

THE SALVIFIC CHARACTER OF JESUS' DEATH IN LUCAN SOTERIOLOGY

RICHARD ZEHNLE

Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y.

IN RECENT years several leading exegetes have claimed that the author of Luke-Acts (who will be designated as Luke in this study) has failed to give direct soteriological value to the death of Jesus. Wilckens lists among the lacunae in Luke's theological conception his failure to make clear the salvific character of the death of Jesus: Luke-Acts proclaims the *fact* that salvation has been granted in the sending of Jesus, but does not explain the *how* or *why* of this salvation.¹ Conzelmann maintains that in Luke's account of the Passion there is no "direct soteriological significance drawn from Jesus' suffering or death."² Käsemann calls the cross of Jesus in Lucan theology a misunderstanding of the Jews which had to be corrected by God's intervention in the Resurrection.³

Some decades ago Dodd offered an explanation of this phenomenon.⁴ In searching for the primitive schema of apostolic preaching, he found that the Jerusalem kerygma failed to assert that Christ died for our sins, an assertion frequent in Paul and seemingly even pre-Pauline. He concluded that the Jerusalem kerygma of Acts was pre-Pauline at least in this aspect, allowing the possibility that the notion may have been developed by the "school of Stephen and Philip, with which Paul appears to have been in touch." Yet other authors have pointed out that such an assertion is missing throughout Luke-Acts. Hence Dodd's reasoning leads to the conclusion that Luke's soteriology must be judged pre-Pauline in the aspect we are considering, which explains why the death of Jesus lacks any soteriological value.

These are serious accusations to bring against the author of the two-volume work which makes up more than one fourth of the *NT*, an author whom recent studies have consistently shown to be both a careful writer and profound theologian. Hence it is the object of this study to investigate the pertinent texts of Luke-Acts to answer the question: How according to Luke is man saved, and what relation does the death of Jesus have to this salvation?

¹ U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1963) pp. 216 f.

² H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of Saint Luke* (London, 1960) p. 201.

³ E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 51 (1954) 137.

⁴ C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development* (London, 1936) p. 25.

IMPORTANCE OF NOTION OF SALVATION IN LUKE-ACTS

A study of Lucan soteriology demands more than an analysis of certain key words and concepts. The notion of salvation is expressed in a variety of expressions and figures. But an investigation of lexical entries derived from the basic root "to save" indicates a special Lucan concern for the question of man's salvation.

Distinctive Vocabulary

Certain words appear exclusively in Luke among the Synoptic writers: (1) *sōtēr*: This word occurs once in Jn; otherwise in the Gospels and Acts only in Lk 1:47; 2:11; Acts 5:31; 13:23. (2) *sōtērion*: This word appears only four times in the NT, three of them occurring in Luke-Acts: Lk 2:30; 3:6; Acts 28:28; Eph 6:17. The ministry of John the Baptist opens with Mk's citation of Isaiah lengthened (only in Lk) to conclude: *kai opsetai pasa sarx to sōtērion tou theou* (3:6). And the ministry of Paul closes in Rome when the apostle, after citing the terrible prophecy of Is 6:9 f. (to which Luke only alludes in the Gospel, 8:10, in distinction to the other Synoptics, Mt 13:14 f. and Mk 4:12, and even to Jn 12:40), announces: *gnōston ourn estō hymin hoti tois ethnesin apetalē touto to sōtērion tou theou* (Acts 28:28).⁵

The Verb sōzō

While the verb *sōzō*^b is not in itself typically Lucan among the Evangelists (Mt 14 times; Mk 13; Lk 16; Jn 6; Acts 13), a comparison of the Lucan use of it with that of the other Synoptic writers is most informative.

1) In three cases of Marcan use, Lk has the pericope but does not use the verb, and in two of these (Mk 5:23; cf. Lk 8:42; Mk 5:28; cf. Lk 8:44) the reason would seem to be that Lk avoids using the word when there is simply a question of healing, with no question of faith involved.

2) Lk adds the verb to Mk in four places: (a) 8:12: In giving the interpretation of the parable of the sower, only Lk specifies that the sower's seed is the *logos tou theou* (8:11); and only he gives the reason why the devil takes it from the first class of hearers: *hina mē pisteusantes sōthōsin* (8:12; cf. Mt 13:18 f.; Mk 4:13-15). (b) 8:36: In the

^a J. Dupont, "Le salut des gentils et la signification théologique du livre des Actes," *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959-60) 132-55, points out the importance of these passages in the total picture of Acts.

^b Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "L'Usage de *sōzein*, 'sauver,' et de ses dérivés dans les évangiles synoptiques," in *La formation des évangiles* (Paris, 1957) pp. 178-94.

account of the Gerasene demoniac, Lk notes (Mk does not; cf. 5:16) that the demoniac was "saved," and the account of his becoming a disciple follows immediately (as in Mk). (c) 8:50: In the narration of the raising of Jairus' daughter, both Mk (5:36) and Lk have Jesus say to Jairus: "Do not fear, only believe." But only Lk adds: *kai sōthēsetai*. We noted above that Mk employs this verb twice in the same episode (5:23, 28), and that it is omitted by Lk, only to be placed here in close proximity to the verb *pisteuō*. (d) 13:23: While Mt 7:13 and Lk both have the saying of Jesus about the "narrow gate," only Lk introduces it with a question concerning the number of the *sōzomenoi*, which is incidentally the only occurrence of the participle in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Acts 2:47; 1 Cor 1:18; 2 Cor 2:15).

3) Briefly, the use of *sōzō* in the third Gospel may be summarized thus: (i) with *psychē* (6:9; 9:24 *bis*), to save one's soul; (ii) in the expression "your faith has saved you" (7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42; cf. 8:50); (iii) for the man possessed by a demon who became a disciple after Jesus cured (saved) him (8:36); (iv) for Jesus on the cross (23:35, 37, 39), where there is question of the Christ "saving" others and not Himself, evident irony on Lk's part; (v) in the religious sense of salvation (8:12; 13:23; 18:26; 19:10). Thus, unlike Mt and Mk, Lk reserves the verb *sōzō* for situations which involve faith; it has a religious connotation in all texts.

4) In Acts it is the evident religious sense which predominates. Two cases seem to be exceptions:

a) 4:9: A question is posed: How has this man been saved (*sesōstai*)? Luke uses the ambiguity of the word to prepare a double response, the first part dealing with the cure of the man (4:10: the verb *sōzō* is not employed), and the second with the salvation brought by Jesus (4:12: each member contains the root *sōzō*: *sōtēria*, *sōthēnai*). This case is thus similar to Lk 8:36; it is not an exception to Luke's usage.

b) 27:20, 31: In the account of the shipwreck the verb *sōzō* occurs twice: in 27:20 there is question of giving up hope of being saved; in 27:31 Paul announces that no one is to leave the ship if all are to be saved. It is perhaps true that we have here an exception to Luke's usage. It is difficult to narrate the story of a shipwreck and marvelous deliverance without recourse to the notion of being saved. Luke employs *diasōzō* four times in the narration (27:43, 44 and 28:1, 4; elsewhere the word is used in Lk 7:3; Acts 23:24; Mt 14:36; 1 Pt 3:20; it would seem to be typically Lucan, and is never used by him in the religious sense of being saved) and may be avoiding a too frequent repetition of the word in using *sōzō*. Yet the possibility of a symbolic

meaning of the shipwreck in Acts must by no means be excluded.⁷ Besides, the resemblance of the usage of 27:31 to 1 Pt 3:20 is suggestive. In the latter, Pt refers to Noah's ark which saved only a small group of eight people by water (*eis hēn oligoi . . . psychai diesōthēsan di' hydatos*). In Acts 27 Paul is granted the salvation (*sōtēria*: 24:34) of 276 "souls" (*psychai*) on board the ship; not a hair on anyone's head will be lost, a remarkable parallel⁸ also to Jesus' urging to perseverance in Lk 21:18 f.: "In your endurance you will possess [for which Marcion's text reads 'save'] your souls (*psychas*)."

Thus a study of the basic salvation terminology of Luke-Acts reveals that for the author salvation is a key concept which he has handled with great care.

REQUIREMENTS FOR SALVATION

In approaching the concept of salvation in Luke, the obvious first question to be asked is: How is a man to be saved?

1) *Lk 18:18-30*. Lk, following Mk (10:17-31) closely, has the question put to Jesus: "What must I do to gain [literally, inherit] eternal life?" That this question is equivalent to "What must I do to be saved?" is shown by the subsequent discussion in both Mk and Lk: *kai tis dynatai sōthēnai* (Mk 10:26; Lk 18:26). In response, Jesus outlines a moral program somewhat in detail. Not only must the questioner keep the traditional commandments, but he must give up all to follow Jesus. For salvation, Jesus requires a positive commitment similar to His own (cf. Lk 9:23-27, 57-62).

2) *Acts 16:30 f.* The simplest and most direct statement in Acts follows the question of the Philippian jailer to Paul and Silas: "Sirs, what must I do that I may be saved? And they said: Believe in the Lord Jesus and you will be saved and your whole household." Two verses later (16:33) we learn that the jailer is baptized with his household. The requirement of baptism, moreover, is declared in Peter's response to his hearers after his speech on Pentecost (Acts 2:38).

3) *Comparison*. The difference between the program of the Gospel

⁷ Cf. M. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London, 1964) pp. 36-40. Acts 27 and 28 describe a symbolic death and resurrection for Paul. Several points are to be noted. (1) For the Semitic mind, death was not a line to be crossed, but a process, and the sea was considered a place of death in the OT. (2) In 27:35 we have a sort of "Last Supper" for Paul. The Eucharistic overtones are undeniable: *labōn arton eucharistēsen kai klasas ērxato esthien*. (3) Paul stays with Publius for three days before going to Rome (28:7), his symbolic resurrection.

⁸ Lk 21:18: *kai thrix ek tēs kephalēs hymōn ou mē apolētai*; Acts 27:34b: *oudenos gar hymōn thrix apo tēs kephalēs apoleitai*.

and that of the Acts is a difference of changed situation and development; basically each reply contains a "negative" and a positive element.

a) The word "negative" is not quite exact; what is required is a change of life, a conversion, which implies naturally a turning away from a sinful life, i.e., a life not in harmony with traditional moral requirements. In Acts this element is expressed by a typical Lucan theme-word, *metanoia*.⁹ (The noun occurs only twice in Mt and once in Mk; it occurs five times in Lk and six times in Acts. The verb *metanoēō* also occurs more frequently in Luke-Acts than in the other Synoptic writers: Mt 5 times; Mk 2; Lk 9; Acts 5). (i) *Jesus*: In the version of the final words of Jesus to His disciples given in Lk 24:47, He declares that they are to preach *metanoia* in His name to all nations. (ii) *Peter*: The theme of *metanoia* is frequent in Peter's preaching (2:38; 3:19; 5:31). He urges the magician Simon to convert from his wickedness (8:22), and declares to the church at Jerusalem that God has given to the Gentiles also *metanoian eis zōēn* (11:18). (iii) *Paul*: In his Areopagus speech Paul tells the Athenians that in former times God overlooked the ignorance of the nations, but now (*nyn*) it is proclaimed to all men everywhere to convert (17:30). He tells the Ephesian elders that he has proclaimed *tēn eis theon metanoian* (20:21), and he similarly sums up his preaching before Herod Agrippa (26:20).

b) It is the positive element, however, which is made quite explicit and concrete in Acts. (i) *Faith*: We have noted Paul's reply to the Philippian jailer (16:31) above; to the Ephesian elders he declares that he has preached *pistin eis kyrion hēmōn Iēsoun* (20:21). His first long discourse, in Pisidian Antioch, proclaims: *en toutō pas ho pisteuōn dikaioutai* (13:39). Peter similarly emphasizes the role of faith in Jesus (cf. 10:43; 15:9). (ii) *The Name of Jesus*: In his first defense before the Sanhedrin, Peter explicitly announces that salvation is given to men in

⁹ According to Conzelmann, *metanoia* loses in Luke-Acts its comprehensive meaning: "*metanoia* alone is not an adequate description of the content of salvation or of the way to salvation" (*op. cit.*, p. 228). The process by which a person is saved can be divided into "repentance" and "conversion"; thus there are works which follow upon repentance that must now be considered separately (pp. 99-101). This theory is obviously demanded by his more general insight that Luke has transformed the primitive eschatological idea by a process of historicizing. Wilckens concurs (*op. cit.*, pp. 181-83), adding that while the reception of salvation is usually eschatological-futuristic in the rest of the kerygma, it is *present* according to Luke in the Name and Person of Jesus (p. 185). R. Michiels, "La conception lucanienne de la conversion," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 41 (1965) 42-78, studies the Lucan use of *metanoia-metanoēō* and concludes that in the third Gospel it is already taken from its eschatological cadre and made moral, not expressing the notion of conversion in its entirety, but the moral aspect, the preparation by man for the reception of faith. In Acts the essentially ecclesial nature of Lucan soteriology is evident.

the Name of Jesus, and in no other name (4:12). In 10:43 he declares that believers in Jesus receive the remission of sins through His Name. (iii) *Baptism*: "In His Name" is not simply a Semitic way of saying "through Him." The Joel citation of 2:21 announces: "And it will happen that whoever will call upon the Name of the Lord will be saved." When Peter outlines what his hearers must do to be saved in 2:38, he declares: *baptisthētō hekastos hymōn epi tō onomati Iēsou Christou*. In like manner Philip baptizes his converts in Samaria in the Name of the Lord Jesus (8:16), and Paul insists on baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus for the twelve Ephesian disciples (19:4-7), even though they have already been qualified as *pisteusantes*. The participial forms of *pisteuō* (whether present, aorist, or perfect) are used quite carefully in Acts. They denote those who, having accepted the apostolic message, have joined themselves to the community, or in some cases they denote the community itself (cf. 2:44; 4:32; 5:14; 15:5; 18:27; 19:18; 21:25; 22:19). The conclusion is inescapable: not just any faith is required for salvation, but that faith which is expressed in accepting baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus. Hence Peter commands that Cornelius and his household be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ, even though they have evidently already received the Holy Spirit (10:47 f.).

In summary: For the author of Luke-Acts, a man is saved by that change of heart which is motivated by faith in Jesus and expressed by baptism in His Name. Concretely, the various fruits of total conversion are all linked to such faith in Acts: (1) *Remission of Sins*: In 2:38 the remission of sins is said to be the result of baptism; in 10:43 it is the result of faith through His Name; in 26:18 it comes through faith in Jesus. (2) *Gift of the Holy Spirit*: In 2:38 and 19:2 the gift of the Holy Spirit seems to come through baptism; exceptionally, as in 10:44, it may precede it. The Holy Spirit is placed in close connection with faith in 15:9. (3) *Predestination to Eternal Life*: Paul declares in 13:48 that those who were destined for eternal life became believers (*episteusan*).

ROLE OF JESUS IN SALVATION

According to Luke, it is necessary to have faith in the Name of Jesus in order to be saved. But why should faith in Jesus produce these effects? How precisely does Jesus contribute to man's salvation?

1) *The Jesus-Event*. Essential to the understanding of the role of Jesus in Luke-Acts is the recognition that the complex, life-death-resurrection-ascension/glorification, constitutes a whole whose individual parts find their full meaning precisely in relation to the whole.

a) *analēpsis*: A major division in the third Gospel begins with the

announcement of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem in 9:51. Lk states that the days of His *analēmpsis* are about to be fulfilled. This word is a *hapax* in the Greek Bible, but from its occurrences in contemporary extrabiblical literature it may be concluded that "about the time when S. Luke wrote the word was probably becoming a sort of technical term for the 'Assumption of the Blessed.'"¹⁰ According to Klostermann, "It may be that the expression here does not intend to stress the isolated act of the Ascension but rather, like *exodos* (9:31), to include the different stages of the 'passage of Jesus from the terrestrial to the super-terrestrial life.'"¹¹

b) *anelēmphthē*:¹² That *analēmpsis* refers to the entire complex, life-death-resurrection-ascension/glorification, is shown by Luke's use of the aorist passive of *analambanō*. This form occurs only five times in the NT, of which four are in Acts. The fifth occurrence is in 1 Tim 3:16, which is evidently a Christian hymn. In place of a detailed listing of the salvific acts of Jesus, the last stich of the hymn says simply: *anelēmphthē en doxē*. The hymn is not "primitive," since it evidently stems from a time when the Gentile mission had been underway for some years (*ekērychthē en ethnesin*). At this time, probably not long before the composition of Luke-Acts, *anelēmphthē* was thought to be a satisfactory summary of the salvific acts that closed and immediately followed the earthly life of Jesus.

In Acts 10:16 *anelēmphthē* indicates the taking up into heaven of the vision seen by Peter. Otherwise it occurs only in the first chapter of Acts (vv. 2, 11, 22) and obviously refers to the ascension of Jesus. The threefold use of this unusual word undoubtedly signals the end of the *analēmpsis* begun in Lk 9:51.

Confirmation of this interpretation is found in the opening verse of Acts 2: *Kai en tō symplērousthai tēn hēmeran...* Outside of this verse the verb *symplēroō* is found only in Lk 8:23, in a realistic sense of a boat filling with water, and Lk 9:51. In this latter case the same infinitival construction is used, a clear indication that the *analēmpsis* of Jesus has ended, and the mission of His apostles is now about to begin.

2) *The Life of Jesus*. Since in the conception of Luke the *analēmpsis* of Jesus must be seen as a whole, the meaning of each part for the salvation of man can be understood only in its place in the total process.

¹⁰ A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke* (Edinburgh, 1901) p. 262.

¹¹ E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen, 1929) p. 111.

¹² Cf. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 262: "The verb *anelēmphthē* is frequent in N.T., and may be called the usual biblical expression for ascending into heaven: Mk 16,19; Acts 1, 2.11.22; 10,16; 1 Tim 3,16. Cf 1 Macc 2,58; Sir 48,9; 49,14; 2K 2,11."

The life of Jesus is presented above all as a life lived in complete conformity with the will of God. Several theme-words indicate this Lucan preoccupation:

a) *dei* (Mt 8 times; Mk 6; Lk 18; Acts 24): In Mk Jesus is quite naturally portrayed as obeying the will of God in all things; the notion is expressed in a variety of ways (cf. 9:12; 12:10 f.; 14:21, 27, 36). But in only one text does he employ the verb *dei* to indicate the strange necessity which governed the life of Jesus, namely, the first prediction of the Passion (Mk 8:31; cf. Mt 16:21; Lk 9:22): *dei ton huion tou anthrōpou polla pathein*. Mt adds another text (26:54), but in Lk the expression becomes thematic:¹³ in 2:49 the boy Jesus declares that He must be occupied in the affairs of (house of?) His Father; in 4:43 the mature Jesus states that He must preach the kingdom; in 13:33 He must be on His way; in 17:25 He declares again that the Son of Man must first suffer many things; in 19:5 He says that He must stay the night at the house of Zaccheus; in 22:37 He declares that what has been written must be fulfilled in Him; in 24:7 He reminds the women after the Resurrection that He had foretold to them that He had to suffer and die, and then rise; in 24:26 He teaches the disciples on the way to Emmaus that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer; and in 24:44 He sums up all His teaching to the apostles thus: "It is necessary that all that has been written in the law of Moses, in the prophets and in the psalms concerning me be fulfilled."¹⁴

b) *horizō*: This verb is used only eight times in the NT, once each in Lk, Rom, and Heb, and five times in Acts. The key texts in Luke-Acts are as follows: (i) Lk 22:22: "The Son of Man goes on His way according to what has been foreordained (*kata to hōrismenon*)."¹⁵ (ii) Acts 2:23: "You killed this man who was delivered up by the foreordained (*hōrismenē*) will and knowledge of God" (cf. Acts 4:28). (iii) Acts 10:42: "This man is the one foreordained (*hōrismenos*) by God as judge of the living and the dead" (cf. Acts 17:31).

c) *poreuomai* (Mt 28 times; Mk 1; Lk 53; Acts 40): This verb seems ordinary enough, and at first one would not expect it to be thematic. Indeed in Mt, in only 3 of the 28 occurrences of the verb is Jesus the subject. But in Lk the verb is used 16 times of Jesus, either alone or with others. The first use, in 4:30 after the rejection in His home town, sets the tone: *autos de dielthōn dia mesou autōn eporeueto*. Jesus is "on His way," and the verb is repeated in 4:42, 7:6, and

¹³ Cf. W. Grundmann, "dei," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 2 (Stuttgart, 1935) 22 f.; E. Fascher, "Theologische Beobachtungen zu dei," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin, 1954) p. 246.

¹⁴ Cf. U. Luck, "Kerygma, Tradition und Geschichte Jesu bei Lukas," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 57 (1960) 63.

7:11. At the Transfiguration He speaks with Moses and Elijah about His *exodos*, which He is about to make (or, more correctly, to fulfil) to Jerusalem (9:31). This journey begins in 9:51: *autos to prosōpon estērisen tou poreuesthai eis Ierousalēm*. We are constantly reminded that He is on His way (9:52, 53, 56; 10:38; 17:11), and when the Pharisees warn Him to go out and *poreuou enteuthen* (13:31), for Herod seeks His life, He makes the strange reply that "today and tomorrow it is necessary (*dei*) for me to be on my way" (13:33). In 22:22 we learn the destination of this journey: "The Son of Man goes on His way according to what has been foreordained, but woe to that man by whom He has been handed over." His entire life has been a going forth to the cross.¹³

3) *The Death of Jesus*. Thus the death of Jesus is, according to the divine plan, the goal and perfection of His life.

a) Lk 13:32 f.: "Behold I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and on the third day I will be perfected (*teleioumai*). But it is necessary (*dei*) for me to go on my way (*poreuesthai*) today and tomorrow and the following day, for it is not right that a prophet should perish outside of Jerusalem."

b) Lk 23:46: While all three Synoptic Gospels have Jesus say in the second prediction of the Passion that the Son of Man will be handed over into the hands of men (*eis cheiras anthrōpōn*: Mk 9:31; Mt 17:22; Lk 9:44), only Lk records the final word of Jesus at His death: "Father, into thy hands (*eis cheiras sou*) I commit my spirit."

4) *Messiahship*. For Lk, this perfecting of Jesus is specifically the perfection of the Messiah, the anointed one of God.

a) In his infancy narrative Luke makes it clear that the promise made to the fathers will be fulfilled in Jesus (1:55, 69-79). He refers to Him explicitly as the Christ in 2:11 and 2:26. Indirect references are many, especially 1:32, in which he says that Jesus will inherit the throne of David His father (cf. Acts 2:30).

b) The Isaiah citation that introduces the apostolate of John the Baptist is common to all three Synoptic Gospels, but only Lk (cf. Jn 1:19-27) has the crowd wonder if John might be the Christ (3:15). John replies to their wondering (*apekrinato*: Mt and Mk have the logion which follows, but not as a reply to such wondering) that the one stronger than he is coming, one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire, who will accomplish a great purification among the people (3:16 f.). Several elements in John's response merit closer attention:

¹³ Cf. F. Hauck and S. Schulz, "*poreuomai*," *TWNT* 6 (Stuttgart, 1959) 574. The Lucan conception of the "way" of Jesus is noted in W. C. Robinson, *Der Weg des Herrn* (Hamburg, 1964) esp. pp. 39-43.

i) The Stronger One (*ho ischyroteros*): This designation occurs only three times in the *NT*: in this response of John, in the parallel passage of Mk (1:7), and in Lk 11:22. This last-mentioned text is particularly interesting in that all three Synoptic Gospels record the Beelzebul controversy in which Satan is characterized as the *ischyros* (Mk 3:27; Mt 12:29; Lk 11:21), but only Lk refers to the *ischyroteros* who will defeat Satan and strip him of his power.¹⁶ In the light of Lk 1:68-74, the title *ho ischyroteros* clearly attributes to Jesus the function of the Messiah, who will liberate the people from the power of Satan.

ii) The Eschatological Judgment:¹⁷ John declares in 3:16b that the Stronger One will baptize in the Holy Spirit and fire. Some exegetes have interpreted this as meaning that the Holy Spirit will be given to those who are found worthy, whereas the wicked will be punished by fire. But such an interpretation seems to be precluded by 3:17, in which both wind (the metaphor of the threshing floor) and fire are represented as purifying agents, the wind separating the wheat from the chaff, and the fire destroying the chaff. The fire is "unquenchable," a reference to the unquenchable fire of Is 66:24, which comes at the end of a passage on eschatological purification and judgment. Moreover, the textual tradition for *hagiō* (the *Holy Spirit*) in Lk 3:16b is not altogether certain. While the overwhelming ms. evidence supports the reading, it is omitted in two minuscules (63 and 64), and by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian; thus it may surely be judged the *lectio difficilior*. Even if we accept the reading *hagiō*, van Imschoot explains that the "spirit" (or wind) may be said to be holy because it is from God.¹⁸ The "baptism" in wind and fire is a metaphorical representation of the eschatological purification and judgment by the one who is coming, contrasted here with the preparatory water baptism of repentance of John. Thus John points to the one coming after him as he who

¹⁶ According to S. Légasse, "L'Homme fort' de Luc 11,21-22," *Novum testamentum* 5 (1962) 5-9, the root of the tradition of Jesus as the Stronger One is to be found in Is 53:12. This suggests to him a possible connection with the Deutero-Isaian Servant concept. M. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (London, 1959) pp. 73 f., doubts the influence of Is 53:12. On the other hand, she finds certain the influence of the LXX version of Is 49:24 f. on the logion in all three Synoptic Gospels; but this does not prove for her any influence of the Servant concept. "Again, this passage is an indication that Jesus was familiar with Deutero-Isaiah, but it sheds no light on the problem of his identification with the Servant, since it is not the Servant in this passage who defeats the strong man but Yahweh himself, so that Jesus' activity fulfills the redemptive work of God."

¹⁷ Cf. P. van Imschoot, "Baptême d'eau et baptême d'Esprit saint," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 13 (1936) 653-66; also E. Best, "Spirit-Baptism," *Novum testamentum* 4 (1960) 236-46.

¹⁸ Van Imschoot, *art. cit.*, p. 661.

will accomplish the eschatological judgment, in other words, the Messiah. In Acts, Luke designates the sending of the Spirit in the words of Jesus (1:5) as the fulfilment of these words of John.

c) Jesus opens His ministry in Lk (and only in Lk), preaching in His home town. His first words are a citation of Is 61:1: *pneuma kyriou ep' eme, hou heineken echrisen me* (Lk 4:18). While all three Synoptic Gospels record the descent of the Spirit connected with the baptism of Jesus, only Lk describes Him as full of the Holy Spirit (4:1) and only Lk has Him begin His ministry with this qualification (4:14). Thus Jesus has been anointed by the Spirit. In Acts 4:27 this anointing is mentioned again (*hon echrisas*) in close proximity to a reference to the Anointed of the Lord (4:26), an indication that Luke is aware of the relation between *chriō* and *christos* and intends its implications. Again Jesus is hailed as a great prophet (Lk 7:16; cf. 7:38 ff.), reminiscent of the prophet like Moses foretold by Dt 18:15, 18.

d) In the Passion narrative only Lk has the notion that the accusers of Jesus described Him as *legonta heauton christon basilea einai* (23:2). More significantly, while Mk makes one reference to *ho christos ho basileus* (15:32; Mt in 27:42 says simply *basileus*) in the blaspheming words of the mockers on Calvary, Lk distinguishes three charges: (i) The *archontes* say: "He saved others, let Him save Himself, if He be the Christ of God, the elect one" (23:35). (ii) The soldiers say: "If you are the king of the Jews, save yourself" (23:37). (iii) Even one of those crucified with him blasphemes: "Are you the Christ? Save yourself and us" (23:39).

We note Lk's insistence on Jesus mocked as the Christ, and the connection with salvation we have noted above. Moreover, in Mt and Mk the mockers declare that if Jesus comes down from the cross they will believe, a statement which is significantly missing from the account of Lk.

In the question of the high priest at the trial of Jesus, all three accounts ask if Jesus be the Christ. Mt adds "the son of God" (26:24); Mk adds "the son of the Blessed One" (14:61). Lk alone is satisfied with the simple question: "Are you the Christ?" (22:67), relegating "son of God" to a second question (22:70).

e) It is especially in the words of the risen Jesus that we learn the connection between being obedient to the will of God, even in His passion and death, and being perfected as the Christ. Thus in 24:26 Jesus asks: "Was it not necessary for the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory?" The next verse tells us that He demonstrated this thesis to the two disciples, beginning with Moses and all the prophets (cf. 24:46).

f) Lk's account of the apostolic preaching insists that Jesus is the

Christ: in Jerusalem (2:36; 5:42), in Samaria (8:5), in the first preaching of the converted Saul (9:22), in Paul's preaching in the synagogue at Thessalonica (17:3) and in Corinth (18:5), and in Apollo's preaching in Corinth (18:28). What Jesus Himself did not preach (cf. the response to the high priest, proper to Lk, when Jesus was asked if He were the Christ: "If I should say it to you, you will not believe": Lk 22:68), and would not allow to be preached (cf. 9:20 f.) before His death has become a principal theme of apostolic preaching.

5) *Cause of Salvation*. For Luke, it is the glorification of Jesus as Messiah that enables Him to be *now* a cause of salvation for men.

a) Because Jesus was completely obedient to the divine plan, even accepting the Passion and death foreordained for Him, God did not allow Him to be held captive by death, but raised Him up and seated Him in majesty at His right hand (Acts 2:24-36), making Him Lord and Christ, and enabling Him to bestow the promised Spirit upon men.

b) Luke's use of the title *kyrios* for Jesus gives evidence of the same care that he has employed for *christos*.¹⁹

i) In the narrative sections of the Gospel, it is true, Luke more than the other Evangelists refers to Jesus as the Lord (Mt 0; Mk 0; Jn 5; Lk 13).²⁰ But, other than the vocative *kyrie*, which "as a common form of respectful address hardly holds the same possibilities as *kyrios*,"²¹ the title is restricted on the lips of men to three cases: 1:43, 76; 19:31. (Angels are, of course, allowed to use it: 2:11). In 1:76 the reference to Jesus is only one of the possible interpretations, and a Christian one at that; the ambiguous *kyrios* for God or Jesus occurs frequently only in Acts. Elizabeth's greeting to Mary (1:43) is inspired prophecy, and 19:31,34 is the phrase of Jesus Himself. As a general rule, then, Luke does not write back into the life of Jesus a title which seems to be postresurrectional in his view (Acts 2:36).

ii) The Gospel, however, prepares us by various hints and foreshadowings for the Lordship of Jesus. The clearest affirmation in the infancy narrative occurs in the announcement of the angel to the shepherds of Bethlehem: "Today has been born to you a saviour who is Christ the Lord" (2:11).²² Elizabeth's greeting to Mary makes the same affirmation: "Whence does it happen to me that the mother of

¹⁹ C. F. D. Moule, "The Christology of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (New York, 1966) pp. 159-85, esp. 160 f.

²⁰ H. Cadbury, "The Titles of Jesus in Acts," in *The Beginnings of Christianity* 1/5 (London, 1935) 359.

²¹ Moule, *art. cit.*, p. 160.

²² While the textual evidence is not unanimous, the witnesses are overwhelmingly in favor of *christos kyrios*. The poorly attested *christos kyriou* may be influenced by 2:26, where *ton christon kyriou* is unanimously attested.

my Lord should come to me" (1:43)? In the ministry of Jesus the only clear foreshadowing of His Lordship occurs in the Son of David controversy (Lk 20:41-44), common to all three Synoptic writers, in which David is shown to have addressed the Messiah as Lord. But there are other hints in the words of Jesus (cf. 6:5; 19:31,34); moreover, He declares in 4:18 that the Spirit of the Lord is upon Him, and in 13:35 that He will come in the name of the Lord (cf. 19:38).

iii) But immediately after the Resurrection the disciples refer to Him as the Lord (24:34). Cadbury's remark is correct, that *kyrios Iēsous (Christos)* seems to have been considered by Luke "as the appropriate way to speak of Him within the Christian circle. Certainly for use within that circle Luke has no other term for Jesus except the simple form *ho kyrios*."²³

c) The special connection of all of this with salvation is that Jesus as the Christ (and Lord) has ushered in the Messianic age of salvation, when God pours forth His Spirit upon His people (cf. especially Ez 36:23-28; Is 42:5; 57:16). Hence Peter's citation of Joel in Acts 2:17-21; the event of Pentecost witnessed by the crowd was the inbreaking of the Spirit of God upon His people. Peter explicitly states that the promise has been fulfilled by the glorified Jesus, who, constituted Christ and Lord by God (2:36), has poured forth the Spirit (2:33).

Therefore, in the theological outlook of Luke the life and death of Jesus lead directly to His glorification by God, which constitutes Him *now* as a cause of salvation for men.

THE ACTS OF JESUS AND SALVATION

Thus an investigation of the texts of Luke-Acts yields what may be termed a mediate influence of the life and death of Jesus upon man's salvation, that is, the life and death of Jesus affect man inasmuch as they have led to the glorification of Jesus by which He has been established cause of salvation. But a further question must be answered: Does the life and death of Jesus have any relation in itself to man's salvation, any intrinsic soteriological value? Obviously a response to this question must include an analysis of the meaning of salvation in Luke-Acts, considered as a psychological reality in human existence. It is only through an understanding of what it means for a man to be saved that the true soteriological value of the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts can be seen.

1) *Acts 17:31*. In the conclusion of his Areopagus address, Paul depicts God as "offering faith to all men, raising Him [the man who has been appointed judge, namely, Jesus] from the dead" (17:31).

²³ Cadbury, *art. cit.*, p. 360.

This declaration is open to two different interpretations: (a) God has raised Jesus from the dead (and made Him Christ and Lord); thus men can have faith in Jesus, and expect salvation from Him. (b) The fact that God raised Jesus from the dead gives man hope that if he is associated with Jesus he too may rise from the dead. Thus faith in the Name of Jesus is both possible and meaningful. From all that has been said, it is obvious that the first interpretation is quite in harmony with Luke's theological perspectives. Is the second?

2) *charis*. The understanding of certain texts of Acts, which have a direct bearing on the validity of the second interpretation, will depend to a large extent on the meaning of the word *charis* in Luke-Acts:

a) It is only Luke among the three Synoptic authors who uses the noun *charis* (8 times in the Gospel, 17 times in Acts; it appears in Jn only 3 times, all in the prologue) and the verb *charizomai* (3 times in the Gospel, 4 times in Acts; it does not appear in Jn).

b) The verb *charizomai* in Luke-Acts always has the idea of giving something which is not due, but which manifests the favor of the giver for the recipient. In Lk 7:21 Jesus gives sight to the blind; in 7:42 f. He speaks of remitting or cancelling a debt; in Acts 3:14 reference is made to Pilate's releasing of Barabbas, a favor which the Roman procurator granted the Jews each year at the feast; in Acts 25:11,16 there is question of "doing someone a favor"; and in Acts 27:24 the lives of those on board ship are given to Paul as a favor.

c) The notion of "favor" or benevolence, whether as a disposition or as an individual action flowing from such a disposition, is basic to the use of the noun *charis* in Luke-Acts:

i) As an action: In Acts 24:27 and 25:3,9 the term *charis* evidently refers to a favor that one does for another (cf. *charizomai* in Acts 25:11,16). In Lk 6:32,33,34 *charis* seems to be the equivalent of *misthos* in the corresponding text of Mt (5:46); indeed, Luke himself sums up by using the word *misthos* in 6:35. Thus *charis* has the sense of reward or recompense, though the nuance of "favor" is not lost, man's relation to God never being put on a plane of strict justice, as is clearly indicated in Lk 17:9.

ii) As a passive quality: Another series of texts denotes a passive quality in the subject, that is, the subject's finding favor in the sight of another. In Lk 1:30 the angel tells Mary that she has found "favor" before God. In 2:52 we are told that Jesus grew in *charis* before God and men, which indicates an observable quality, as we say that a person is favored by God (cf. 2:40, which will be considered below). The community of believers finds favor in the sight of all the people in Acts 2:47 and 4:33. In 7:10 we are told of Moses' favor before Phar-

aoh, and in 7:46 of David's favor in God's sight. To this series of texts we should add two other instances less clear in themselves: Acts 6:8, in which Stephen is described as being *plērēs charitos*, and Acts 18:27, in which Apollos is able to contribute much to the believers of Corinth *dia tēs charitos*. This latter instance may refer to the benevolence of the Ephesian community, i.e., to the favor they did for Apollos in writing to the Corinthian community about him; or it may refer to the favor with which he was received by the Corinthian community itself; or—and the same is true for 6:8—it may refer to *charis* in the following acceptance.

iii) A final series of texts denotes an active quality, a disposition of benevolence in the subject in favor of someone else. (a) In Lk 2:40, Acts 11:23, 13:43, 14:26, and 20:24 there is mention of the *charis tou theou* (cf. 15:40, which speaks of the *charis tou kyriou* in the same context as 14:26). Here the meaning is a permanent subjective disposition, the favor or benevolence of God for man. In Acts 11:23 Barnabas is able to notice the effects of the favor of God in the community of Antioch. Similarly, the *charis theou*, which is said to be upon the infant Jesus in Lk 2:40, seems to be observable before men in 2:52. Acts 13:43, 14:26, and 15:40 probably refer to a current Christian blessing. In 20:24 Paul declares that he has borne witness to the *euaggelion tēs charitos tou theou*; the meaning of this text will be considered below. (b) Acts 20:32: Paul commends the elders of Ephesus to the Lord and *tō logō tēs charitos autou*, "which is able to build (you) up (*oikodomēsai*) and to give the inheritance to all the sanctified." The same expression occurs in Acts 14:3 and undoubtedly lies behind the expression *epi tois logois tēs charitos* of Lk 4:22. Again the meaning of this expression will be investigated later. (c) Acts 15:11: "But through the favor of the Lord Jesus (*dia tēs charitos tou kyriou Iēsou*) we believe that we have been saved in the same manner as they" (non-Jews). This statement concludes Peter's decisive intervention in the council at Jerusalem, which was to decide the question of circumcision for non-Jewish members of the new community. Obviously the statement can be interpreted in two ways: that we have been saved through the graciousness of Jesus, who is Lord and has the power to save us; or that we have been saved by participating in the favor which Jesus has in the sight of God. This ambiguity is similar to that detected for Acts 17:31 above.

Whatever solution to the ambiguity of the key texts (15:11; 20:24; 20:32) is adopted, it may be concluded that in almost all of its occurrences *charis* clearly refers to an active disposition of favor for someone (invariably of God for man in these texts), or to an action resulting

from this disposition, or to a passive disposition of being favored by another. In no text is this family of meanings to be excluded.

3) Key texts are Acts 20:24, 20:32, and 15:11.

a) *Acts 20:24*: Paul refers to finishing his course and the ministry (*diakonia*) which he received from the Lord Jesus, to bear witness to *to euaggelion tēs charitos tou theou*.

i) This is a solemn declaration of Paul, the last statement about the nature of his work that he will make to a Christian audience (21:19 is a general recapitulation).

ii) The word *diakonia* occurs only once in the Gospels, in Lk 10:40. The incident is not recounted by Mt and Mk; Jn has something similar and uses the verb *diakoneō* (12:2, as does Lk in 10:40) but not the noun. In contrast, the noun occurs eight times in Acts, frequently in the Pauline epistles, and once each in Heb and Ap. The usage of the word in Acts finds a remarkable parallel in Paul. (a) In Acts 6:1 *diakonia* has the general meaning of "service," which it has also in 1 Cor 16:15 and Heb 1:14. (b) In Acts 1:17 it refers to the participation of Judas in "this ministry" (*elachen ton klēron tēs diakonias tautēs*), i.e., the ministry of the apostles. In 1:25 Peter declares that one must be chosen to take the place of this ministry and apostolate (*labein ton topon tēs diakonias tautēs kai apostolēs*). The word *apostolē* occurs only here in Acts, but it occurs three other times in the NT, all in Paul's letters, and all in key texts referring to his apostolic mission (Rom 1:5; 1 Cor 9:2; Gal 2:8). Acts 6:4 defines the duties of the apostles as prayer and the ministry of the word. In Paul the most frequent meaning of *diakonia* is precisely the Christian apostolic ministry (Rom 12:7; 1 Cor 12:5; 2 Cor 3:7-9; 4:1; 6:3; 11:8; Eph 4:12; Col 4:17; 1 Tim 1:12; 2 Tim 4:5,11; cf. Ap 2:19). (c) In Acts 11:29 and 12:25 *diakonia* refers to the assistance sent by the church of Antioch to the community at Jerusalem during the famine through the hands of Paul and Barnabas. This, of course, is an exact parallel to the designation of Paul's collection for the community of Jerusalem as *diakonia* in Rom 15:31; 2 Cor 8:4; 9:1; 12:13. (d) In Acts 21:19 Paul reports to James on the work that God has accomplished among the Gentiles through his ministry. Similarly, in Rom 11:13 Paul declares to the Gentiles that he is apostle to the Gentiles, and he boasts of his ministry. (e) Acts 20:24 is the clearest statement by Paul in Acts of exactly what his ministry is: *diamartyresthai to euaggelion tēs charitos tou theou*. This statement finds a remarkable parallel in the text in the Pauline epistles which gives the clearest notion of what Paul's *diakonia* is: all is God's doing, who reconciles us to Himself through Christ and gives us the *ministry* of the reconciliation, inasmuch as God

was reconciling the world to Himself in Christ, not holding men's faults against them, and entrusting to us the message (*logon*) of reconciliation (2 Cor 5:18 f.). The concept of "reconciliation" is proper to Paul (*katallassō* and *katallagē* occur only in Rom, 1 Cor, and 2 Cor), but basically what Paul is declaring in 2 Cor 5:18 f. is what Luke has him say in Acts 20:24: he is proclaiming the good news of God's favor for men through Jesus. We recall that in Acts 13:39 f. Paul proclaims that remission of sins is being announced to men through Jesus, and in Acts 10:36 Peter describes God as *euaggelizomenos eirēnēn dia Iēsou Christou*, which Haenchen paraphrases: "In sending this message (through the apostles), God announces the peace between men and Himself which Jesus Christ has restored."²⁴ Hence Acts 20:24 defines the mission of Paul, his *diakonia*, as the proclamation of God's favor for men.

b) Acts 20:32: What then is the *logos tēs charitos autou* if not this same message of the favor of God for men? Acts 14:3 must be interpreted in the same manner, and it would seem that the words of Jesus in Lk 4:22 foreshadow the same preaching.

c) Acts 15:11: The good news announced by the apostolic message is the favor of God for men; this favor implies the remission of sins and is given to all those who have faith in Jesus, which means all those who are baptized in His Name. Thus the alternate explanation of Acts 15:11 (and 17:31) proposed above is justified: by associating himself with Jesus by a public act of belonging (baptism in His Name), man participates in the favor which Jesus has with God.

4) *The Acts of Jesus as Salvific*. Conversion, as preached in Luke-Acts, comports a positive act of faith in Jesus, of accepting a dedication inspired by all He stands for. His life was one of conformity to God's will, as proven by His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father. Thus in His life, death, and resurrection the favor of God for man may be seen, and a man is motivated to make an act of faith in His Name. This explains why the apostolic preaching insists on the conformity with God's will in the life of Jesus, but also why the proclamation of the Resurrection plays so central a place. Indeed, apart from it the death of Jesus has no meaning for Luke.²⁵

²⁴ E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1965) p. 297.

²⁵ Cf. U. Wilckens, "Interpreting Luke-Acts in a Period of Existentialist Theology," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (New York, 1966) pp. 60-83; e.g., p. 66: "If one allows Luke himself to speak, then it is obvious that the center of his scheme is the idea that in Jesus the fullness of God's salvation was truly present and was for all time established by the resurrection."

It is in this light that we must understand the *aphesis hamartiōn* in Luke-Acts:

a) Use of the word *aphesis* in Luke-Acts: (i) The word occurs only twice outside of the expression *aphesis hamartiōn*, both in the citation of Is 61:1 and 58:6 in Lk 4:18. Here the meaning is clearly "freedom" or "liberation."²⁶ (ii) The *aphesis hamartiōn* is always connected with either *metanoia* (Lk 3:3; Acts 5:31) or with faith in the Name of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18); in one case (Lk 24:47) both elements are mentioned. Lk 1:77 is an apparent exception, but the expression *gnōsin sōtērias* undoubtedly foreshadows the more specific terms, as a comparison with Acts 5:31 clearly shows.²⁷ Thus the *aphesis hamartiōn* is always a direct result of the conversion mentioned above.

b) Meaning of *aphesis hamartiōn*: The foregoing study of *charis* in Luke-Acts led to the conclusion that the *aphesis hamartiōn* that is to be acquired according to Luke-Acts by a conversion to Jesus Christ consists in a consciousness of having the favor of God through Jesus. Thus he who has faith in the meaning of the death and resurrection of Jesus has confidence that whatever his past actions may have been, they do not separate him from God; he has obtained a "liberation" from the conviction of estrangement from God which resulted from his sins.

c) A clear confirmation of this interpretation is contained in one of the most beautiful parables proper to Lk, the parable of the prodigal son. The son is conscious that he has sinned (Lk 15:18: *hēmarton eis ton ouranon kai enōpion sou*) and that his sins have destroyed the intimacy he once had with his father, so that he is no longer worthy to be considered as son (Lk 15:19). But the father, as soon as he perceives that the son is returning, is moved by compassion, runs to greet his son, and bestows gifts upon him to convince him that his acceptance as son is complete (Lk 15:20-23), for "this is my son who was dead and has returned to life" (Lk 15:24). Thus, for Lk Jesus has given us by word and example a true knowledge of God and His abiding favor for those who turn to Him.^{27a}

²⁶ According to R. Bultmann, "aphesis," *TWNT* 1 (Stuttgart, 1933) 508, "Even where *aphesis* is to be understood as liberation (twice in Lk 4:18, on the basis of Is 61:1 and 58:6), liberation at least includes the idea of forgiveness." Conversely, the notion of liberation is always contained in the Lucan use of *aphesis*.

²⁷ Compare Lk 1:77, *tou dounai gnōsin sōtērias tō laō en aphesei harmartiōn autōn*, with Acts 5:31, *dounai metanoian tō Israēl kai aphesin hamartiōn*.

^{27a} Cf. E. Linnemann, *Jesus of the Parables* (New York, 1966) pp. 76-78; D. O. Via, *The Parables* (Philadelphia, 1967) pp. 172-74.

d) This, of course, does not in any way mean that there is no ethical imperative for the Christian.²⁸ Faith in Jesus Christ and entrance into the community in His Name imply that one has taken on the same commitment as Jesus, that one wishes to live in the same manner as He. Luke clearly indicates this in Acts: (i) He refers to the new community and its beliefs as "the way" (*hē hodos*: 9:2; 19:9,23; 22:4; 24:14,22). In this light what was said above about the verb *poreuomai* and "the way" of Jesus to the cross acquires a directive value for the personal life of the Christian. (ii) He employs the word *dei* for the apostles in the same way as for Jesus in the third Gospel; like Him they are to follow the way indicated by the divine will (cf. Acts 5:29; 9:6,16; 14:22; 19:21; 20:35; 23:11; 27:24).

THEOLOGY OF SATISFACTION

The notion of satisfaction is a theological explanation of the relation of the death of Jesus to our salvation. Whether or not this theological explanation is actually present in the Pauline epistles is disputed,²⁹ but it is certainly true that the formulation of this theological position has leaned heavily on expressions found therein. The question of interest at the moment, however, is whether or not such a theological explanation is justified on the basis of Luke-Acts.

1) *Absence in Luke-Acts.* Recent exegesis has tended to respond in the negative.

a) The reason most frequently alleged against a Lucan theology of satisfaction is the complete absence from the apostolic preaching in Acts of an expression stating that Jesus died *peri* or *hyper hamartiōn*. The expression occurs frequently in the Pauline epistles, and as early as 1 Th 5:10. One wonders how an exposition of the preaching of the primitive Church could fail to use the expression at least once, especially in the discourses attributed to Paul.

b) The brief episode of the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee (Mk 10:35-40; Mt 20:20-23) is not found in Lk, but the dispute over precedence among the disciples which follows it (Mk 10:41-45; Mt 20:24-28) is found in Lk's account of the Last Supper. It is noteworthy that Mk's statement in 10:45, that the Son of Man has come "to give His life as a ransom for many" (*dounai tēn psychēn autou lytron anti*

²⁸ J. Dupont, "La conversion dans les Actes des apôtres," in *Etudes sur les Actes des apôtres* (Paris, 1967) pp. 473-75.

²⁹ Cf. S. Lyonnet, "De notione expiationis," *Verbum domini* 37 (1959) 336-52; 38 (1960) 65-75, 241-61. Lyonnet argues that in Paul the redemption is operated by the intercessory prayer of Jesus to a merciful God and not by an expiatory sacrifice to an exacting God.

pollōn), is not found in Luke, who certainly knew Mk. The omission is commonly taken as a deliberate avoidance of what might appear to be a theology of satisfaction.³⁰

c) It has been suggested on the basis of Lk 24:21 (*hēmeis de ēlpizomen hoti autos estin ho mellōn lytrōsthai ton Israēl*) that Luke saw the death of Jesus as a satisfaction for sin. But in the first place the verb *lytroomai* need not imply a theology of satisfaction. In Tit 2:14 it is explicitly stated: *hina lytrōsetai hēmas apo pasēs anomias*. In Lk 24:21 there is no such qualification, nor does the use of *lytrōsis* in Lk 1:68 and 2:38 demand such an interpretation. Actually Lk 24:21 is presented as the reflection of one who was still "foolish and slow of heart" (24:25). He declares: "But we were hoping that He was the one who would liberate Israel." Rather than see here an indication of a theology of satisfaction on the part of the author, we should do better to see a parallel to Acts 1:6, in which a disciple asks Jesus if in this time He will restore the kingdom to Israel.

d) Lk 22:19 f.: A more serious objection is posed by the words of institution of the Eucharist of Lk 22:19 f. First Jesus says that His body "has been given for you." Then taking the cup He says: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed in your behalf (*hyper hymōn*)." But several observations tell against the probative force of this text. (i) The text is not secure. Many exegetes favor the so-called "short text" of Codex Bezae, which omits 22:19b-20. It is asserted that Lk reproduced an earlier tradition according to which the Last Supper was a farewell banquet, and that later through the influence of a more developed cult the words of institution were inserted into the text after the tradition recorded in 1 Cor 11:23 ff. (ii) If 22:19b-20 is taken as authentic, however, there is still the fact that this text is one of only two references to the blood of Christ which might seem to reflect some kind of theology of satisfaction. The Pauline influence is incontestable, and it is clear that these words of institution were part of the cult of the community when Lk was written. The reason for including them need not have been Luke's theological perspective, but a fidelity to the traditions of the community of his time. (iii) Moreover, it is not at all evident that the words reflect a theology of satisfaction. Jesus declares that His blood is shed "for you," i.e., for the disciples, but understood as representing all who would be disciples. There is no question of a death "for sins," of giving His life as a "redemption." The words are capable of an interpretation completely

³⁰ Cf. Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 201, and Cadbury, *art. cit.*, p. 366. J. Dupont, *Le discours de Milet* (Paris, 1962) p. 183, is not convinced by this reasoning and is unimpressed by the previous argument from silence.

in harmony with the Lucan perspective regarding the salvific nature of the death of Jesus that we have outlined above.

e) *Acts 20:28*: The other text in which Luke seems to refer to a redemptive value of the death of Jesus occurs in the address of Paul to the Ephesian elders at Miletus in which he refers to "the Church of God, which He acquired"³¹ through the blood of His Own." The thorny textual problems of this text need not concern us here;³² it is clear that there is a reference to the blood of Jesus and that in some way the existence of the community is said to be due to this blood. Again several observations are in order. (i) While the reference to the blood of Jesus seems certain, the text itself has always presented considerable difficulties to scribes and commentators alike. The expression *dia haimatos tou idiou* has been widely corrected to *dia idiou haimatos* by scribes and early Fathers. Hort, regarding the translation "through the blood that was His own" (i.e., His Son's) as based on bad Greek, postulated an original *huiou* that had been omitted after *idiou* by haplography. But this is pure conjecture and has not met with universal support.³³ (ii) Again we note that this reference to the blood of Jesus is the exception rather than the rule in Luke-Acts. Moreover, it occurs in a speech of Paul in which many "Paulinisms" have been detected.³⁴ It is quite conceivable that Luke reproduced these words from some Pauline source. (iii) Further, this text is not evidence for a theology of satisfaction in Luke. There is no mention of a redemptive death for sins; and that the community should result from the death of Jesus, while not perhaps a clear statement of Lucan thought (for him, the death of Jesus has salvific value only in the light of the Resurrection), it is in no way in contradiction to it.

2) *The Suffering Servant*. It has been argued that, faced with the

³¹ The verb *peripoieomai* occurs only three times in the *NT*. In Lk 17:33 it means to save or preserve something. The meaning given here agrees with that of 1 Tim 3:13. The noun *peripoiēsis* occurs five times in the *NT* (Eph 1:14; 1 Th 5:9; 2 Th 2:14; Heb 10:39; 1 Pt 2:9). It would seem to be a word coined by Christian tradition, since it does not occur in Greek writers before the Christian era. The phrase employed by Luke in Acts 20:28 seems, then, to reflect early Christian tradition.

³² Cf. C. DeVine, "The 'Blood of God' in Acts 20, 28," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 9 (1947) 381-408. The author surveys ms. evidence, the versions, the Fathers, and most of the relevant literature. He concludes that the reading "Church of God" is primitive since it explains the variant "Church of the Lord" (introduced by a scribe to avoid a Patripassianist interpretation), while the reverse is not true. Moreover, he argues that while "Church of God" is a good Pauline expression, "Church of the Lord" is not, and there is ample evidence that Luke has given a Pauline flavor to the discourse.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 405. J. Dupont, *Les problèmes du livre des Actes* (Louvain, 1950), is quite critical of DeVine's article; he favors the conjecture of Hort (pp. 92 f.).

³⁴ H. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," in *The Beginnings of Christianity* 1/5 (London, 1935) 402-27; cf. 412 f.

stumbling block of the death of Jesus, the early community sought the explanation in the Servant Song of Is 53, which was interpreted as Messianic by Palestinian rabbis in early times.⁴⁵ Passages in this chapter refer to the vicarious suffering of the Servant, which is then alleged as the basis of a redemptive-satisfaction interpretation of the relation of the death of Jesus to our salvation. But there are evidences in Luke-Acts of the application of the Deutero-Isaian concept of the Servant of Yahweh to Jesus. Therefore a theology of satisfaction is indicated in Luke-Acts.

a) In evaluating this argument, the first question which must be considered is the *fact* of the influence of the notion of the Servant of Yahweh of Deutero-Isaiah on the thought content of the discourses attributed to the early community by the Acts. (i) While admitting that the title *pais* was used of Jesus in early Christianity and was derived from the OT, Cadbury⁴⁶ doubts that it can be traced to the influence of Deutero-Isaiah; he prefers to see an application of the title to Jesus in a way similar to its use for noted personages of the OT. He offers a convincing refutation of the arguments brought forth in favor of such an influence by Harnack.⁴⁷ (ii) But there are two examples often alleged in favor of Deutero-Isaian influence which make such influence probable, namely, 3:13 (*edoxasen ton paida autou*; cf. Is 52:13: *idou synēsei ho pais mou kai doxasthēsetai sphodra*) and 8:32 f., which cites Is 53:7 f. textually. Even so, Cadbury rejects the first,⁴⁸ and it must be admitted that the title *pais* is not mentioned in the second.

b) But even should the influence of the Deutero-Isaian Servant on these discourses be admitted, the presence of a Suffering Servant conception, which would indicate a theology of satisfaction, is by no means proven; for the *nature* of the influence must still be considered.⁴⁹

i) After a study of the Servant passages in Acts, Hooker offers two

⁴⁵ Cf. J. Jeremias, "Zum Problem der Deutung von Jes. 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum," in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Neuchâtel, 1950) pp. 113-19.

⁴⁶ Cadbury, "Titles," p. 367: "It may be admitted that *pais sou* or *autou* was used of Jesus in early Christianity in a liturgical way, and that that usage was derived from the Old Testament. . . . But that the usage applies to a specific Old Testament passage or group of passages seems most unlikely in view of its wide distribution in the LXX. More probably it is used of Jesus as of other Old Testament personages both famous and anonymous."

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 367-69.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 368. After listing the passages urged by Harnack (including Acts 3:13), he states: "The weakness of the evidence is manifest."

⁴⁹ D. Stanley, "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and Its Transposition by St. Paul," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 16 (1954) 348-425, has exaggerated the influence of the specifically Deutero-Isaian concept on Acts. Nevertheless, he insists on the influence of the *Suffering* Servant only in the story of the preaching of Philip (Acts 8:26 ff.) to the Ethiopian eunuch (cf. our treatment below).

pertinent observations.⁴⁰ (a) Even in a passage as Acts 3:13 in which the influence of Deutero-Isaiah seems probable, it is not at all evident that in order of time the notion of Servant of Deutero-Isaiah preceded the application of the *pais*-title to Jesus. "In other words, we must consider whether the use of the title 'Servant' suggested the idea of the Servant Songs, or whether the identification of Jesus with the Servant of the Songs led to the use of the title 'Servant.'" The author opts for the first alternative. (b) If the influence of the Deutero-Isaian Servant on Acts is granted, "the only ideas which are adopted from Is 52-3 are those of 'delivering up' and of exaltation; no use is made of the two most distinctive characteristics of the third and fourth Songs, the nature of the Servant's sufferings, and their atoning value." The *pais*-title by no means implies the notion of the Suffering Servant.⁴¹

ii) The direct quotation from Is 53 in Acts 8:32 f. is if anything a proof that Luke has carefully avoided what might seem to be a theology of satisfaction. As Cadbury has noted, "the one time that he does quote Isaiah 53 [Luke] almost unbelievably escapes all the vicarious phrases with which that passage abounds."⁴²

iii) The argument presented above in favor of Deutero-Isaian Suffering Servant influence neglects important differences between modern exegesis and that of earlier times. (a) Early Christian exegesis was atomistic. The use of a phrase or passage from a book did not imply the use or even the approval of the thought content of the surrounding passages.⁴³ (b) Mowinckel⁴⁴ has pointed out that traditional Jewish exegesis retains nothing of the notion of the innocent sufferer when applying the notion of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah to the Messianic

⁴⁰ Hooker, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

⁴¹ J. Ménard, "*Pais theou* as a Messianic Title in the Book of Acts," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (1957) 83-92, shows that the concept of Jesus as Servant of God in the earlier strata of the Gospel did not entail the theology of the Suffering Servant. But he feels that this theology lies behind the preaching of Acts. Yet he concludes his study (p. 92): "It seems that the title *pais theou* as we find it applied in Acts to the Suffering Messiah, cannot be more than an accidental use of the term, for in itself it does not connote suffering. It was merely given to Jesus, because it was found in Is 53, which was understood as describing the future Messiah." But it is more logical to conclude that Luke has employed the title but not the theological explanation sometimes connected with it, unless evidence can be shown for that specific explanation in Acts.

⁴² Cadbury, "Titles," p. 366.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 369 f.: "In their atomistic use of Scripture the early Christians were very different from the modern theologian who, gathering together the four 'servant passages' of Isaiah, derives from them a complete concept, treating them as a whole, and then assumes that this Christological concept underlies the passages mentioned, and even such passages as have no more echo of Isaiah than the simple *pais*."

⁴⁴ S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Oxford, 1956) pp. 323, 330-33.

hope. The Targums identify the Servant of the Lord with the Messiah and use this expression as a Messianic title. Yet in the translation of Is 53 "we have a complete re-writing of the text, bringing it at every point into agreement with the national, political conception of the Messiah." Where the Hebrew text speaks of the sufferings and the ignominious death of the Servant, the Targum applies these to the heathens, who are vanquished at the hands of the victorious Messiah. In summarizing rabbinic interpretations of the Servant of the Lord he declares: "The central idea in Is 53 was never clearly grasped, and did not have any decisive influence on the conception of the Messiah."

iv) Grundmann⁴⁵ argues that while the Marcan account of the death and resurrection of Jesus seems to be closely linked to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, the Lucan account does not. In Luke the idea of an expiatory sacrifice is played down; Jesus is the *archēgos tēs zōēs* (Acts 3:15) who joins His followers with Him in His victory over death. Thus, if in Luke there is no trace of a Suffering Servant theology of expiation, it is because he has his own interpretation of the death and Resurrection which differs from it.

CONCLUSION

From all that has been said it is evident that the death of Jesus does have a soteriological significance for Luke.

In the first place, it is precisely because of the nature of the life of Jesus, a life of obedience that led Him on His way to the cross, that He has been established Christ and Lord, and has poured forth the Spirit upon His Church, which is now the locus of salvation. Thus, briefly, His life and death have constituted Him an active cause of salvation for men.

Second, through the life and death of Jesus the graciousness of God, His love for man, has been made known. God does not hate man; He awaits only man's turning to Him to forgive him all his sins and grant him salvation.

Third, this turning to God (*metanoia*) means a profession of faith in the Name of Jesus. It means becoming a member of His Church by baptism and following His "way," His life of obedience to the Father, no matter what contradictions and sufferings such obedience may entail.

What is true in the position of Wilckens, Käsemann, Conzelmann, and Dodd is that Luke does not employ the doctrine of satisfaction to explain the meaning of the death of Jesus, a doctrine which historically has relied heavily on certain passages of the Pauline epistles for its scriptural foundation. In scholastic terminology, Luke sees the connec-

⁴⁵ W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (2nd ed.; Berlin, 1961) pp. 454-57 (excursus 6).

tion between the death of Jesus and the salvation of the individual Christian along the lines of formal (exemplary) causality rather than efficient causality. But that his lack of agreement with Paul on this point means that his own theological viewpoint should *ipso facto* merit an inferior note is a totally unwarranted conclusion. Whatever position we may adopt on the much-debated question of the relationship of Paul to the author of Luke-Acts, we are bound to misunderstand it unless we admit that we are dealing with two creative theological geniuses,⁴⁶ and that the latter deserves a fair hearing on his own terms and in his own right.

⁴⁶ The work done on Luke-Acts during the past fifteen years has made quite untenable the remark of C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London, 1952) p. 110: "Among Christian thinkers of the first age known to us there are three of genuinely creative power: Paul, the author to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist."