

Marquette University

**e-Publications@Marquette**

---

Theology Faculty Research and Publications

Theology, Department of

---

1984

## Luke 3:23-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies

William Kurz

Marquette University, [william.kurz@marquette.edu](mailto:william.kurz@marquette.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo\\_fac](https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo_fac)



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kurz, William, "Luke 3:23-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies" (1984). *Theology Faculty Research and Publications*. 216.

[https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo\\_fac/216](https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo_fac/216)

**William S. Kurz**

## **LUKE 3:23-38 AND GRECO-ROMAN AND BIBLICAL GENEALOGIES**

### **Introduction**

Recent studies of Greco-Roman material and portions of the Bible that are similar to Luke-Acts are breaking down the old impasse in New Testament studies between Jewish and Hellenistic backgrounds. For example, the SBL Luke-Acts Seminar devoted its meeting in 1980 to the Jewish connection of Luke-Acts and in 1981 to the Greco-Roman connections.<sup>1</sup> This article shall study both sets of influences on the genealogy in Luke 3:23-38. The thesis is that Luke 3:23-38 plays an important role in the attempt by the author (henceforth simply "Luke") to provide a "continuation of the biblical history" in a Greco-Roman environment.<sup>2</sup> The genealogy especially grounds the Lucan narrative in the biblical history of God's dealings with his people since Adam. It shares the forms and functions of genealogies in Luke's Greek Bible, with Greco-Roman modifications and additions.

Because others have treated Luke's genealogy extensively, I will bypass many common considerations in commentaries and focus on the sometimes peculiar aspects which are clarified by comparison with other Greco-Roman and biblical genealogies.<sup>3</sup>

### **Greco-Roman Genealogies and Luke 3:23-38**

The first striking fact about Luke's genealogy when compared with Matthew's and many in the Old Testament is its ascending rather than descending order. Wolfgang Speyer notes that the descending form was used in most Old Testament genealogies. Thus, like Matthew's genealogy, those in the early chapters of Genesis and 1 Chronicles and Ruth 4 descend from ancestor to descendants. Speyer states that the ascending form found in Luke 3 first became widespread in the Hellenistic period, and he gives Ezra 7:1-5 and Judith 8:1 as examples. In the Greco-Roman period, both kinds were available. For example, Plutarch, *Pyrrhus* 1, and *Lycurgus* 1:4 have short

genealogies in descending (Matthean) order; Josephus has the ascending order in *Antiquities* 1.3.2 §79 for Noah as tenth from Adam, and 2.9.6 §229 for Moses as seventh from Abraham. Speyer speaks of the Lucan genealogy as Hellenistically fashioned.<sup>4</sup>

Luke uses for his ascending genealogy the genitive article *tou*, common in many Greek genealogies. Speyer claims that Luke had to use the article because of the indeclinable Semitic names, but many Greek genealogies with declinable names also use the article.<sup>5</sup> For example:

*Leōnidēs ho Anaxandrideō tou Leontos tou Eurykratideō tou Anaxandrou tou Eurykrateos tou Polydōrou tou Alkamaneos tou Tēleklou tou Archeleō tou Hēgēsileō tou Doryssou tou Leōbōteō tou Echestratou tou Hēgios tou Eurystheneos tou Aristodēmou tou Aristomachou tou Kleodaïou to Hyllou tou Hēracleos* (Herodotus 7.204).

For similar examples see Herodotus 4.147; 7.11.2; 8.131. Nor does Luke 3:23 have *tou* before the name of Joseph, which is also an indeclinable Semitic name. It should be noted that in the Herodotus examples neither do the first names have *tou*. Luke's example (complicated by his parenthetical remark) reads: *ōn huïos hōs enomizeto Iōsēph tou Ēli. . .*<sup>6</sup>

An important Greek convention that Luke deliberately ignores in order to imitate the Greek Bible is the use of at least Greek endings on names. In the unapologetic use of barbaric names, Luke's ascending genealogy is much closer to that in Tobit 1:1 than it is even to the Greek part of a bilingual inscription. Tobit 1:1 reads: *Biblos logōn Tōbit tou Tōbiēl tou Ananiēl tou Adouēl tou Gabaēl ek tou spermatos Asiēl ek tēs phylēs Nephthalīm*. The Greek part of the Palmyrene-Greek inscription has: *Aailamein Hairanou tou Mokimou tou Hairanou tou Maththa*.<sup>7</sup>

Whereas Luke follows the Semitic forms from the Greek Bible, Josephus follows Greek conventions and tries to put Greek endings on all the names, besides introducing some stylistic variety instead of a mere listing of names. *Antiquities* 1.3.2. §79 gives Noah's genealogy: *Nōchos . . . apo Adamou dekatos: Lamechou gar estin huïos, hou patēr, ēn Mathousalas, houtos de ēn tou Anōchou tou Iaredou, Malaēlou de Iaredos egegonei, hos ek Kaina teknoutai tou Anōsou syn adelphais pleiosin, Anōsos de Sēthou huïos ēn tou Adamou*. Contrast Luke's Semitic forms of the same names: *tou Nōe tou Lamech tou Mathousala tou Henōch tou Iaret tou Maleleēl tou Kainam tou Enōs tou Sēth tou Adam* (Luke 3:36-38).<sup>8</sup>

The length of Luke's list (more than seventy names) is most unusual

for Greco-Roman writings. Herodotus tells of Hecataeus's pride in his genealogy of sixteen names back to a god, until the Egyptians told him of 345 generations of high priests (Herodotus 2.142-43).<sup>9</sup> Whereas Greek nobles traced their genealogies through several generations back to a god, those not of noble birth could rarely get back to the third ancestor.<sup>10</sup> A grave inscription of Heropythos goes back fifteen generations to the mythical Cyprios. A second-century B.C. epigram from Dodona goes back thirty generations to Cassandra. A genealogy in an inscription from Pisidia has the person forty-first after Heracles and thirty-ninth from the Dioscuri.<sup>11</sup> For the Romans at the beginning of the empire as well as during the republic, genealogies of many generations were very difficult and usually impossible to compile. Romans were less interested than Greeks in mythical genealogies and were more interested in historical ancestors (see the funeral praises).<sup>12</sup> But by the end of the Roman republic most noble houses had a genealogy going back to a hero or a god. More practically, inscriptions stressed genealogies to great-grandparents.<sup>13</sup>

Single linear genealogies of seventy-seven generations back to Adam are not common in the Bible either. The sheer length of Luke's list must have sounded impressive to his listeners.<sup>14</sup> But those familiar with the genealogies of Genesis and the first nine chapters of genealogies in 1 Chronicles would not be overawed by Luke's.

We have seen that Greeks and Romans traced genealogies back to gods. Nowhere does the Bible do this, so that Luke's tracing Jesus back to Adam and then to God sounds *prima facie* like the Greco-Roman custom. Speyer suggests that "Seth, Adam, God" in Luke 3:38 would jar Jewish ears.<sup>15</sup> However, he overlooks Luke's preparation in 3:23 for the Adam-God link: "being the son, as was thought, of Joseph." In the light of Luke's account of the virgin birth, the Adam-God relationship is like that of Jesus and Joseph.

Nevertheless, the genealogical link between Jesus and God seems more likely to have been inspired by Luke's culture than by his Bible. For the Greeks, genealogies from the gods expressed a belief in the relationship between humans and the divine. There was a wide consensus in popular belief that extraordinary humans (heroes, wonder-workers, great kings, saviors, the wise) came from gods, either from heaven or from a divine parent.<sup>16</sup> To be noted also is the belief, common to many Mediterranean people, in degeneration from an original golden age, as in Hesiod's *Theogony* and in Jewish apocalyptic.<sup>17</sup> But the Greeks did not have a common founder for all human races as in the Israelite Adam. Speyer relates the personage Adam to belief in one God.<sup>18</sup> Genealogical relationships and solidarity among peoples were far more important for nomads than for Greeks and Romans.<sup>19</sup> When the importance of genealogies (from

Israel's nomadic past) combined with the belief in only one God, a common genealogy for the whole human race from Adam resulted. This gives reason to consider further below the extension of Luke's genealogy to Adam and God.

### **Biblical Genealogies and Luke 3:23-38**

Scholars commonly recognize that Luke locates his gospel in the context of contemporary world history (Luke 1:5; 2:1-2; esp. 3:1-2). Less universally noticed is how Luke also locates his narrative within the biblically described history of the world from Adam to the judgment day of the Lord. Luke not only showed that these events did not take place "in a corner" (Acts 26:26), but he also grounded them in God's past work and future consummation. Thus, the biblical "time line" on which Luke placed his two volumes extended from the beginning to the judgment of the world. To situate his narrative on the part of this line from Adam to "the events accomplished among us" (Luke 1:1), Luke used the form of genealogy.<sup>20</sup>

The following comparison of the functions of genealogies in Luke's Gospel with those in the Greek Bible will have four points: (1) the placement of the genealogy in relationship to the entire gospel; (2) the extension of the genealogy back to Adam; (3) the meaning of mentioning God at the head of the genealogy; and (4) genealogies as providing a context for the main narrative within the history of God's people.

### *Placement of the Genealogy Within the Entire Work*

Scholars have frequently discussed the differences between Matthew and Luke in the placement of the genealogies and the question of why the genealogy in Luke appears after the infancy-youth section.<sup>21</sup> That the genealogy in Luke 3:23-38 is fitted into its immediate context to explain the title Son of God in Luke 3:22 and to provide an immediate backdrop for his testing as Son of God in 4:1-13 is commonly known. Not so widely recognized are the similarities in placement between Jesus' genealogy in Luke 3:23-38 and that of Moses in Exod 6:14-17.<sup>22</sup>

Luke precedes his genealogy with a substantial amount of introductory material. After his preface (a Hellenistic form present in later Greek biblical books like the Sirach translation and 2 Maccabees epitome), Luke begins in Greek biblical style, *Egeneto en tais hēmerais Herōdou . . .* (Luke 1:5).<sup>23</sup> Luke sets the stage in expectations of pious Jews before introducing the story of Jesus. Thus the story of Zachary, Elizabeth, and the conception of John precedes the parallel account of Mary's conception of Jesus (Luke 1:5-25 and 26-38).

Similarly, Exodus 1 precedes the Moses story with the transition

from Joseph at the end of Genesis to the new king "who did not know Joseph" (Exod 1:8 [G], cited in Acts 7:18). His order to kill all male Israelite babies sets the stage for introducing the (unnamed) parents of Moses, both of the tribe of Levi. (One can compare the levitical priest Zachary from the division of Abijah, mentioned in 1 Chr 24:10 and Neh 12:4, 17, and Elizabeth, a daughter of Aaron.)

Both Luke 1-2 and Exodus 2 then describe the births, naming, nurturing, and growth of Moses and Jesus. Both relate an event in the youth of their heroes that foreshadowed their later work but preceded it by many years: Moses' attempt to rescue fellow Israelites, leading to his forty-year exile, and Jesus in the temple at age twelve, but subject to his parents until about age thirty.<sup>24</sup> Only then do the respective missions of Moses and Jesus begin. When Moses is shepherding in the desert, God reveals himself and commissions him at the burning bush (Exodus 3). The word of God coming to the Baptist in the desert begins his ministry of preaching and baptizing. When Jesus is baptized, God addresses and commissions him (Luke 3:1-22).

Because of multiple sources, of which Luke may not have been aware, Exodus 3-6 has repetitions in the commissioning of Moses to go to Pharaoh. In Exod 6:13 God again orders Moses and Aaron to Pharaoh. The genealogy of Aaron and Moses is inserted here in Exod 6:14-27. In 6:28-7:5, after the two have been "properly introduced," Moses is again told to take God's message to Pharaoh; he balks, is given Aaron as "prophet," and is further instructed in his mission. For Moses this is equivalent to one last temptation to resist his mission and clarification of what it will involve. Moses and Aaron's obedience is then reported in 7:6, and 7:7 gives their respective ages when they began their mission. Only then follows the extended narration of their rescue mission of the ten plagues culminating in the death of first-born sons (Exod 7:8-chap. 11, followed by the Passover in chap. 12).

In a similar placement, after Jesus is named Son of God and is filled with the Spirit (Luke 3:22), his genealogy as Son of God is given (3:23-38), then the testing and clarification of his mission as Son and his obedience (4:1-13), and finally the beginning in 4:14 of the extended account of Jesus' saving mission beginning in Galilee and culminating in his own death as God's Son (23:34 and 46) at Passover time. One slight difference is that Jesus' age comes at the beginning of the genealogy, Moses' and Aaron's only after their obedience and immediately before the plague accounts.

In other words, in relationship to the overall stories of Moses in Exodus and Jesus in Luke, the genealogies occur in almost the same relative positions. They are preceded by preliminary accounts of birth, youth, and commissioning, and they are followed by detailed narratives of Moses' and Jesus' main missions.



Though such parallels can seem arbitrary, Acts 7:18-37 gives solid evidence that Luke had in mind precisely this parallelism between the structures of Jesus' career and Moses' career and that he elaborated his parallelism on the basis of the Greek version of Exodus. In a way reminiscent of Luke's use of Mark, Acts 7 retells the story of Moses with frequent quotations from the Greek text of Exodus and constant use of its language, combined with Lucan introductions, summaries, transitions, substitute favorite expressions, and interpretative comments.

The heavy use of verses, phrases, and language from Greek Exodus is quite obvious from the bold print for allusions in Nestle's 25th edition, and it is still clear in the 26th edition, which italicizes full quotations. We have room to cite only some, inviting readers who so desire to compare the Greek texts of Acts and Exodus.<sup>25</sup>

Acts 7:18 quotes Exod 1:7 about the new king and describes the Egyptian oppression in the same combination of words (Acts 7:19 *katasophisamenos*, Exod 1:10 *katasophisōmetha*; Acts 7:19 *ekakōsen*, Exod 1:11 *kakōsōsin*; Acts 7:19 *mē zōgoneisthai*, three forms of the verb in Exod 1:17, 18, 22). The same unusual expression is used for the baby Moses in Acts 7:20 (*ēn asteios*) and Exod 2:2 (*idontes auto asteion*; the Hebrew has the very ordinary *kf-ṭōb*).<sup>26</sup> For Moses' adoption, Acts 7:21 has *hē thygatēr Pharaō . . . heautē eis huion*; Exod 2:10 *tēn thygatera Pharaō . . . autē eis huion*. Many other coincidences of otherwise unusual words or combinations clearly show deliberate use of Exodus by Acts 7.

Even more important is the deliberate parallelism in *structure* between the career of Moses in Acts 7 (closely based on Exodus) and that of Jesus in Luke's gospel, which has been convincingly shown by scholars.<sup>27</sup> Both are in times of fulfillment of promises to Abraham (Acts 7:17), both grow in wisdom (Acts 7:22 as in Luke 2:40 and 52, not in Exodus), both were "powerful in words and deeds" (Acts 7:22 = Luke 24:19). It could be said of both that "he thought the brothers would understand that God was giving salvation to them at his hand, but they did not understand" (Acts 7:25; *passim* for Jesus in the Gospel and the speeches of Acts). The people reject both not just once but twice. The speeches of Acts use similar expressions for the rejection and vindication of Moses and Jesus: *touton ton Mōūsēn, hon ērnēsanto . . . touton ho theos kai archonta kai lytrōtēn apestalken* (Acts 7:35 and Luke's frequent parallelism of the relative *hon* and demonstrative *touton*, as in Acts 5:30-31, *hon hymeis diecheirisasthe . . . touton ho theos archēgon kai sōtēra hypsōsen*).

Finally and conclusively, Acts 7:37 obviously parallels Moses and Jesus. "This" Moses (who worked signs and wonders [7:36] and was sent as savior [7:35]) prophesied that God would *anastēsei* ("raise up,"

with a pun on "resurrect") "a prophet for you . . . like me (= Deut 18:15).

Luke's effort in the speeches of Acts to show parallel structures for the careers of Jesus and Moses, while respecting differences in the details of their lives, is confirming evidence that Luke imitated the Exodus structure in the placement of his genealogy.

What can the parallel placing of the genealogies of Moses and Jesus just before the beginnings of their saving missions indicate about the narrative *functions* of each? After the introductory youth and call of Moses, the genealogy in Exod 6:14-27 situates Moses and Aaron within the priestly line of Levi, and ultimately within God's whole people, before the account of how God saved his people through them by the plagues. Unlike Luke's linear genealogy tracing just a single line of descent, the genealogy in Exod 6:14-27 is segmented to give the descendants of several sons of one father. As a result, it relates Moses and Aaron not only to direct ancestors and descendants but also to collateral priestly lines of Levi (as well as descendants of Reuben and Simeon) to which other protagonists of the desert story (like Korah, Numbers 16) belong. In fact, the genealogy focuses more on Aaron than on Moses, tracing Aaron's line through Eleazar to the priestly line of Phineas. It thus also legitimates Phineas's line by grounding it in the saving figures of the exodus.<sup>28</sup>

The similar placing of Luke's genealogy suggests a similar function. Supplementing the dating from contemporary rulers in Luke 3:1-2, Luke 2:23-38 gives Jesus' position within the ancestral subdivisions of God's people as well as his temporal relationship to the people's history. Thus it places Jesus in an obscure (versus the royal) branch of David's line, as Moses and Aaron belonged to Levi's. It puts Jesus at the end of God's long saving history, traced to its very beginning in Adam. Contrast the Exodus genealogy that also named Aaron's descendants and began only with the sons of Jacob. These differences are quite significant. Though Luke wrote one or two generations after Jesus, Jesus is the end of the genealogical line, unlike Aaron who was in the middle of his. The line has led to its definitive fulfillment in Jesus, and now God's people is in the eschatological age of the Spirit's outpouring, which has relativized the importance of blood relationships in God's people (Acts 10-11 and 15). Nevertheless, one function of both genealogies is to show the relationship of the saviors to their people's history.

#### *Depth of Luke's Genealogy Back To Adam*

1 Chronicles 1-9 and Luke 3:23-38 both trace their respective heroes David and Jesus all the way back to Adam through genealogies. Though the Genesis genealogies also go back to Adam, they



obviously cannot extend forward as far as David. It seems reasonable to ask whether Luke imitated Greek Chronicles in the functions to which he put his genealogy.<sup>29</sup> Whether the author of the genealogy in Luke 3 relied more on 1 Chronicles than on Genesis is hard to prove because of confusion in the manuscripts. In favor of Genesis is the fact that only Genesis 11:12-13 [G] agrees with Luke 3:36 in having *Kainam* (or *Kainan* in many manuscripts) between *Arphaxad* and *Sala* (Göttingen text). *Kainam* is missing in Hebrew Genesis 11 and in all but the Alexandrian manuscript of 1 Chr 1:17-24 [G].

The following considerations favor Greek Chronicles over Greek Genesis. (1) Luke 3:34 has *Abraam* with Chronicles rather than *Abram* with Genesis (Göttingen). (2) The prominent simple list form of the genealogies in Chronicles (as in Luke 3) would have been much easier to use than culling the names from Genesis 5 and 11, which have much extraneous material. (3) The likelihood that the Lucan genealogy used Chronicles for later names suggests its use for earlier ones also. Thus Greek Chronicles seems more likely than Genesis to be the source of Luke 3. But unless Codex A of 1 Chr 1:17-24 or a nonextant equivalent were used,<sup>30</sup> Greek Genesis would have had to be consulted for *Kainam* in Luke 3:36.<sup>31</sup>

The first obvious function of gathering all genealogical material from the hero back to Adam is to situate the narrative within the overall history of God's dealings with humans from the beginning. Closely related is the function of spanning gaps in the traditions narrated in the biblical context, as between creation and the patriarchal stories by the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11, between Adam and Saul/David in 1 Chronicles, and between especially Adam and Abraham, David, and Jesus in Luke 3.<sup>32</sup> Another related function of the genealogical connection to Adam is to show continuity of God's people through periods of national disruption, as when the genealogies of Genesis 46 and Numbers 26 connect the sons of Judah with the exodus clans.<sup>33</sup> This function is less obvious between David and Adam in 1 Chronicles, but perhaps it is implied. It does seem to fit the link between Jesus and David through a Davidic line, which avoided the curses that destroyed Judah's royal line.

Genealogies can also help to show epochs in history according to a prearranged plan by God,<sup>34</sup> as in arrangements of names in multiples of seven<sup>35</sup> or the epochs marked by the flood, Abraham, exodus, etc. The Chronicler seems to have preserved this from his Genesis source, as in the separate Adam-Noah's sons and Shem-Abraham lists. It is probably clearer in Luke's source, arranged in sevens from Adam to Jesus and thus highlighting major intermediate figures, than when God has become the head of the list. Beginning from Adam, the seventh figures include Enoch, Abraham, David, Salathiel, and Jesus,

which is what one would expect (cf. Jude 14, "Enoch the seventh from Adam"). With God at the head of the list, none of those names is in the seventh position, but rather Jared, Terah, Jesse, Neri, and Joseph. That would not, however, have been noticed by those listening to the reading of Luke's gospel, since the names are in ascending (reverse) order. It is quite possible that Luke reversed the order of his genealogical source to facilitate the notion of "Jesus son of . . . God," just as a copyist of manuscript D reversed Matthean royal names and substituted them into the Davidic segment of the Lucan genealogy (Nestle-Aland, 26th ed.).<sup>36</sup>

Another obvious function of genealogies is simply to identify the individual through his ancestry, as in 1 Sam 1:1 (Elkanah son of Jeroham son of Elihu son of Tohu son of Zuph, an Ephraimite), 1 Sam 9:1 (for Saul), 2 Sam 20:1 (for Sheba), Zeph 1:1, and Zech 1:1. Or it links the individual with well-known personages from the past.

When the genealogy proceeds through sons who were not first-born (e.g., Jacob, Judah, David, Nathan in Luke 3), the importance of being chosen by God is implied. Thus, 1 Chr 5:1-2 explains why Joseph, not Reuben, got the birthright. 1 Chr 17:7 emphasizes the free choice of David, that "I took you from the pasture from following the sheep to be leader over my people Israel." 1 Chr 2:13-15 had listed David not as first-born of Jesse but as "the seventh." The listing of Jesus' descent from David through a nonroyal line in Luke 3 may imply such free choice by God.<sup>37</sup>

For readers familiar with the biblical narratives, genealogies (as in Luke 3 and 1 Chronicles 1-9) also function as "encapsulated history" and a mnemonic device for quick recall of a whole sweep of history in the briefest possible way.

### *Why Luke Mentions God at the Head of His Genealogy*

Like the Chronicler, Luke extends his genealogy back to the first man. Unlike the Chronicler, or as far as I know any other Jewish writer to his time, Luke goes even beyond Adam to God.<sup>38</sup> The first section of this study mentioned that Greco-Roman sources trace people back to an origin in some god. Popular Hellenistic philosophy contained the view that the whole human race is descended from the gods or divine principle. The Areopagus speech, especially Acts 17:26 and 28-29, shows that Luke was aware of such thinking. Those verses argue that all humans are descended from one man and "we" (humans) are all descendants (*genos*) of God.<sup>39</sup>

In argument and wording, the Areopagus speech combines Stoic, rhetorical, poetic, and biblical expressions, concepts, and allusions. It identifies the "unknown god" with the God who created and is Lord over the cosmos. God therefore does not dwell in temples made by

humans; not does God need anything from humans, since "he himself gives to all men life and breath and everything" (Acts 17:25 RSV). These were important themes in popular Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish propaganda. This God made from one human (Adam) the whole race to inhabit the earth and set times and boundaries so humans would seek God (see Luke 3:38; Acts 1:7; Genesis 1-5 and 10; Deut 32:8; and Ps 74:17).

Acts 17:27b-29a are especially important for understanding Luke 3:38. They argue that God "is not far from each of us. For in him we live and move and are, as even some of your poets have said: 'for we are his [God's] *genos*.' Being there the *genos* of God. . . ." *Genos* refers to descendants of a common ancestor, and humanity as God's *genos* is found in Cleanthes and Dio Chrysostom as well as in Luke's quotation from Aratus.<sup>40</sup> The background for understanding how Luke 3:38 and Acts 17:28-29 relate in the context of Luke-Acts seems to be LXX Gen 1:26-27 and 5:1-3. In Gen 1:26-27 God says, "Let us make man according to our *eikona* and *homoiōsin*." They (*anthrōpos* is collective) were to rule all other creatures. "And God made man, *kat' eikona theou* he made him, male and female he made them."

The link between *eikōn* and descendants becomes clear in Gen 5:1-3. The chapter begins, "This is the *biblos geneseōs anthrōpōn*: on the day God *epoiēsen* . . . *ton Adam, kat' eikona Theou epoiēsen auton*." Gen 5:3 then uses similar expressions for Adam's begetting of Seth: *Kai egennēsen kata tēn idean autou kai kata tēn eikona autou*. The choice of words implies a careful distinction between how God is related to Adam and how gods in Greek mythology are related to heroes they beget from human partners. God made (*epoiēsen*) Adam, whereas Adam begot (*egennēsen*) Seth. God's transcendence is preserved, yet a filial relationship is implied by saying Adam was *kat' eikona Theou* as Seth was *kata tēn eikona* of Adam. The care of the Greek translators was not lost on Luke.

For on the one hand Acts 17:28-29 uses terminology from Greek literature and philosophy to say that humans are all the *genos* of God, which would ordinarily imply some kind of ancestry by God of the human race. But Acts 17:26 had said God *epoiēsen te ex henos pan ethnos anthrōpōn katoikein* . . . , although here *epoiēsen* may well be a helping verb, for Luke's Christian readers it is nevertheless allusive to the language of Genesis. We are obviously all the *genos* of God through the one man, who remains unnamed according to rhetorical style for a speech ostensibly addressed to Athenian philosophers. Especially in view of Luke 3:38, however, the allusion to Adam is obvious for Luke's readers.

Acts 17 therefore provides an explanation of Luke's affixing God to the head of Jesus' genealogy. Like Acts 17, Luke's designation of

Adam as son of God gives an *interpretatio graeca* of the biblical information. Listing a god at the head of human genealogies was pagan rather than biblical practice. But Luke's genealogy already contains hints that Adam's origin from God was not by sexual generation, hints that would be clear to readers familiar with the Bible. Two clues are his inserted phrases *hōs enomizeto* at the beginning of Luke's genealogy and "of God" at its end: "Jesus . . . being the son, as was supposed, of Joseph of Eli . . . of Adam of God" (Luke 3:23 and 38). Not only does the first phrase "harmonize" the genealogy with the virginal conception in Luke 1:26-38, but it also points to an analogy between Jesus' filial relationship to Joseph and the special kind of filial relationship of Adam to God known by anyone familiar with Genesis.

Neither Jesus nor Adam was sexually begotten by his "father" in the genealogy—Joseph and God. Rather God *made* Adam and gave him the divine prerogatives of ruling and naming the rest of creation. Luke 1:26-38 also has echoes of the creation story. Jesus is not sexually conceived but is created in Mary's womb by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:34-35). The creative and life-giving functions of the Holy Spirit are widely attested in the Old Testament and well known among first-century Jews and Christians.<sup>41</sup> Nor is either of the verbs in Luke 1:35 for the Spirit's action (*epeleusetai* and *episkiasei*) used with sexual meanings in the Greek Bible or ordinary secular usage.<sup>42</sup> And because it is through the Holy Spirit and power of God that Jesus is created in the womb, "therefore the one to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God" (1:35).

The pericope following Luke's genealogy provides some confirming evidence for this analogy between Jesus and Adam as sons of God in a nonsexual sense, as made by God's creative power. Many have noticed an implied parallel between Adam and Jesus in Jesus' temptation (Luke 4:1-13). Jesus is tempted as Son of God, but unlike the disobedient Adam he remains an obedient Son.<sup>43</sup>

This evidence suggests some functions of Luke's affixing God to his genealogy. In the light of Acts 17, implying that all humans are children of God through "one man," Adam relates the biblical account to Hellenistic concerns, especially the unity of the human race and its kinship with God. Adding the phrase "as was supposed" at the beginning and "of God" at the end of the genealogy calls attention to more than one kind of sonship-paternity relationship in the genealogy. Besides ordinary generation there is also a creative fatherhood of God for Adam and Jesus, and a legal fatherhood (in terms of inheritance) of Joseph for Jesus and God for Adam. Thus, even those functions most influenced by secular Hellenistic concerns take place within the Genesis story of Adam and its perspective of God as transcendent creator of the human race.

*Locating the Main Account within  
the History of God's People*

This function has already been implied in the earlier comparisons between Luke 3:23-38 and Exod 6:14-27 and 1 Chronicles 1-9. But those passages were compared from different perspectives, namely, the placement of the genealogy in the work and the extension of the list back to Adam. A further brief comparison with Ruth 4:18-22 G can clarify the function of showing where the story fits in the overall history of God's people. The likelihood that the author of the Luke 3 genealogy consulted Ruth for his names from Phares to David gives added reason to compare Luke 3:23-38 and Ruth 4:18-20 G.<sup>44</sup>

A notable similarity between Luke and Ruth is the relative independence of their main narrative from their genealogy. Both genealogies read like later insertions into a narrative that could stand without them. As in Matthew and Mark, Luke's temptation story would follow naturally upon the heavenly proclamation of Jesus as God's Son. Luke has had to insert the genealogy into his source Mark's arrangement here. Similarly, the story in Ruth is finished when the genealogy appears, which leads some even to claim it was added by a later hand.<sup>45</sup>

The story in Ruth reaches its climax when Ruth and Boaz preserve the name and line of Naomi's dead husband and sons through the birth of Obed. With Ruth 4:17, "A son has been born to Naomi," the plot line is resolved. But the text goes on to show the story's wider significance: "and they called his name Obed; this is the father of Jesse the father of David." This would have been sufficient to insert the story into Israel's history. The further addition of the final genealogy links the story not only with later generations up to David but also with earlier ones back to Phares the son of Judah the patriarch. In so doing, the genealogy locates the story of Ruth on the "biblical time line" from the patriarchs through the exodus generation through the judges to its "fulfillment" in David.

If so, why does the genealogy begin with Phares and not the better-known Judah? The seventh-generation emphasis may be the answer. The story's male hero Boaz is seventh from Phares but eighth from Judah.<sup>46</sup> Ruth 4:12 had prepared for the genealogy: "and may your house be as the house of Phares, whom Tamar bore to Judah. . . ." In both cases a dead husband's kinsman (Judah and Boaz) provides his childless widow (Tamar and Ruth) with a child on his behalf (with obvious differences!). Second, by mentioning Phares as a son of Judah the patriarch, Ruth 4:12 freed the redactor from having to begin the genealogy in 4:18 with Judah, thereby reserving the climactic seventh place in the genealogy for Boaz. This is evidence that the person responsible for the canonical version of Ruth and not some later



glossarist put the genealogy at the end of Ruth.

If this is true, it follows that Luke and the redactor of Ruth have made similar adjustments in adding a genealogy to their narratives. Both genealogies are obviously insertions or additions to originally independent stories (as Luke's source Mark). Neither genealogy was needed to provide contemporary time indicators, for both stories had those already. Ruth is set in the time of the judges: *Kai egeneto en tō krinein tous kritas* (Ruth 1:1).<sup>47</sup> In accordance with Hellenistic taste, the temporal setting in Luke 3:1-2 is more detailed. Rather than providing temporal setting, both genealogies relate the story to earlier biblical accounts of God's dealings with his people. The adjustments both the author of canonical Ruth and Luke made in their genealogies were similar. The former began with Phares rather than Judah to reserve the seventh place for Boaz (4:18), preparing for this by "Phares, whom Tamar bore to Judah" in 4:12. Luke linked genealogy to narrative by inserting "as was supposed" in view of the virginal conception, and "of God" for its context between Jesus' naming and temptation as God's Son. Finally, the focus of both genealogies is the climactic figure in the history of God's people—David for the redactor of Ruth, and Jesus the Son of God, who will receive "the throne of David his father and will rule over the house of Jacob forever" (Luke 1:32-33).

### Conclusions

Comparison of Luke 3:23-38 with Greco-Roman and biblical genealogies has shown that in content and function Luke's genealogy is in continuity with those in his Greek Bible, which had already been Hellenized. Some of Luke's choices among biblical options and some modifications show Greco-Roman preferences and concerns. Thus Luke's ascending format was frequent in Herodotus and inscriptions and common only in later, more Hellenized parts of the Greek Bible. Yet the closest grammatical parallel to Luke's is the ascending genealogy of Tobit 1:1 with its same use of the article and Semitic name endings.

The position of Jesus' genealogy in Luke 3 not only links his naming (3:22) and temptation (4:1-12) as God's Son but also imitates the placing of Moses' genealogy (Exod 6:14-27) between his youth, call, and mission (Exodus 2-6) and his further protest and definitive mission of the plagues (6:28-11:10). Acts 7 confirmed that Luke deliberately paralleled the structures of the career of Moses and that of Jesus, the prophet like Moses.

Luke's genealogy is biblical in many of its names and in its extension back to Adam. Its pattern of sevens confirms the continuity of God's plan from the beginning through many epochs. The mention of



God at the head of Luke's genealogy is an *interpretatio graeca* not found in Jewish sources. But modifications like *hos enomizeto* (3:22) in the light of Acts 17:26, 28-29 show that the relationship between Adam and God is seen in the light of Genesis. Neither Joseph nor God begot Jesus or Adam sexually, but God *made* Adam and treated him as a son by giving him divine prerogatives over creation.

Like Ruth 4:18-20, Luke's genealogy was added to an independent story in a source (Mark) and linked to the story through modifications in the genealogy. Both genealogies situate their stories within the history of God's people. Luke 3:23-38 links Jesus to his biblical roots and thus helps Luke provide a "continuation of the biblical history" in ways meaningful to his Greco-Roman environment.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>See *Society of Biblical Literature 1980 Seminar Papers* (ed. P. J. Achtemeier; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980); *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers* (ed. K. H. Richards; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981). F. Danker (*Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* [St. Louis: Clayton, 1982]) says this in the conclusion of his monumental 509-page study: "For those with firm background in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures this experience finds expression in language relating especially to the figure of the Spirit-filled 'Servant.' On the other hand, for the benefit of auditors with broad Graeco-Roman background Luke incorporates language patterns drawn from the Hellenistic semantic field of the honored benefactor. For both publics he introduces motifs that are part of the generic cultural experience."

<sup>2</sup>This characterization is descriptive and does not try to specify the genre of Luke-Acts, nor does it take sides among various parties trying to relate Luke-Acts to Greco-Roman history, biography, or romance. It calls attention to Luke's attempt to do in his time and culture what his Greek Bible had done earlier—narrate God's saving action for his people through chosen agents. Even his Greek Bible had such different kinds of narrative as the Elijah-Elisha cycle within Kings, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and Ruth.

<sup>3</sup>Extensive important recent treatments of Luke's genealogy, often in broader genealogical contexts, include M. D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies* (SNTSMS 8; Cambridge: University Press, 1969) 229-52; W. Speyer, "Genealogie," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 9 (ed. T. Klauser; Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1976) cols. 1145-1268, esp. cols. 1213-34; H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKNT 3/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1969) 1. 198-204; R. E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1977) 57-95 (esp. tables Matt, Luke, OT, pp. 76-79); J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel*

According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes (AB 28; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981) 488-505 (esp. tables pp. 492-94); E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HNT 5; 3d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1975) 56-59; R. Hood, "The Genealogies of Jesus," *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby* (ed. A. Wikgren; Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961) 1-15; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 157-65; L. Ramlot, "Les généalogies bibliques: Un genre littéraire oriental," *BVC* 60 (1964) 53-70; E. Lerle, "Die Ahnenverzeichnisse Jesu: Versuch einer Christologischen Interpretation (Lk 3:23-38)," *ZNW* 72 (1981) 112-17; L. Overstreet ("Difficulties of New Testament Genealogies," *Grace Theological Journal* 2 [1981] 303-26) is a harmonizing rejection of historical criticism on them; W. S. Kurz ("Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible," *SBL 1980 Seminar Papers*, 283-300) contains an earlier version of much of the second section of this study as well as material not treated here.

<sup>4</sup>Speyer, "Genealogie," ed. 1211. Note, however, that in this sense the biblical genealogies he mentioned, as well as others like Tobit 1:1, are also Hellenistic.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., col. 1230.

<sup>6</sup>This undermines the citation of F. Godet in Overstreet ("Difficulties"); Godet argues that the absence of *tou* puts Joseph outside the genealogical list, which is therefore Mary's. See also the inscription quoted by Klostermann (*Lukas-evangelium*, 57): *Dēmētrion Hermapiou tou Hermapiou tou Hermadatou*. . .

<sup>7</sup>Cited by Klostermann (*Lukasevangelium*, 56) from G. A. Cooke, *A Text-book of North Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903) No. 110 (second century A.D.). Note the lack of the article on the first genitive name.

<sup>8</sup>See H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge: Harvard, 1920, repr. 1969) esp. pp. 154-58.

<sup>9</sup>See Speyer, "Genealogie," cols. 1158, 1169.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., col. 1172.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., cols. 1174-75.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., cols. 1187-88.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., col. 1196.

<sup>14</sup>For the distinction between linear and segmented genealogies, see the excellent *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* by R. R. Wilson (Yale Near Eastern Researches 7; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977). For the Greeks, see M. Broadbent, *Studies in Greek Genealogy* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).

<sup>15</sup>Speyer, "Genealogie," col 1203.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., cols. 1157, 1164.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., col. 1165.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., col. 1204.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., col. 1201.

<sup>20</sup>For a description of Luke's biblical time line, see Kurz, "Historiography," 283-86.

<sup>21</sup>See Fitzmyer (*Luke*, 488-89) on the possibility that the gospel

existed at one time without the infancy narrative. C. H. Talbert ("Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15," *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H. Silberman* [ed. J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel; New York: Ktav, 1980] 130) challenges that hypothesis.

<sup>22</sup>See A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1910) 101-2; also quoted in Overstreet, "Difficulties," 314; R. E. Brown, "Genealogy (Christ)," *IDB Supplementary Volume* (ed. K. Crim; Nashville: Abingdon, 1976) 354.

<sup>23</sup>For biblicistic style, see judicious recent treatments by Fitzmyer (*Luke*, 109, 113-27): Luke's writings are closer than most of the New Testament to Attic writers, yet "90 per cent of his vocabulary is in the LXX, where it resembles most the vocabulary of Judges, Samuel, Kings, and above all 2 Maccabees"; and F. L. Horton, Jr. ("Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts," *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* [ed. C. H. Talbert; Special Studies Series, 5; Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978] 1-23), who suggests "synagogue Greek." See also standard sources like J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1909); J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. 4, Style*, by N. Turner (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976); H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1927; reprint, Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1958); idem, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920); J. de Zwaan, "The Use of the Greek Language in Acts," and W. K. L. Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1920-1933) vol. 2. Convincing evidence of Lucan use of the Greek Bible is marshaled in E. Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition* (SBLDS 41; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978).

<sup>24</sup>For Greco-Roman resonances, see Talbert, "Future Greatness," 131-37.

<sup>25</sup>See Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 38-140, esp. on Moses, pp. 76-102. Our two analyses were done independently and confirm each other.

<sup>26</sup>Compare the similar citing of *asteios* from Exodus 2 G in Heb 11:23, the only other New Testament occurrence. In the Greek Old Testament, it appears only here in Exod 2:2, in Num 22:32 (for a way acceptable to God), Judg 3:17 for Eglon, Jdt 11:23 for Judith, LXX Susanna 7, and 2 Macc 6:23 (with *logismon*). In the Stoics it seems almost equivalent to *spoudaios* (J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949] 86).

<sup>27</sup>E.g., L. T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 70-76. For extensive evidence of Luke's parallel structuring in general, see C. H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) with references.

<sup>28</sup> An oddity of the Lucan genealogy is the large number of names from the priestly tribe of Levi. This is related to the peculiarity that Elizabeth, the wife of the priest Zachary and "daughter of Aaron," is called the kinswoman (*syngenis*) of Jesus' mother (Luke 1:36). All other uses of *syngenis* and cognates in Luke and Acts denote actual blood relationship (Luke 1:58, 61; 2:44; 14:12; 21:16; Acts 7:3, 14; 10:24). Therefore, besides Luke's emphasis on Jesus' Davidic ancestry, he may also be hinting at levitical connections. The same phenomenon of emphasizing one important blood line while referring to a second occurs in the genealogy in Exod 6:14-27. Exodus provides the levitical/Aaronic genealogy with Davidic connections. Exod 6:23 identifies Aaron's wife as Elizabeth (!), the daughter of Aminadab and the sister of Naasson, who are identified in Num 1:7; 7:12 and 17: Naasson is the head of the house of Judah when Moses and Aaron take the census. Compare also the Davidic genealogy in Ruth 4:20; 1 Chr 2:10; Luke 3:23-33 (and Matt 1:4). Of the four sons of Aaron and his wife Elizabeth of Judah (Exod 6:23), two died without heirs, and Eleazar and Ithamar headed the two major priestly lines. Thus, the priestly lines have connections through the wife of Aaron himself to Judah, David's tribe.

<sup>29</sup> Lest such imitation be rejected as too sophisticated for Luke, the widespread role of imitation as a procedure in Hellenistic rhetoric should be recalled, as well as the likelihood that Luke himself had some rhetorical training. For imitation, see E. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) esp. 51-69; Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 1 and 11. For an extensive treatment of the role of rhetoric in Luke-Acts, see W. S. Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 42 (1980) 171-95.

<sup>30</sup> Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 150-54) is helpful on textual questions in Lucan quotations from the Greek Bible. For example, he notes that the Alexandrian text, the one most in agreement with New Testament quotations, is also the one most susceptible to Christian editing.

<sup>31</sup> See esp. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 488-505. With several commentators, I think Luke had among his sources a genealogy from Adam to Jesus containing seventy-seven names in eleven groups of seven. To it he himself added *tou theou* at the head of the genealogy and also the phrase *hōs enomizeto* to qualify Joseph's paternity and to harmonize the genealogy with Jesus' virginal conception in Luke 1:26-38. See Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1. 199-204; Marshall, *Luke*, 157-65, esp. 160-61; J. Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas übersetzt und erklärt* (RNT; Regensburg: Pustet, 1977) 154-57; M. D. Johnson, *Purpose*, 229-39.

<sup>32</sup> R. R. Wilson, "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research," *JBL* 94 (1975) 172; M. D. Johnson, *Purpose*, 78. See the examples of many kinds of summaries of biblical history in G. Robinson, "Historical Summaries of Biblical History," *EvQ* 47 (1975) 195-207.

<sup>33</sup> M. D. Johnson, *Purpose*, 80.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 80-81.

<sup>35</sup>J. M. Sasson, "A Genealogical 'Convention' in Biblical Chronography?" ZAW 90 (1978) 171-85; see also Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 490.

<sup>36</sup>The reversed order meant most of the early names were unknown, so that listeners would not notice patterns of seven until later in the genealogy, if at all. Nor did Luke specify the number as Matthew did. These may help explain the widely differing number of names in important manuscripts, from about seventy-two to seventy-eight. See Speyer, "Genealogie," cols. 1230-31; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 491-97; Brown, *Birth*, 91-92, "seventy-seven to sixty-three."

<sup>37</sup>M. D. Johnson, *Purpose*, 79-80.

<sup>38</sup>See Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1. 201-2, "ganz ungewöhnlich." See Speyer, "Genealogie," col. 1203. M. D. Johnson (*Purpose*, 237) says that there is no known parallel in the Old Testament or in rabbinic texts; compare pp. 239 and 112-14 on Hellenistic and Roman practices of tracing a genealogy back to a god.

<sup>39</sup>For thorough discussion of these notions with their Greco-Roman and Jewish counterparts, see M. Dibelius, "Paul on the Areopagus," in his *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. H. Greeven; London: SCM, 1956) 26-77, esp. 47-58; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 524-25; H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT 7; 2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1972) 104-11; J. Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 254-68; Speyer, "Genealogie," cols. 1147-51, 1157, 1204 and the literature they cite.

<sup>40</sup>BGD, p. 156, *genos*, and works cited in the preceding note.

<sup>41</sup>See the extensive arguments and many texts cited by Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1. 52-54; E. Sjöberg and E. Schweizer, "pneuma," TDNT 6. 386-87, 402; S. Schulz, "skia/episkiazō," TDNT 7. 399-400. See also Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 350-51; and Brown, *Birth*, 313-14. (Luke does not mention preexistence: this treatment of Jesus' being created in the womb obviously refers to the human Jesus.) Compare also Justin Martyr's explicit arguments against the pagan myths and any sexual interpretation of the Spirit's role in the virginal conception, 1 *Apology* 33.3-6. The Spirit and power (which Justin identified with the Logos) *elthon epi tēn parthenon kai episkiasan ou dia synousias alla dia dynameōs enkymona katastēsē* (33.6, Goodspeed, p. 49).

<sup>42</sup>LSJ, 618, 657; Moulton and Milligan, 231-44; J. Schneider, "erchomai/eperchomai," TDNT 2. 680-81; Schulz, "skia," 7. 399-400; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1. 52-54. See Isa 32:15 G: *heōs an epelthē eph' hymas pneuma aph' hypselou*.

<sup>43</sup>In addition to commonly made comparisons between Luke 4:1-13 par. and Adam's fall and that of Israel, God's disobedient sons, in the desert, note also Jesus' prayer before his passion. In Luke 22:39-46, Jesus prays as Son to "Father," saying, "yet not my will but yours be done." See the Adam-Jesus comparisons in J. H. Neyrey, "The Absence of Jesus' Emotions—the Lucan Redaction of Lk 22,39-46," *Bib* 61 (1980) 163-65, 168.



<sup>44</sup>The most likely sources for the names between Judah and David are LXX 1 Chr 2:3-15 and Ruth 4:18-20. To use Chronicles here, one would have had to cull the names from among many collateral lines. Ruth 4:18-20 is a ready-made list with no extraneous material. For Luke's *Esrōm*, Ruth has *Esrōn* (Alexandrian text *Esrōm* in v. 18 only); 1 Chr 2:5 has *Arsōn*, 2:9 *Eserōn* (Rahlfs). To Luke's *Arni*, Ruth's *Arran* is closer than Chronicles' *Aram*. Luke's *Admin* seems a mistaken duplicate for the following *Aminadab* (but cf. the seventy-seven name list), which could be equally related to either list. Luke's *Sala* is closer to Ruth's *Salman* than to Chronicles' *Salmōn*. Both sources have *Ōbēd* for Luke's *Jōbēd*. In general, Schürmann (*Lukas-evangelium*, 1. 201), Ernst (*Lukas*, 156-67), and Marshall (*Luke*, 164-65) prefer Ruth to Chronicles. Some suggest a Hebrew source. But because of the notorious textual difficulties with names, this explanation will have to suffice. Note the despairing comment in B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: UBS, 1971) 136.

<sup>45</sup>See O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) 479-80; G. E. Wood, "Ruth, Lamentations," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer, and R. E. Murphy; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968) 1. 609. O. Loretz ("Das Verhältnis zwischen Rut-Story und David-Genealogie im Rut-Buch," *ZAW* 89 [1977] 124-26) disagrees, as does A. S. Herbert ("Ruth," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* [ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley; London: Nelson, 1972] 316): "There is no necessity to suppose that the genealogy is a later addition to the book. . . . What the writer has done is to use this well-known and often repeated story and give it a point." I see the genealogy as inserted at the level of the canonical redaction of the story, so that, though it is not an original part of the story, it is an original part of the book of Ruth, as Luke's genealogy is an original part of his book.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. J. M. Sasson, "Generation, Seventh," *IDB Supplementary Volume*, 354-56; and "Genealogical 'Convention.'"

<sup>47</sup>Note that this typical Old Testament introduction (as in Ezek 1:1; Lamentations title; Josh 1:1; Judg 1:1; Ruth 1:1; 2 Kgdms 1:1) is an obvious mark of Luke's style: *kai egeneto en tō* plus the infinitive. It occurs in Luke 1:8; 2:6; 3:21; 5:1, 12; 8:40; 9:18, 29, 33, 51; 10:38; 11:1, 27; 14:1; 17:11, 14; 18:35, etc.