterizes his teaching in the Temple upon arriving. 40

It is appropriate here to reconsider Klaus Baltzer’s provocative reading of Luke 19. Decades ago, Hans Conzelmann observed that, unlike Mark, “[Luke] does not connect the Entry with the city at all—according to Luke Jesus never enters it [Jerusalem] before the Last Supper . . . [instead] he connects it [the Entry] with the Temple.” 41 Working from this observation, Baltzer argues that Luke has modified Mark’s Triumphal Entry specifically in order to allude to Ezekiel’s vision of God’s presence re-entering the

39 I consider this to be so in light of the high probability that those who understood the reference to Jer 7:11 here would also recall the passage’s poignant (and several) pairing(s) of Jerusalem with Shiloh.


JT. In this regard, Baltzer directs attention to 1) the departure of the Lord’s glory from the Temple in Ezek 8–11,\textsuperscript{42} noting the clear reference to the Mount of Olives in 11:23, 2) the re-entry of the Lord’s glory into the temple in Ezek 43, and 3a) Luke’s several added references (compared to Mark) to Jesus’ glory at the Transfiguration (9:31, 32), which go along with Luke’s unique reference there to Jesus’ imminent “exodus” at Jerusalem (9:31), 3b) as well as the potential connection between the cloud at the Transfiguration and the frequent linking of that phenomenon with God’s presence in the OT. He claims further (4) that Jesus’ ejection of the ware-dealers from the JT in Luke 19:45-46 is in fulfillment of the removal of abominations emphasized in Ezek 43:8-9.\textsuperscript{43}

As a whole, Baltzer’s thesis is plausible—and certainly also provocative—although, like so many questions of intertextuality, it is impossible to substantiate (or, alternately, to disprove). Certainly Luke places comparatively greater emphasis on Jesus’ glory at the Transfiguration (versus both Mark and Matthew) and also establishes a connection between that scene and the entry scene in Luke 19 (cf. 9:31). Also supporting Baltzer’s reading is the initial framing of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (9:51) with reference to Jeremiah and especially Ezekiel. This earlier reference to Ezekiel, when Jesus begins his judgment-bearing march to Jerusalem, would pair naturally with a subsequent allusion to Ezekiel when Jesus enters the JT. The earlier reference might provide clarity on another level as well: both Jeremiah and Ezekiel depict God (as well as sometimes the respective prophets themselves) as the one who “sets his face” for

---

\textsuperscript{42} LXX: καὶ ἔξηλθεν δόξα κυρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου (Ezek 10:18); καὶ ἀνέβη ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐκ μέσης τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐστι ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους, ὥ ἦν ἀπέναντι τῆς πόλεως (Ezek 11:23)


The up-shot of this discussion is that Baltzer’s thesis, in combination with the Septuagintal echoes to Luke’s use of τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς in 19:44, points to the likelihood of theophanic resonances within Luke 19:41-48—Jesus’ final approach toward and entry into the Temple. These resonances suggest a deeper meaning to Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as not merely “cleansing” the Temple but also as also his taking up residence there: Is the audience not invited to hear in Jesus’ actions a strong hint that God’s very presence, God’s glory, has come to the Temple in the person of Jesus? These theophanic resonances also help to substantiate my reading (following others’) that Luke indicates throughout his Gospel that Jesus’ arrival means the interruption of the JT’s cultic functions. For when Jesus’ journey finally reaches its telos, Jesus arrives not simply in Jerusalem but specifically in the Temple itself, announces it as a house of prayer in fulfillment of the eschatological expectations of Isa 56:7, and maintains a

---


45 Also included would be Peter’s calling/confession (Luke 5:1-11), the scene with the 10 lepers (17:11-19), Luke’s ambiguous use of “Lord” throughout his Gospel (ala Rowe, Christology), the Septuagintal echoes of τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου in 19:44 (discussed above), and possibly the theophanic echoes detected by Hutcheon (“‘God Is with Us’”). Note Luke’s use of ἐπισκέπτομαι in his Gospel: In 1:35, God’s power overshadows Mary at the divine conception of Jesus, while the theophanic cloud covers Jesus, the disciples, and the ancient prophets at the Transfiguration (9:34); moreover, Jesus’ ministry represents God’s visiting (ἐπισκέπτομαι) his people (1:68, 78; 7:16).
teaching ministry there, challenging and opposing the traditional (priestly) power brokers of the Temple.

*Jesus in Jerusalem: Build-Up, Passion, Waiting (Luke 20–24)*

It is in Jerusalem and its Temple that the conflict prophesied by Simeon (2:33-35), foreshadowed by John (3:1-20), begun with Jesus’ ministry in Galilee and exacerbated during Jesus’ Journey, reaches its climax. Jesus, having taken possession of the JT, now engages in what will prove to be mortal combat with the Jerusalem authorities. After a controversy in the JT regarding Jesus’ power (20:1-8), Jesus tells the Parable of the Tenants (20:9-18), and the scribes and chief priests, knowing he told the parable against them, seek to lay hands on Jesus, restrained only the people’s favorable view of him (20:19). After hypocrites (20:20-26) and Sadducees (20:27-40) fail to trap Jesus and after Jesus stumps the leaders with a riddle (20:41-44), he warns his disciples, in the hearing of the people, against the scribes’ greed and hypocrisy (20:45-47), contrasting them unfavorably with an honest, indigent widow (21:1-4). All of this is part of Jesus’ daily teaching the people in the JT, with clear popular support (21:37-38). Bested, the Jerusalem authorities no longer engage in the challenge-and-riposte games that characterize the earlier portions of the Gospel; rather, their murderous intentions materialize (22:2), with Satanic aid (22:3), in a plot to arrest Jesus (22:4-6)—and so begins the Passion Narrative of Luke’s Gospel (Luke 22–23), followed by the Post-Resurrection scenes (Luke 24).

Scholars usually treat Luke 22–23 as a distinct section within Luke’s Gospel, but I here group it with the rest of Luke 20–24, doing so on geographical grounds and without implying a rejection of the strong case for its distinctiveness as a section. As Elizabeth
Struthers Malbon (with others) has noted, literary texts, like any terrain, admit of multiple, complementary maps—and here my map, fittingly, orients to Luke’s geographical emphases.\(^{46}\)

Many fine volumes treat Luke’s Passion narrative,\(^{47}\) and precious few of their insights will see adequate daylight here. Among the distinctive features of Luke’s portrayal of Jesus’ passion are his emphasis on the Jerusalem authorities’ culpability in Jesus’ death\(^{48}\) and his tempering of the anguished isolation that characterizes much of Mark’s account. Luke takes numerous other departures from Mark’s account, and below I treat two which hold significance for my study.

*The Fate of Jerusalem, the Temple, Jesus’ Disciples (Luke 21:5-38)*

Intervening between Jesus’ praise of the widow (21:1-4) and the events that precipitate his crucifixion (22:1-6) is a scene in which Jesus announces the fate of Jerusalem, the Temple, and his disciples (21:5-38). Although this scene has obvious bearing on my study, not only has much of its import been properly unpacked by previous commentators but also those conclusions are generally well-known and well-accepted. Thus I will give it comparatively modest attention here.

Luke indicates that the discourse takes place within the Temple grounds themselves (vs. the private setting of Mark 13:3f.), since the scene begins with a question


from a disciple about the JT’s beautiful (and apparently readily viewable) appearance (21:5-6) and ends with the notice that Jesus taught daily in the JT, withdrawing to the Mount of Olives at night (21:37). Thus Jesus’ words regarding the Temple here should be heard as part of his overall teaching within the Temple (going back to 19:47-48), as well as part of his spiraling conflict with Jerusalem’s religious leaders.

Jesus’ speech consists of a summary of things to come (vv. 8-11) followed by a fuller and chronological description: persecution of the disciples (vv. 12-19), then Jerusalem’s destruction, leading to “the times of the Gentiles” (vv. 20-24), followed by further eschatological signs (vv. 25-28), capped with parabolic warnings about watchfulness (vv. 29-36). Luke therefore draws a rather firm temporal and causal boundary between Jerusalem’s destruction and the eschatological portents that follow, in comparison to Mark 13, although Luke still seems to present Jerusalem’s devastation as an eschatological event. Luke also makes clear that the conflict lines which have entangled Jesus will now pass on to his disciples (vv. 12-19). That the description of Jerusalem’s devastation comes immediately following the prophecy of persecution of his disciples strongly suggests a causal link between the two, and the details of that description, as well as Luke’s larger framing of the fall, strengthen the connection.

---


50 As Green helpfully notes: “the antagonism between Jesus and the Jewish leadership associated with the temple inevitably raises the question of the temple itself” (Luke, 733).

51 In this breakdown, I largely follow Green, Luke, 731–32.

52 See Green, Luke, 731, 735: “Jesus’ explicit denial that the end time would come immediately after the fall of Jerusalem (v 9b)—effectively driving a temporal and, thus, hermeneutical, wedge between these two events—is an important interpretive move on his part.” Also, Marshall, Luke, 770; Evans, Luke, 307, 310; Fitzmyer, Luke, 2:1329.
Green notes, Luke depicts Jerusalem’s fall with “a virtual collage of scriptural texts that draws the anticipated destruction of Jerusalem and the temple into an interpretive relationship with the fall of the city at the time of the Exile.”\textsuperscript{53} So its devastation is a result of divine judgment, and the earlier warnings about its rejection of the prophets (especially Jesus himself) sound here with its devastation following its rejection of Jesus’ followers. Its rejection coincides with “the times of the Gentiles,” which may reference both Gentile hegemony over Judea/Jerusalem and the extension of God’s salvation to the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{54}

Requiring consideration—however briefly—is the import of the apparent temporal marker in v. 24: Jerusalem will be trampled under the feet of the Gentiles “until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled (ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν).” While this certainly appears to leave open the possibility of Jerusalem’s (physical) restoration—i.e., when “the times of the Gentiles” has ended—Luke neither dwells on the point nor takes up the theme of restoration again (or in earnest) but instead strikes other eschatological emphases, including the Son of Man’s return (vv. 25-28). The other clear reference to the hope of restoration in Luke’s writings comes in Acts 1:6-8, and there Luke also clearly shifts away from the expectation of Jerusalem’s political and physical restoration—to the mission to which Jesus calls his followers.\textsuperscript{55} While Luke thus leaves open the possibility

\textsuperscript{53} Green, \textit{Luke}, 738–39. Among the scriptural hues which Luke chooses to omit is mention of the “desolating sacrilege” (Mark 13:14), perhaps out of historiographical concern. His description of Jerusalem’s being surrounded by (Roman) armies more accurately depicts the actual demise of Jerusalem during the first revolt; thus the “desolating sacrilege,” which recalls Antiochus Epiphanes’ setting up an idol inside the Temple, probably struck Luke’s historiographically-oriented mind as something of a canard regarding the Roman destruction of Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{54} See Green, \textit{Luke}, 739.

\textsuperscript{55} Cf. the helpful discussion in Green, \textit{Luke}, 739.
of Jerusalem’s restoration (here and in Acts 1:6-8), he also makes it clear that this possibility is entirely secondary to other aspects of the eschatological drama. This suggests that regarding the possibility of Jerusalem’s restoration Luke is (a) agnostic (i.e., may consider it neither impossible nor certain), even while he is (b) interested in redirecting his audience’s attention away from this hope toward more productive avenues of eschatological expectation.

Finally, and tentatively, in v. 28, Jesus states that, when the (later) eschatological portents occur, “you” should lift up “your” heads “because your redemption (ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν) is near.” Although the make-up of Jesus’ audience for the speech as a whole is not entirely clear and although some indications point towards the amorphous crowd of people, the “you” here clearly points, as with the second person address of vv. 12-19, specifically to followers of Jesus. The appearance of ἀπολύτρωσις here is noteworthy since it otherwise occurs nowhere in Luke’s oeuvre and is also absent from the parallel accounts of Mark and Matthew. Given its observability/audibility, then, it may recall Luke’s use of the almost equally rare λύτρωσις in 1:68 and especially in

---

56 Thus I agree with Tannehill that Luke leaves open the possibility of Jerusalem’s physical restoration but disagree with his claim that Jerusalem’s restoration is “an essential part of the revelation of God’s salvation to all flesh (see 1:68; 2:38; 3:6).” It is not essential if for no other reason than that Luke knows it does not in fact happen (from a recent post-70 C.E. perspective). Tannehill’s (incorrect) claim that “[a]dmission that all hope for Jerusalem and for a large portion of Israel is lost would represent either loss of faith in the power of God or modification and limitation of the grand vision of God’s purpose with which the story begins” (Narrative Unity, 1:163) thus precisely articulates two heads of the trenchant theodical challenge which Luke faces.


58 If the audience for the speech is the crowd of people as a whole, then Jesus is singling out a particular demographic within the crowd (his disciples) even while using language that seeks to draw the crowd as a whole into the sub-group—even as, perhaps, Luke makes use of “you” language here also in an attempt to draw his audience closer to Jesus’ inner circle.
Both strike the chord of nationalistic hopes for Israel’s political redemption, yet here they find their antiphonal response in a passage that vividly highlights Jerusalem’s imminent demise. For anyone who missed the irony of (H)Anna(h)’s “waiting for the redemption (λύτρωσιν) of Jerusalem” in 2:38, the reappearance of ἀπολύτρωσις here may serve to spur them to deeper understanding: not Jerusalem but rather the faithful followers of Jesus are those who, when eschatological crises hit, will find true (ἀπο)λύτρωσιν.


Luke’s unique and puzzling “Daughters of Jerusalem” scene appears well into his Passion Narrative, coming just after Pilate’s reluctant condemnation of Jesus (23:13-25) and the notice that Simon carried Jesus’ cross (v. 26). Here the amorphous mass of people (πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν) seemingly repent of their earlier involvement in securing Jesus’ execution (23:13, 18, 21)—or, if Luke invites us to read between the lines, the Jewish people are simply divided regarding Jesus, in line with Simeon’s prophecy. Nevertheless, the mass of people, viewed as a coherent character, here resume their more commonly sympathetic posture in Luke’s Gospel (v. 27).

---

59 The word occurs nowhere else in Luke and Acts.

60 Noting the irony of the connection but failing to apply it to exegesis of 2:38 is Green, Luke, 741.

61 Unfortunately, I do not have space to examine the significance of Luke’s singling out the women here, despite its being a worthy and fascinating question. Scot McKnight is probably not far off the trail in noting the “surprising lead given to the women” and their bravery in commiserating with a criminal, in contrast to the disciples’ cowardice (Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory [Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2005], 141–42).


63 See the discussion in Green, Luke, 809; also, Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:918–19.
Jesus’ warning to the women, who stand here as often in the LXX as representative of the city’s residents as a whole, redounds with riddles and allusions. The mention of women who “were beating themselves” (ἐκόπτοντο; v. 27) seems to recall Zech 12:10-14, although the significance of such an echo is indeterminate. Here Luke may be simply drawing on imagery from Zech 12, without intending to evoke a deeper meaning from the reference—a possibility rendered more likely if v. 29 draws on the imagery, but not meaning, of Isa 54:1 and if v. 31 draws on the imagery, but not meaning, of Ezek 17:24. Luke 23:30 is a clear citation of Hos 10:8, but again the allusion’s deeper or contextual meaning is difficult to discern. Worse, the very meaning of Jesus’ statement about green and dry wood in v. 31 is notoriously opaque.

Whatever the precise import of each detail of Jesus’ complicated warning to the women (and to the city they represent) in vv. 28-31, the warning clearly serves to recall

---


65 In the minority and in agreement with Green, *Luke*, 815.

66 Green likewise seems unsure how much meaning to read into this echo, citing it only as providing “imagery” for Luke (*Luke*, 815)—and this may be as deep a significance as we may safely extract. Brown notes that “[t]he atmosphere here is not far from that of Jer 9:16-19” (*Death of the Messiah*, 2:921).

67 Brown argues against Luke’s drawing on Isa 54 here precisely because, despite some similarities (and note also the presence of mountains in Isa 54:10), Luke’s meaning appears to differ from that of Isaiah (*Death of the Messiah*, 2:923). But, in light of Luke’s profound reliance on Isaiah elsewhere in Luke and Acts, Brown may undervalue the background probability that Luke should be drawing on Isaiah here. It is also possible that Luke, taking Isa 54:1 in isolation from its context, reads it as a straight macarism for the childless, though, to be certain, only in light of the context in which he interprets it here—i.e., the city’s impending doom. This would not be the first time an NT author cited a prophecy from Scripture out of what modern auditors consider to be its proper context.

68 See Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:925.

69 Brown is relatively optimistic, however, taking the subject of the protasis as the Jerusalem leaders and the subject of the passive apodosis as God—thus, paraphrasing Brown, “if the Jerusalem leaders and people do this when the wood is green, what will God do to them when it is dry?” (*Death of the Messiah*, 2:925–27).
and re-punctuate both Jesus’ status as a prophet and Jerusalem’s treatment of the prophets as a key source of its demise (cf. 11:49-51; 13:33-34), as well as the city’s punishment for failing to understand the meaning of the events unfolding with Jesus’ ministry there (19:41-44)—a meaning that of course extends, in Luke’s mind, beyond even Jesus’ prophetic status. Thus, “the fate of Jerusalem and its inhabitants has been sealed by what the adversaries of Jesus are now doing”; the die is cast.

The Rending of the Veil (Luke 23:45)

Following Jesus’ pronouncement to the “daughters of Jerusalem,” Luke (very) roughly follows Mark in narrating Jesus’ crucifixion, adding a short scene (23:39-43) and possibly a line from Jesus (23:34a) and making several omissions, including of the passersby’s mockery regarding Jesus’ alleged statement about destroying the Temple and raising it in three days (Mark 15:29-30; cf. Luke 23:35). Luke rejoins Mark in noting the darkening of the sun from the sixth to ninth hours (Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44, though equivocating on the precise beginning time of the darkness and specifying the cause of the darkness as an eclipse) but then immediately reports also the dramatic tearing of the Temple veil (ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον; Luke 23:45). Luke’s well-known re-ordering (darkness-veil-cry-death, 23:45-46, vs. darkness-[cry-response]-cry-

---

70 τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν of 23:28 seems to echo τὰ τέκνα σου of 13:34.


72 Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:927.

73 This omission makes sense given that Luke has already omitted the corresponding accusation from Jesus’ trial(s); as noted earlier, Luke reserves this charge for Stephen’s trial in Acts 6–7. Luke may also wish to downplay any impression of Jesus’ (and thus the early Church’s) being socially or politically dangerous—a frequently-noted Lukan emphasis.
death-veil in Mark 15:37-38), as well as his omission of Mark’s description that the veil was torn in two from top to bottom (εἰς δύο ἀπ’ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω; 15:38), has given interpreters much grist for commentating and debating. Interpretations of the ultimate meaning of the veil’s rending center often on whether Luke’s rearrangement works to connect the rending of the veil to the darkening of the sun in v. 44 (e.g., Matera) or to Jesus’ last cry and death in v. 46 (e.g., Sylva), and also on how Luke’s overall treatment of the JT informs this episode—with most post-1980 discussions taking a largely Weinert-ian line (i.e., assuming in Luke a “positive attitude” toward the Temple). As I have earlier indicated, Weinert’s attitude-centric positive assessment is problematic not only because it neglects significant pieces of evidence from Luke’s writings but also, more fundamentally, because it frames the question as a matter of Luke’s personal biases rather than allowing that Luke may be a theologian in a meaningful sense and thus may be responding to deeper (esp. theodical) questions.

Although I cannot hope exhaustively to discuss, and certainly not to solve, the riddles at play here, I will attempt to offer an interpretation that is, at the minimum,

74 Frank J. Matera (“The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources,” *CBQ* 47.3 [1985]: 469–85) claims that Luke moves the rending of the veil prior to Jesus’ death in order 1) “to avoid the impression that the death of Jesus is the end of the temple and its cult” and 2) “to align the torn curtain with the sun’s failure and the three hours of darkness” (475). Matera reaches these conclusions largely based on his assessment—here informed significantly by Weinert, if the footnotes are any indication—that “Luke’s attitude toward the temple . . . is much more positive [than Mark’s]” (474). J. Bradley Chance emphasizes Luke’s bringing the darkness, the rending, and Jesus’ death into close proximity, taking them as “the satanic character of the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem,” “the destruction of Jerusalem,” and the Jewish leader’s rejection of Jesus, respectively, basing his claims largely on Luke’s pattern of connecting Jesus’ rejection with the Temple’s destruction (*Jerusalem*, 118–21); thus the rending symbolizes the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Dennis D. Sylva (“The Temple Curtain and Jesus’ Death in the Gospel of Luke,” *JBL* 105.2 [1986]: 239–50) argues that Luke repositions the tearing of the veil in order to establish a connection with Jesus’ cry to God and thus to show “Jesus’ communion with the God of the temple” (250). See also Green, “Demise of the Temple,” 495–515, whom I discuss below. See the many interpretive options laid out in Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1157.

75 This is certainly true of Matera, “Death of Jesus”; and, to some degree, Green, “Demise of Temple,” 498; Sylva, “Temple Curtain”; and Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1103.
plausible. The first thing to note, after perusing the secondary literature on this question, is the broad range of interpretations on offer: most are conflicting; several are flatly contradictory. One way out of the cul-de-sac may be to pay less attention—at least initially—to Luke’s re-ordering of the veil-rending and more attention to Luke’s overall presentation of the JT. While Joel Green, for one, might object to this maneuver as a downplaying of “local co-text,” even he acknowledges, when analyzing this passage, the need to appeal to the larger Lukan framing. Not only do the diverse interpretations of the passage, most of which focus on Luke’s re-ordering, thus point in this direction, but so do other considerations. One such consideration is Luke’s concern for a well-ordered narrative. While there may be interpretive significance to Luke’s re-ordering the veil-rending, he also likely moved it in order to pair it with the darkening of the sun in v. 44. As is widely noted, portents surrounding the death of important people were common in the ancient world, and grouping the portents together helps, in typical Lukan fashion, to stream-line the narrative (which had already begun to balloon through the addition of the “Daughters of Jerusalem” and penitent criminal scenes). Whatever theological

---


78 Suetonius, for example, reports death portents for each of the twelve Caesars whose lives he narrates. Cf. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, 379.


Luke’s desire to group the darkening of the sun and the rending of the veil is even more likely if both are divine testimony regarding Jesus (positively) and his opponents (negatively), as argued by James R. McConnell, *The Topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts* (diss. Baylor University, 2009): “an accompanying occurrence . . . reinforces the testimony through the eclipse; simultaneously the veil of the
function may have been served by placing the veil-rending prior to Jesus’ death, this move certainly served the organizational and stylistic function of bringing the portents together. Luke’s re-ordering may also have served the historiographical function of adding verisimilitude to Mark’s account by preventing the potential for (mis)interpreting the centurion’s exclamation as a result of the rending of a veil which, taking the narrative historically, he most likely could not see.  

If the points above open space for a consideration of the veil-rending in Luke that does not hinge on Luke’s ordering of events, what light is brought by Luke’s larger presentation of the JT in his Gospel? For one thing, Luke’s presentation of the JT is by no means as “positive” as some have claimed, and so the traditional reading that the rending of the veil stands here, as in Mark and other early Jewish and Christian interpretations, as symbolic of Jerusalem’s eventual destruction cannot be summarily ruled out. It is crucial, however, to take Luke on his own terms (and not those of Mark

temple is divided down the middle” (278–79). McConnell likens Luke 23:45-46 to the darkness reported at Caesar’s death in Plutarch’s account (also taken as divine testimony).

80 While the question of whether the centurion could/did see and respond to the rending of the veil—or whatever else—in Mark’s gospel does not concern me here (I gladly leave that vexed question to others), it is certainly likely that Luke, who as many believe, positions himself as a writer of some kind of ancient history, would have objected on the grounds of verisimilitude to the suggestion that a centurion standing beside the cross could have seen the rending of whichever Temple veil. Thus Luke has a historiographical motive for moving the rending of the veil—if only to eliminate this possible misunderstanding. Not only would the centurion not have presumably had a line of sight from which to see the rending of the Temple’s veil—even the outer veil—but the darkness would have made seeing impossible anyway. Making a strong recent case for καταπέτασμα as a reference to the inner veil is Daniel M. Gurtner, “LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil,” NovTest 47.4 (2005): 344–53.

81 See the evidence (and further secondary sources) cited by Chance, Jerusalem, 119–20.

82 No less an interpreter than Brown reads Luke’s veil-rending as an indication of divine wrath, “a forewarning that the continuing rejection of Jesus will bring the destruction of the holy place” (Death of the Messiah, 2:1104, 1106). Brown indicates that this reading does not exhaust the meaning of the veil-rending in Luke, however (see Death of the Messiah, 2:1106).
or other early Christians), and so we must go enter more deeply into the world of Lukan thought in pursuit of this question.

Toward this end, note Luke’s use (following Mark) of ναός in 23:45. To be sure, there is a geographical/spatial logic behind Luke’s use here: he often appears to employ ἱερόν for the Temple grounds/mound at large and ναός for the inner sanctuary (cf. Luke 1:9, 21, 22), as would be fitting here.83 Even so, the re-appearance of ναός, after so long an absence, recalls its otherwise unique appearance in Luke’s opening scene, in which Zechariah’s priestly administration of the Tamid in the JT is interrupted by the announcement of John’s imminent birth. As noted above, the JT, which in terms of setting dominates Luke 1–2, enjoys a sacerdotal cultic function until Simeon’s interruption of Jesus’ dedication in Luke 2—an interruption which both reorients the scene in which it occurs and marks a shift away from the JT as a sacerdotal cultic center in Luke’s gospel.84 Here ναός, with its explicitly sacerdotal cultic overtones (in Luke’s world and otherwise), reappears—and yet reappears only so that its curtain may be torn. That it is torn at the time of Jesus’ death recalls the earlier hints that Jesus’ life and ministry mean the end of the JT as sacerdotal cultic center—first in the Zechariah and Simeon scenes of Luke 1–2, then in the leper stories of Luke 5 and 17, and finally in


84 As I have noted, the interruption of the Tamid offering in 1:9-22 prefigures the later interruption by Simeon. Even so, I persist in labeling the Simeon interruption as the major hinge on which Luke’s presentation of the JT’s functions turns because it is there that the shift first becomes clear, in my view; as such, the Simeon scene is more instructive and important for interpreting the Zechariah scene than vice-versa.
Jesus’ own designation of the JT as a “house of prayer” in Luke 19. 85 This interpretation of the rending of the veil 86 finds support in Luke 13:35a, which, on my reading, warns of God’s abandoning the JT. The present progressive sense of ἀφίεται there points to the already-initiated but not-yet-completed nature of God’s abandonment of the Temple—a process that, begun with Jesus’ birth, reaches its consummation with his death. While this abandonment does not mean that the JT ceases to hold any significance or utility in salvation history (it is still, after all, a house of prayer and worship), it does, on my reading, indicate the Temple’s rejection as the uniquely chosen dwelling place of Israel’s God. 87

85 Luke continues this omission of the JT’s cultic function—while noting its utility by the early Christians as a place of prayer—in Acts, though adding a polemical line by using ναός to refer (in its only two occurrences in Acts) to foreign idols (17:24; 19:24) and punctuating the end of the JT’s cultic function by the calamitous interruption of Paul’s attempt to fulfill his (reluctantly assumed) cultic vows in Acts 21—when the doors of the Temple are literally but also symbolically and ominously closed. Charles Talbert and others have of course argued for a parallel between Jesus’ arrest, trial, and execution and Paul’s arrest and near-execution in Acts 21–22.

86 Among other commentators, my reading is perhaps closest to that of Green, “Demise of the Temple,” although we arrive at our conclusions on different grounds and although he prefers to speak of the end of the temple as a “cultural center” rather than “sacerdotal cultic site”; still, our counterpart phrases are, I think, largely synonymous—and the difference is perhaps largely accounted for by his “socio-cultural” emphasis versus my theodical (and thus theological) focus. The key difference between our readings is my claim that God here abandons the Temple, against his interpretation of the rending as symbolic of God’s now extending “the good news to those outside the social boundaries determined by the temple itself” (506)—which nevertheless seems to me to imply God’s abandoning the JT as God’s unique cultic institution. In agreement with my interpretation of Luke’s veil- rending as God’s abandonment of the Temple is Bruce Longenecker, “Rome’s Victory,” 98.

87 Sylva, “Temple Curtain,” who questions the reading of Luke 13:35a as God’s abandoning the temple, claims that, even if correct, on this view such abandonment cannot apply to the time period narrated in either Luke or Acts, since the apostles (Luke 24:53; Acts 2:46; 3:1) and Paul (Acts 21:2) both participate in worship there (249 n.25). Sylva overlooks the fact, however, that this worship is never, in Luke’s narration, specifically sacerdotal, except in Paul’s concessive worship of Acts 21—which is (significantly) interrupted by the very people who claim zeal for defending the worship of the Temple! That the temple continues to have a function, both as a house of prayer/worship and (along with Jerusalem more generally) as the launching point for the worldwide mission of Jesus’ disciples, does not mean that God has not abandoned it as the uniquely chosen and sanctioned cultic site nor that God has not forsaken its priestly administrators.
With this framing, we may now (re-)narrow our focus to (re-)examine the reason for Luke’s re-ordering of events here. Doing so, we find that the above interpretation dovetails well with Dennis Hamm’s insightful reading of Luke 23:44-47. Hamm notes that by moving the rending of the veil to its current location, Luke draws attention to its occurrence at the ninth hour—precisely when the Tamid service was being offered in the temple itself. If, as seems likely, Luke’s ideal audience had the requisite cultural knowledge regarding the twice-daily sacrifice to make this association, then Luke’s emphasizing that the tearing of the veil occurred simultaneously with the Tamid offering supports my reading of Luke 23:45. After all, it requires no great imaginative leap to recognize that the rending of the veil, occurring when it does, represents an interruption (however temporary) of the priestly worship in the temple—and thus imitates, and recalls, Simeon’s disruptive appearance in Luke 2:21-28 and, to a lesser degree, Luke’s narration of Jesus’ activity in the Temple (2:41-52) and Gabriel’s cultus interrupting appearance to Zechariah (esp. 1:21-23). In addition to this, the symbolic importance of God’s rending the veil while the service is in process—though of course potentially working in multiple directions—clearly suggests the abrogation of such priestly activity.

---

88 Thus, in Luke’s arrangement of things, only a brief genitive absolute clause (τοῦ Ἰλίου ἔκλιποντος) now separates the tearing of the veil from the temporal notice.


90 This is true whether the καταπέτασμα refers to the inner veil partitioning off the Holy of Holies (thus visible only to the attending priests) or to the veil before the Sanctuary (thus visible to all the assembled Israelite worshipers). For an argument that καταπέτασμα refers to the inner veil, see Gurtner, “LXX Syntax,” esp. 345–47.

91 Perhaps also pointing in this direction is James Dawsey’s suggestion that Luke moves the rending of the veil prior to Jesus’ death because Jesus’ ministry in the JT (which Luke elaborates from the shortened “cleansing” scene in Mark) must conclude—with the veil’s rending—before he can give up his
connection between this event and the Zechariah scene, since the latter also depicts the *Tamid* service.\(^\text{92}\)

Thus, local co-text and the larger context of Lukan thought suggest that Luke 23:44-46 may represent not only God’s interruption of the *Tamid* service in the Temple but also God’s finally realized abandonment of the Temple—and thus its end, in the Lukan world, as the proper cultic site of Israel’s God. This double-sided act—God’s self-removal from the JT and its corresponding end as proper cultic site—clears the way for Act’s emphasis on the universality of God’s salvation (again, first sounded by Simeon; Luke 2:29-32).\(^\text{93}\) Though Luke has hinted at the obstructive role of the JT, and its power brokers, in the spread of salvation in Luke 17:11-19 and Luke 19:41-45, the point will find clear expression in Acts.\(^\text{94}\)

Before moving on, it is apropos to note that this reading of the rending of the veil in Luke 23:45 works in two directions from a theodical perspective. First, as Bruce Longenecker has noted, God’s abandonment of the Temple at Luke 23:45 means that Israel’s and Jesus’ (and Luke’s) God does not suffer a loss of honor with Rome’s subsequent military conquest of the temple; in fact, God’s abandonment is the very thing, 

---


\(^\text{93}\) On this, see the helpful discussion in Green, “Demise of the Temple,” 504–14.

\(^\text{94}\) This theme finds expression especially in the Temple authorities’ hostility to the nascent Christian movement (Acts 3–7) and then later their violent reaction to Paul’s presence in the Temple (Acts 21–22), and probably also in the opposition of some Christian Pharisees (if Luke associates them with the JT) to inclusion of the Gentiles apart from their being circumcised and made to follow the Law of Moses (Acts 15).
from the perspective of Lukan theology, that opens the JT to attack.\textsuperscript{95} Thus the frequent and widely broadcast Flavian boasting of Jerusalem’s destruction does not, Luke informs the auditor, have any bearing on God’s power and should not be mistaken as a referendum on God’s honor. Secondly, on the other side of the theodical problem facing Luke, the potential accusation that God was unjust in abandoning the JT is answered: God abandoned it only after repeated warnings (Luke 11:49-51; 13:1-9, 31-35; 19:41-45; 23:28-31) and in just (even merciful) response to its power brokers’ rejection of God’s prophets and, finally, their rejection even of the great prophet, Messiah, Lord, and Son of God (cf. Luke 21:9-19).

\textit{Jesus’ Final Commission, and Waiting in Jerusalem (Luke 24:44-53)}

The final pericope for consideration in this chapter is also the final scene of Luke’s Gospel, Luke 24:44-53. Following Jesus’ several post-resurrection appearances, he opens the disciples’ minds to understand the scriptures (24:44-47), commissions them as witnesses beginning in Jerusalem (vv. 47-48), promises to send power and the Father’s promise from on high (v. 49), and then ascends to heaven (v. 51). Then the disciples, after worshiping him, return to Jerusalem with great joy, καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν (vv. 52-53). As is well-known, this ending to Luke’s Gospel has strong similarities, in theme and plot detail, to the beginning of Acts.

In need of consideration here are the Septuagintal echoes that many detect in Jesus’ final blessing to the disciples (vv. 50-52). Many see in Luke’s description of Jesus here a strong, intentional resemblance to priestly actions, as detailed in, e.g., Lev 9:22-24,

\textsuperscript{95} Longenecker, “Rome’s Victory,” 98.
and above all, in Sir 50:20-23. The (underlined) similarities with Sir 50:20-23 are indeed somewhat striking, including Simon’s/Jesus’ 1) raising the hand and 2) blessing the people (twice in Sirach, once in Luke but twice mentioned), 3) the people’s worshiping God (Sirach; italicized) or Jesus (Luke; italicized), 4) with grateful hearts (Sirach) or great joy (Luke).

Table 6: Priestly Blessings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τότε καταβὰς ἐπῆρεν χεῖρας αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δούναι εὐλογίαν κυρίου ἐκ χειλέων αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>εὐλόγησεν αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ καυχήσασθαι·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐδευτέρωσαν ἐν προσκυνήσει</td>
<td>καὶ ἐγένετο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιδέξασθαι τὴν εὐλογίαν παρὰ ψήφιστου.</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτόν αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>διέστη ἀπ’ αὐτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ νῦν εὐλογήσατε τῷ θεῷ πάντων τῷ μεγάλα ποιοῦντι πάντη,</td>
<td>Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν ψυχοῦντα ἡμέρας ἡμῶν ἐκ μήτρας καὶ ποιοῦντα μεθ’ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δώῃ ἡμῖν εὐφροσύνην καρδίας</td>
<td>μετὰ γαρὰς μεγάλης.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ γενέσθαι εἰρήνην ἐν ἡμέραις ἡμῶν ἐν Ἰσραηλ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In view of such evidence for Luke’s reliance on Sir 50, many believe, though some doubt. Joel Green, for example, rejects the possibility that Luke portrays Jesus in this way precisely because “Luke otherwise demonstrates no interest in portraying Jesus in priestly garb.” Instead, Luke presents Jesus on the “leave-taking” model of Jacob (Gen 49) and Moses (Deut 33), “with the echoes of Sirach [merely] emphasizing the stature of Jesus.”

Green’s (and others’) rejection of a priestly emphasis here may be too hasty, however. For one, Luke’s description of the blessing has little analog in the proposed Jacob and Moses parallels, beyond the very general similarity that great personages bless their successors, whom they are leaving behind. Unlike those blessings, which elaborate lengthy and involved futures for each of the sons/tribes of Jacob, Luke’s account not only fails to specify any content regarding the blessing but also does not specify that the

---


100 Green’s dismissal of Mikeal Parsons’ analysis (“Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel,” in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1986* [ed. Kent H. Richards; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 201–23, esp. 205–6), for one, is misguided. He accuses Parsons, among other things, of circular reasoning regarding Luke’s putative priestly presentation of Jesus here (Luke, 861). What Parsons actually claims, however, is 1) that a priestly presentation of Jesus here, which numerous commentators observe, would provide a strong and fitting example of Luke’s use of circularity to provide closure, and 2) that the dismissal of a priestly reading here on the basis that Luke elsewhere does not present Jesus as a priest overlooks Luke’s possible use of this literary device. There is a certain circularity to Parsons’ reading of course, but it is not the circularity of logically bankrupt tautology but rather the inescapable circularity of the “hermeneutical circle” (since there are other grounds—viz. the verbal echoes outlined above—for reading Jesus as priestly here than simply to posit that such a reading shows that Luke provides closure via circularity).
blessing was to the Twelve (minus one)—which would have served as a nice, if imperfect, analog to the blessing of Jacob’s sons. The parallels to Sir 50:20-23 are all the more striking given the very general nature of the parallels with Gen 49 or Deut 33. Secondly, the parallels are decidedly priestly—the raising of the hand in blessing, the blessing itself, and the worship in response to the blessing, followed by mention of the worshipers’ gladness/joy. Thirdly, while Green is correct in noting that Luke does not elsewhere portray Jesus in priestly garb, Green’s reading of Luke 17:11-19, which largely agrees with my own reading, can easily point in this direction at least. Moreover, despite his usually admirable attention to narrative flow and context, Green fails to consider that, within Luke’s narrative world, Luke 24 consists of rather rarefied air: with the brief exception of Acts 1:4-9, here alone in Luke’s writings do we have a post-resurrection, pre-ascension Jesus. This would be an ideal moment, then, for Luke to punctuate a new aspect of Jesus’ identity—especially an aspect of his identity that only reaches full fruition after his resurrection.

The question, then, is not whether this image for Jesus is presented elsewhere in Luke’s writings but is, rather, 1) whether a presentation of the post-resurrection, pre-ascension Jesus as priest coheres with Luke’s overall characterization and presentation of Jesus and 2) whether it coheres with his treatment of the Temple. Regarding point one, the question of Luke’s characterization of Jesus, Luke certainly has no problem importing

---

101 Leviticus 9:22-24 also commends itself in this regard (καὶ ἐξάρας Ααρων τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς . . . καὶ ἐξελθόντες εὐλόγησαν πάντα τὸν λαὸν, καὶ ὤρθη ἡ δόξα κυρίου πάντι τῷ λαῷ. . . καὶ ἔδειξεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐξῄσθη καὶ ἐπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον), though it lacks mention of the people’s joy/gladness. This passage may well lie behind both Luke 24 and Sir 50.

102 If v. 52’s προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν is judged to be non-Lukan or “non-original,” then the case for reliance on Sir 50 (or Lev 9) is weakened but not undone.
and attributing a diversity of identities and roles to Jesus—Messiah, Lord, Son of Man, prophet, and so forth—so an attribution of priestly qualities here, while by no means implied by the other images by which he characterized Jesus, is at least broadly coherent within his polyvalent portrait of Jesus. Furthermore, there may in fact be hints in this direction in several scenes: the boy Jesus’ service in the Temple (Luke 2:41-52), as well as Jesus’ taking possession of the Temple (Luke 19:45–21:38), the leper stories of 5:12-16 and 17:11-19 (see loc.), and also Luke’s de-emphasis on the Temple’s sacerdotal cultic function with the arrivals of John and especially Jesus. This final point gets also at the question of whether Jesus’ having a priestly role would cohere with Luke’s treatment of the JT: it indeed makes sense and all the more so if Luke here presents Jesus as priest “outside of the temple, and, indeed, outside of Jerusalem.”103 To argue in this latter direction would be inescapably circular, however, and so it serves not to establish the case for a priestly Jesus in Luke 24:50-51 but only to strike down Green’s (representative) objections to such.

In light of the similarities noted above, then, I find it likely that Luke here indeed draws on Sir 50:20-22, or else he draws on a very similar description of a priest (perhaps Lev 9)—in either case intending a priestly portrayal of Jesus here. This portrayal helps make sense of Luke’s de-emphasis on the JT’s sacerdotal cultic role throughout his Gospel: Jesus’ arrival means the end of the JT’s cultic functions precisely because Jesus, among the many other roles which he fills, comes also as priest, though in Lukan

theology he probably gains full priestly status only with his death.\textsuperscript{104} The audience is left only to surmise the further fact that, because of his unique relationship to God and indeed because of Jesus’ own (admittedly fuzzy) divine status in Luke, Jesus’ priestly service is not bound by physical locale—although there are hints also in this direction, especially in Jesus’ treatment of the lepers in 5:12-16 and 17:11-19, and this dovetails with the decentralizing theme of Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 (see my comments on Acts 7 in the appendix). Moreover, this reading seems to work well within the architectonics of Luke’s Gospel: in a grand inclusio, Jesus at last “giv[es] the blessing that the priest Zechariah was unable to give”; Luke’s finale thus resolves the incomplete action of his opening scene.

Even so and in keeping with his multivalent characterization of Jesus throughout his Gospel, Luke presents Jesus here as more than a priest: “then they worshiped him” (using προσκυνέω; v. 52).\textsuperscript{105} In other passages, Luke drops hints and suggestions of characters’ worshiping Jesus (e.g., 17:16), but here for the first time is the worship unmistakable. Thus the priestly blessing leads the faithful to worship not God, as in Sir 50, but Jesus.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{104} If true, this introduces a potential timing problem, with Luke’s moving the rending of the veil prior to Jesus’ death while his priestly status appears only post-resurrection. The problem is hardly insurmountable, however. Luke is of course not always vigorously strict in his schematization of time, even when schematizing salvation history—thus, e.g., he depicts Gentile converts (such as the Ethiopian official) prior to the official mission to the Gentiles in Acts 10, and Luke’s shift away from the Temple as a cultic site (argued for in this chapter) begins with the Zechariah scene in Luke 1 and yet gains full steam with Jesus’ presentation in the Temple in Luke 2.


\textsuperscript{106} The claim that Luke’s description of the disciples’ worshiping in the Temple (τῷ ἱερῷ διὰ παντὸς in v. 53 alludes to the Tamid service (so Hamm, “Praying ‘Regularly’”; cf. Bachmann, \textit{Jerusalem und der Tempel}, 344–45) is hardly compelling. Although this phrase could refer to the daily Hebrew priestly service (as in Lev 28:10, 15, 23, 24, 31; 29:6, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38), it was hardly a technical cultic term in the LXX (2 Kgdms 9:7, 10, 13; 4 Kgdms 4:9; 25:29, 30; 1 Chron 16:11; 2 Chron
Summary

The conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders reaches its crescendo as Jesus arrives at and takes possession of the Temple. Luke frames this arrival with his puzzling Kingship Parable, which comes in response to questions of the kingdom’s imminence and location as Jesus approaches Jerusalem. In Luke’s hands, Jesus’ arrival itself may recall and reverse Ezekiel’s vision of God’s departure from the Temple.

The subsequent series of conflict scenes occurs within the Temple itself and collectively demonstrates the Temple’s new (reduced) role—no longer as a sacerdotal cultic site but rather a place of prayer and instruction. Jesus’ interruption of the Temple’s sacerdotal functions and his transmuting it into a place of prayer and instruction enacts Luke’s earlier muting of the JT’s role as sacerdotal cultic site.

This transmuting reaches full realization only with the culmination of the conflict which has characterized Jesus’ ministry. As Jesus hangs on the cross, ready to expire, the veil of the ναός is torn—interrupting the afternoon Tamid offering, effecting and symbolizing God’s abandonment of God’s one-time “house.” This moment thus encapsulates and weaves together the various Lukan threads accounting for the demise of Jerusalem and its Temple: the Shiloh-esque rejection and abandonment of the house controlled by those who persist in immorality and who persecute God’s prophets (and indeed God’s Prophet), and thus the abrogation of its unique role as proper cultic site.

---

9:7) and is certainly not one in the Lukan corpus (e.g., Acts 2:25; 10:2; 24:16). See also, Rom 11:10; 2 Thess 3:16; cf. Heb 2:15 vs. 9:6; 13:15. If Luke intends a reference to the Tamid service, then it is subtle indeed and hardly brings the Jerusalem cult and its sacerdotal details back to center stage and might in fact point to a priestly role for the disciples (given the priestly echoes of vv. 50-52)—but an allusion to the Tamid remains, in my opinion, rather unlikely.
Luke ends his Gospel not here, however, but rather with teasing hints of a priestly Jesus, completing the blessing that Zechariah was prevented from offering (as Luke began his Gospel). Thus Luke offers a tantalizing but faint counterpoint to the numerous scenes in which he mutes the priestly workings of the Temple. In doing so, he brings his Gospel full-circle.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusion


In the foregoing analysis of Luke’s Gospel (chs. 4–6), I have attempted to demonstrate that Luke presents a coherent, if multivalent, portrait of Jerusalem and its Temple.¹ I have identified four major aspects to this portrait. First, Luke interprets Jerusalem and its Temple in terms of the abandoned οἶκος of Shiloh (Luke 1–2; 13:35a; echoed faintly in 19:46), thus giving a powerful scriptural warrant—one long-since employed by Jeremiah—for God’s rejecting his own holy place. Second, within Luke’s Gospel narrative, the proper function of the JT is to point characters (and also auditors) to recognition of Jesus. Luke sculpts his narrative with a progressively realized eclipsing of the JT’s sacerdotal operations with Gabriel’s annunciation of John’s birth (1:9-22) and especially by Jesus’ birth (2:22-40, 41-52), ministry (5:12-16; 17:11-19; 19:45-48), and finally death (23:45), with hints of a post-resurrection Jesus as priest (24:50-53). These narratival hints receive some degree of narratival clarification as Jesus’ ministry slowly encroaches upon the sacred space reserved for the JT—through extending forgiveness of sins, crossing boundaries of purity and gender, and embodying God’s holy presence.

Third, Luke presents Jesus as a prophet whose person, mission, and message entails a

---

¹ Regarding Luke’s polyvalent picture, compare Holmås’ claim that “when it comes to the theological justification for the criticism of the temple, Luke gives us a composite picture,” one comprised of 1) a criticism of “Jerusalem’s blindness and unbelief in response to God’s eschatological act of salvation” and 2) a criticism for its exclusivity—criticisms which Holmås believes are ultimately linked (“‘My House Shall Be a House of Prayer,’” 398).

Throughout, Luke employs scripture, and despite his frequently subtle echoes, his use of scripture elaborates and clarifies the position of Jerusalem and the Temple in his narrative world and theology. Luke does this in several ways, including his often inviting auditors to hear echoes as having typological import. Thus, for example, Luke 1–2 presents both Jesus and John after the pattern of Samuel. Although Luke goes on to characterize the Messiah and his forerunner after other great figures as well, the initial Samuel framing of Luke’s gospel helps also to establish a typological connection between the Jerusalem religious authorities of Jesus’ day and the rejected house of Eli and also between Jerusalem and Shiloh.

Luke also makes use of irony and the double-meaning of words to communicate his complex theological position regarding Jerusalem and the Temple. The first and perhaps most poignant instance of this is his description of Anna in 2:38 (καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ). To adopt the straightforward meaning of this sentence is simply an avenue that is not open for Luke’s ideal audience, who know both that Jesus, after characterizing Jerusalem as murderer of the prophets, would himself be wrongly executed by its authorities and that those expecting Jerusalem’s redemption in the sense of restoration at the time of Jesus’ birth held this
hope vainly indeed. I have argued for Lukán double-meaning also regarding ὠἶκος from the pivotal phrase of 13:35a (ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ ὠἶκος ὑμῶν).

I have attempted to root my case in both the immediate context (or co-text) and location of a given passage, as well as its larger Lukán context. Given the latter concern, I have attempted to lay out what I see as the major (relevant) dynamics of Luke’s narrative, including especially the agonistic dynamic which is foretold by Simeon and which transpires, with crescendo-ing force, across the entirety of Luke’s Gospel (and throughout Acts).

If even partially successful, my study has demonstrated that Luke’s treatment of Jerusalem and the Temple goes far beyond mere personal preference or bias—as though Luke had a simple personal disposition toward these sacred institutions that has somehow bled through into his writings in a facilely identifiable way. Far from it! Rather, Luke proves (again) to be a genuine theologian wrestling with scripture and with tradition in his attempt to answer for his audience (and perhaps also for himself) the pressing questions of his day. These are, as I have explored, above all questions of theodicy: How could God let his city that bears his name be destroyed, his house be defiled? Does this show that the God of Israel—now also the God of Jesus, Paul, and those members of this strange sect (“Christians”)—to be effete in the face of Roman might? Or perhaps worse: Does this show God to be faithless? Luke does not necessarily or often front these theodical questions in his Gospel—but he does frequently concern himself
with Jerusalem’s fate and does also explicitly raise issues of theodicy, as in Luke 13:1-9.\(^2\)

If Luke as a theologian suffers from subtlety of expression to go along with his depth of vision, keenness of insight, and passion of inquiry, we can only say that he finds himself in good company.\(^3\) Comparing Luke to Paul’s letters, “whose mode of argumentation has a more recognizably didactic and persuasive look,” Joel Green notes that “the Third Gospel presents its message in the form of a narrative” and its “mode of persuasion is perhaps more subtle, but no less theological.”\(^4\) Thus Luke sometimes teases his audience with unstable meanings (2:38; 13:35a), asymptotic hints (19:11; Acts 1:6-7), translucent tales (13:6-9; 19:11-27), and tickling reverberations (throughout).

As the preceding paragraphs suggest, many of the relevant themes and hints for my thesis find their origin in Luke 1–2 and especially in Luke 2:22-52—which establish the Shiloh-Jerusalem connection, which first clearly establish Jesus as a prophet (like Samuel), which most decisively begin the Lukan shift from Temple as sacerdotal center to place of prayer and instruction, and which allude to the eventual conflict between Jesus and some within Israel. Each of the four major threads I have uncovered, then, as well as Luke’s use of irony and double-meaning regarding Jerusalem and the Temple, find their foundation here. This fact, combined with the emphasis on narrative beginnings by

\(^2\) Also revealing Luke’s interest in theodicy are the Parable of the Persistent Widow, with its odd and potentially subversive portrait of God as Judge (18:1-8), and the Parable of the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8); see ch. 3.

\(^3\) Surely this charge could be leveled against any number of great theologians from the past, from Origen to the Cappadocian fathers to Kierkegaard to Bultmann and Barth. This is not to obscure, of course, the fundamental differences between Luke’s narratively constructed theology and the more formal theological methods of later theologians.

\(^4\) Idem, *Theology*, 3. Admittedly, my analysis of Luke’s Gospel has not been able exhaustively to explore how Luke “engages in the theological task and the strategies by which he engages his audience in transformative discourse” (Green, *Theology*, 132–33).
previous scholars, has directed me to give this early portion of Luke’s Gospel comparatively greater attention.

From the standpoint of ancient theodicy, Luke leans heavily on (non-stringent forms of) retribution theology to address—or perhaps to head off—questions regarding God’s faithfulness. Could a faithful God allow the holy city and Temple to suffer so terribly? Luke answers with a resounding, if doleful, “yes.” For Israel’s God, Luke informs us, has done similarly in the past, both in the complete rejection of Shiloh and in the previous rejection of Jerusalem, and, furthermore, God did so only in response to persistent national impenitence, including the immorality of the leaders and the rejection of God’s prophets, finally of the prophet who was in fact more than a prophet, Jesus himself. Luke addresses questions of God’s power less directly (as already noted by Longenecker), largely bypassing them by showing God’s abandonment of the JT during the ministry and especially the crucifixion of Jesus—hence, the destruction of Jerusalem in no way reflects negatively upon God’s power or honor. While Luke seldom, in my view, directly contrasts God’s power against Roman might—thereby tackling head-on the insinuations of Flavian propaganda regarding Israel’s God—he does seem to marginalize Roman might through Jesus’ reference to the end of the “times of the nations” (Luke 21:24). Certainly, moreover, he highlights God’s power, as animated in Jesus, especially vis-à-vis Satanic power (10:18-19; 13:16). In Luke’s master portrait, then, despite abandoning Jerusalem and its Temple to the devices of their wicked human masters, God is neither lacking in power nor deficient in faithfulness but amply displays God’s abiding faithfulness in the ministry of Jesus and later through the ongoing mission of Jesus’ disciples.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX

Jerusalem and the Temple in Acts

An Overview

The task here is simply to map, with brushstrokes all-too-broad, the landscape of Acts on the question of Jerusalem and its Temple. Most significant for this question is Acts 1–7, although a later episode provides clarification and emphasis to the lines which occur at the beginning of Luke’s second volume.

New Developments: Jerusalem and the Temple in Acts 1–7

Acts 1 picks up where Luke 24 leaves off narratively, yet it soon moves theologically beyond anything made explicit in Luke’s Gospel. The disciples’ query in 1:6 about whether the Lord Jesus would now “restore the kingdom to Israel” places the limelight on contemporary Jewish eschatological hopes, much as did Luke 1–2 (viz. via the descriptions of Simeon and Anna).1 Jesus’ response in vv. 7-8 serves to qualify and thus also partially to rebuff these expectations: alluding to Isa 49:6 (precisely a passage and part of scripture in which such hopes find expression) Jesus characterizes the programme to follow in terms of a centrifugal mission (going out from Jerusalem), thereby making somewhat tenuous expectations of a complementarily centripetal mission (to Jerusalem).2

---

1 See Bauckham, Jewish World, 328–46.

As Acts plays out, the hint proves to be well-taken: Jerusalem will indeed serve as a launching pad (the centrifugal function) for the Christian mission, but whatever initial promise the gathering of Diaspora Israel at Pentecost (Acts 2) has for a centripetal movement to Jerusalem, the city does not quite live up to its billing as the eschatological gathering site for hordes of Gentiles (as in Isa 2:2-3; 60:3, 10; 61:5). Much the contrary, the city and its leaders continue their behavior from Luke’s Gospel; they persist in resisting God’s plan and in persecuting those who are truly faithful (Acts 4:1-22; 5:17-42; 6:12–8:1). Thus they fail both to acknowledge their wickedness in crucifying God’s Messiah and Holy One (5:28) and to perceive the unfolding fulfillment of Israel’s eschatological expectations.

---

3 I remain on the fence regarding claims that in Acts 2 Luke narrates the descent of the eschatological temple (on this, see above all G.K. Beale, “The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost—Part 1,” *TynBul* 56.1 (2005): 73–102; idem, “The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost—Part 2,” *TynBul* 56.2 (2005): 63–90). Such a claim would be coherent with my reading of Luke’s Gospel and would in some ways be anticipated by those portions of Luke’s Gospel that, on my reading, state God’s abandonment of the JT and imply the abrogation of the Temple’s cultic functions with the ministry of Jesus (thus proleptically indicating the reality brought to fruition at Pentecost: that Jesus, via his Spirit, completely abolishes any need for a physical temple by creating the new, eschatological temple). Luke may, on the other hand, describe Pentecost along the lines of Sinai (as Beale claims) but intend to leave open-ended the import of the scene, not specifically limiting himself to a vision of the Church as the eschatological temple.

4 The picture is of course rather complex, even within Isa 40–66. In Isa 60, for example, the Gentiles who come to Zion generally do so in order to receive punishment.

5 For example, Luke portrays the healing of the lame man in Acts 3:1-10 in terms evocative of Isa 35:6—both passages envision the lame (χωλός—Acts 3:2) leaping (ἀλλοματι—Acts 3:8) for joy—yet the authorities, in their questioning of Peter and John, completely miss the point (3:11).
All of this comes to a head, as Luke narrates it, with Stephen’s trial. Here the persecution (earlier cooled just shy of boiling point by Gamaliel’s timely intervention [5:33-39]) finally bubbles over into murder by mob action. It also instigates, so the narrative implies, the subsequent persecution of the church by Saul (8:1-3).

Stephen’s speech is not only pivotal narratively, however, but it also brings full expression to Luke’s theology of the Jerusalem Temple. Coming at the end (and bringing to culmination) Luke’s picture of a Jerusalem leadership that at every turn opposes and intimidates the servants of God, Stephen’s speech gives verbal expression to the realities already hinted at by Luke’s narrative. In Stephen’s speech, Luke leads the listener (as in the narrative Stephen leads his own audience) to see that God’s activity and saving purposes have often extended beyond the bounds of God’s specially chosen geographical bounds—first with Abraham (vv. 2-8), then with Joseph (vv. 9-16), and also with Moses (vv. 17-44). As the speech nears its climax, Stephen quotes two prophecies, first from Amos 5:25-27 (Acts 7:42-43), upbraiding Israel for its idolatry, and then from Isaiah 66:1 (Acts 7:49-50). The Isaiah quote is, in context, quite shocking. For Stephen prefaces it with the assertion that God does not dwell in “things made by human hands” (χειροποιήτως; v. 48), and then by quoting Isaiah 66:1 (“What kind of house will you build for me…?”) Stephen clearly applies to the JT this word reserved in the LXX for idols? In doing so, not only does Luke give a clear instigating cause for the subsequent

---


7 To recycle an earlier footnote: χειροποιήτως occurs nine times in the LXX (Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 19:1; 21:9; 31:7; 46:6); the only passage in which the reference to idolatry is potentially uncertain is Lev 26:30. Heightening the sting of Stephen’s accusation, Isaiah regularly uses the term to refer to the vain images of foreign nations (two exceptions, 2:18 and 31:7, refer to Israel’s own idols).
mob violence against Stephen but he also goes beyond the theology of the JT expressed in his Gospel. Moving beyond earlier statements that Jerusalem would be rejected for its immorality and the general opposition of its leaders to God’s purposes and servants and moving beyond hints of a shift away from Jerusalem’s sacred position as the unique cultic center for Israel’s God, Luke here announces that the attempt to limit God’s presence to the Jerusalem temple is, in fact, nothing less than idolatry. This provides yet another—and one last—powerful warrant justifying God’s abandonment of the city and its Temple, a final weapon in Luke’s theodical arsenal.

Other than this significant step beyond the theology of Jerusalem and the Temple presented in Luke’s Gospel, Acts continues, sometimes by amplification, the theological lines mapped across the earlier Lukan narrative. Hints of Shiloh are (to my knowledge) absent, but Jerusalem is again the city which boasts the dangerous occupation of persecuting God’s servants. Thus, also, it opposes the nascent church which now (finally) embodies the wealth ethic (2:43–47; 4:32–37) that Jesus preached and for which he indicted Israel’s leadership. Moreover, God’s Spirit has been poured out upon the Church, making more explicit Luke’s earlier hints that Jesus’ presence means the end of the JT as unique cultic site. Indeed, although the JT serves frequently as the setting for the Church’s activities in Acts 1–7, its cultic and especially sacerdotal functions are consistently muted. It is now, Luke seems to indicate, nothing beyond a place for prayer

---

8 The violation of this wealth ethic is a better explanation for God’s harsh treatment of Ananias and Sapphira, it seems to me, than the claim that Luke presents them as violating the Lord’s “temple presence” (contra Anthony Le Donne, “The Improper Temple Offering of Ananias and Sapphira,” NTS 59 [2013]: 346–64).

9 In Acts 2, for example, a cultic rationale—the Pentecost pilgrimage—serves as part of the backdrop to the episode, although everything specifically sacerdotal is excluded from Luke’s narration. Likewise, in Acts 3:1 Peter and John indeed go to the Temple “at the hour of prayer,” or the time of the
and instruction—and thereby no more significant a locale than the houses and synagogues which serve similar functions at many points in the narrative of Acts.

But does not, we might ask, the fact that Jerusalem, and especially the Temple, serves as the setting for the rise of the Church indicate that Luke gives it some significance beyond what I have indicated above? Indeed I believe it does—and here we return again to contemporary Jewish eschatological expectations. In my thinking, Luke has two trenchant reasons for setting Jerusalem and its Temple as the locus for these eschatological events. For one, he presumably believes this is in fact where and how the Church began—in Jerusalem, at Pentecost. A theological concern supplies his second reason, however: by locating the Church’s eschatologically significant origins in Jerusalem, Luke endeavors to demonstrate that the hopes for Israel’s restoration foretold by the scriptures were indeed fulfilled, even if not exactly as anticipated. Especially left ambiguous was, again, the expectation that Jerusalem would serve as the gathering point for the nations (the centripetal movement to Jerusalem). Luke was almost certainly aware of this expectation and perhaps attempted to finesse it by emphasizing the centrifugal counterpart to this expectation, as well as by demonstrating the Jerusalem leadership’s persistent opposition to God—a major plot element of Acts 1–7. Additionally, his eventual disclosure that the attempt to localize God’s presence to Jerusalem and its Temple amounted to idolatry may be an attempt to explain the failure

---

10 The above comment will perhaps suffice to indicate the (only) limited sense in which I endorse the temple vs. household paradigm suggested by John Elliott for Acts.
of this centripetal movement to materialize. Here the logic would seem to run:

Jerusalem’s envisioned role as the gravitational center for God’s eschatological purposes has been frustrated (permanently? temporarily?) by its opposition to God’s purposes and God’s agents and above all by the fact that its Temple has, alas, become an idol.

*Strengthening the Impression (Acts 8–28)*

Jerusalem and its Temple largely drop from sight as the narrative of Acts pushes on—away from Jerusalem and into the foreign missionary work of Paul. As many have noted, however, Acts’ movement away from Jerusalem is cyclical, and not straightforwardly dispersive, and things have a way of circling back around. The most significant reappearance of the sacred city occurs with Paul’s fateful arrival there in Acts 21.

Here, quite curiously, Luke shines the spotlight on the Temple’s ongoing cultic role—the first time he does such (by my count) since the opening pericope of his Gospel! What can this mean? Several points deserve consideration. Though rather obvious, it needs saying that Luke here acknowledges the Temple’s ongoing cultic significance specifically in order to portray Paul’s participating in a vow taken by four Jewish Christians. Luke frames the taking of this vow as a concession: as suggested by James, Paul is to take this vow with four other Jewish Christians in order to demonstrate the falsehood of rumors that he was teaching Jews to abandon Moses, circumcision, and

---

11 Luke’s highlighting of the JT’s ongoing cultic role in Acts 21 is foreshadowed by his note in 20:16 that Paul was hurrying to get to Jerusalem before Pentecost. If an earlier verse in Acts 20 implies Paul’s observance of the Passover Feast (v. 6—so Parsons, *Acts*, 303), any implied reference to the JT is muted by the fact that Paul partakes of the feast well away from Jerusalem.

12 Whether Paul himself also partakes in the vow is up in the air; see Parsons, *Acts*, 303.
other Jewish identity markers (21:21-25). Luke thus depicts the Temple’s cultic role here as holding specifically (and only) cultural significance and in doing so considerably diminishes its importance. Absent are any hints of the Temple’s cosmic significance, its architectural and cultic correspondence to ultimate heavenly reality; on the contrary, Paul participates in the vow simply as a matter of Jewish custom, to edify his brothers.

As things play out, however, Paul does not in fact complete the purification ritual, for misinformed and belligerent Asiatic Jews seize him in the Temple before the rite is completed (21:27-29). Once again, in a favorite Lukan plot-twist, a scene that begins with a cultic rationale reorients rather drastically when the cultic action is itself interrupted. Several differences apply here in comparison to earlier scenes following this pattern, however, not least of which are that the cultically-inclined character (here Paul) never gets to finish the rite and that this is so precisely because the characters who claim surpassing zeal for the Temple prevent him from doing so!

These are facts upon which any attempts to rehabilitate the Temple as a proper cultic site within Luke’s theology on the basis of the sacerdotal/cultic elements of Acts 21 must ultimately founder. Indeed Luke here gives narrative illustration to the theological points made earlier regarding the Temple. Once again it serves as both the hub of opposition to God’s will and proves to be an idolatrous stumbling block. Though Luke does not specifically raise the charge of idolatry here, intratextual connections—a favorite pastime of Luke especially in Acts—strongly point in this direction.
Indeed several parallels suggest a connection (taken together, a rather strong one in fact) between this scene and an earlier scene in Acts. This earlier scene also centers around zeal for a temple, the Artemis Temple in Ephesus. As the Asiatic rabble-rousers stir up themselves and other members of the mob-to-be, their rationale hinges on the dubious claim that Paul has brought a Gentile into the Temple (21:27-28). Luke provides a semi-parenthetical note explaining that they had previously seen an Ephesian, Trophimus, in the city with Paul and had (rather wildly) inferred his presence also in the Temple. The identification of the man’s city of residence as Ephesus serves as a verbal cue that recalls the earlier riot scene. Further links between the Ephesian riot (19:21–40) and Jerusalem riot scenes are ample and instructive (21:27–22:29). Both scenes of course share the general features of narrating a mob scene that occurs surrounding a temple. More than this, in each scene a Jew attempts to address the mob—Alexander in 19:33 and Paul in 21:49. This Jew motions to the crowd and attempts to speak (19:33; 21:40). In both cases as the speaker begins to address the mob, his ethnic identity becomes a focal point of attention and has an immediate effect upon the crowd—re-igniting the crowd at Ephesus but further silencing the Jerusalem mob. Despite their divergent initial reaction, the Jerusalem mass ultimately re-ignites, demanding Paul’s death (22:22) and is, like the Ephesian mob (19:35–40), dispelled only by the intervention of a government official (22:24). Also connecting the two scenes is that fact that, in narrating the Ephesian riot, 

---

13 I certainly do not deny connections also between this scene and other scenes in Luke’s writings, especially between this scene and Acts 7 and between this scene and Jesus’ passion. The accusations against Paul here and Stephen in Acts 6, e.g., are notably similar.

14 The crowd simply learns, through unidentified means, that Alexander is a Jew (19:34), whereas Paul emphasizes his own heritage by speaking in Aramaic (19:40–22:2) and by other means, such as describing the law as τοῦ πατρίου νόμου (22:3).
Luke makes the surprising choice of describing the ringleader of the riot, Demetrius, as a maker of ναός (19:24)—the very word applied to the JT in Luke 1:9, 21, 22; 23:45; and often in the LXX. The only other occurrence of ναός in Acts also refers to foreign temples or idols and also emphasizes their composition by human hands (17:24). These uses of ναός echo against Stephen’s description of the JT as something “made by human hands” and thus insinuate an implicit identification and criticism of the JT—hence, working to connect the Ephesian and Jerusalem riot scenes.

These several similarities work to link the Jerusalem riot scene with the Ephesian riot scene in the minds of Luke’s auditors. The divergent response to Paul’s speaking in Aramaic, then, likely injects an element of hope into the latter scene (22:2). Here the parallelism seemingly breaks down: unlike the rioting idolaters of Acts 19, perhaps the crowd in Acts 22 will listen to Paul’s message. But this hope proves vain, and the Jerusalem worshipers follow the pattern of the Ephesian heathen—despite Paul’s cultically appropriate worship and despite the fact that the offensive elements of his speech consisted of a revelation mediated while praying in the JT itself (22:17-18). Thus Luke, in narrative confirmation of the closing words of Stephen, shows the Jerusalemites, when faced with a threat to their Temple “made with hands,” behave exactly as Luke’s ideal readers/auditors should expect idolaters to act.

The closing of the Temple doors (ominously narrated in Acts 21:30) bears ambiguous symbolic import. It probably represents a final indication of both the

---

15 As indicated in ch. 4, I generally follow Taylor’s view on this (see “Jerusalem Temple,” 472), that Luke employs ναός polemically, in ways designed to stress God’s abandonment of the JT. He does this in the Third Gospel by shifting away from acknowledging the cultic/sacerdotal role of the Temple and by using the term to detail the rending of the veil and in Acts by applying the term exclusively to human-made temples/idols (Acts 17:24; 19:24).
intractability of Jerusalemite opposition to God’s purposes and the sealing of the fate of
the Jerusalem Temple and its idolatrous worshipers,\textsuperscript{16} in particular anticipating the
cessation of the Temple’s cultic activities, likely by allusion to Mal 1:10.

\textsuperscript{16} On this latter point, I am in line with the view of F.F. Bruce, “The Church of Jerusalem,” 659,
though I do not share his overall assessment of the question of Jerusalem and the Temple in Luke’s
writings.
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