

1-1-1980

Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible

William Kurz

Marquette University, william.kurz@marquette.edu

William S. Kurz, S.J.
Marquette University

I. INTRODUCTION

Scholars commonly recognize that the author to Theophilus (henceforth Luke) locates his Gospel narrative within 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. The focus of his first LOGOS (Acts 1:1) is of course the story of Jesus, of the second that of the spread of the Word through Jesus' witnesses till its rejection by many of the Jews at Rome in Acts 28. But just as one of Luke's concerns was to relate these accounts to contemporary history and to show that they did not take place "in a corner" (Acts 26:26), another was to ground them in God's past work in history and his promised future consummation on the Day of the Lord.

Some of the methods of so situating his story within the sweep from ancient to future history were available to Luke in profane Hellenistic narrative and historiography. But the "time line" on which Luke placed his two-fold LOGOS was conceived in a specifically religious way, that in the Bible. This line began with Adam and ended with the biblical Day of the Lord. In addition, the Greek Bible which Luke so extensively quoted and used already contained a variety of genres of narrative, almost all of them focussed on God's action for his people through chosen individuals, in ways very similar to those found throughout Luke-Acts. It also contained most of the historiographical conventions and motifs found in Luke-Acts. It therefore seems reasonable to investigate the Greek Bible as a probable source for many of the narrative techniques in Luke-Acts.

This article will select from narrative forms and approaches found in the Greek Bible some that were used by Luke to situate his account within the broader scope of religious history, specifically the history of God's dealings with his chosen people. It is submitted as a part of the dialogue on the "Jewish connections of Luke-Acts" and as a contribution to the on-going discussion on the genre of Luke-Acts.¹ Page limitations prevent it from attempting a full answer to the genre question. It is meant rather to describe evidence that needs to be considered in genre discussions.

Three important narrative forms and approaches for locating Luke's account on a "biblical time line" are genealogies, summaries of OT history in speeches, and the use of the Testament or farewell address to describe "future history" that extends beyond the last narrated event in the main story (Acts 28).

Thus the genealogy of Jesus in Luke 3 shows Jesus' roots in, and continuity with, the fathers of the people back to "Adam son of God." In the Acts speeches, the summaries of OT history are commonly understood as a way to show the connection between the events in Luke-Acts, and God's past promises and prophecies to his people. Similarly, the testaments and prophecies about the future, found in the mouths of Jesus and

Paul, enable Luke to include a description of events which take place after the activity of Paul which he describes in his last chapter. These include Paul's death, the destruction of Jerusalem, the rise of false teachers and persecution, cosmic cataclysms, and Jesus' return as Son of Man. These three devices enable Luke to mention the whole history of God's dealings with his people from Adam to the final day.

Space does not permit more than a mere mention of the contents of the whole time line here. This article will concentrate on that part of the time line covered by the genealogy. OT surveys of the past, and testament-like prophecies of the future, are being developed in other articles. But for some sense of the entire time line, here is a brief introductory sketch.

Luke begins his time line at the very beginning - Adam's origin from God. He grounds the whole genealogy, a synopsis of all of human history, in God's action. The genealogy from Adam to Abraham is based on biblical genealogies and has no surprises. The list of names provides a quick review of whatever is known from biblical tradition about the pre-patriarchial "history" of humanity. In a similar way the names from Abraham to David come from the Bible, but for this period he supplements the bare list of names with his OT surveys in Acts speeches.

After David the situation changes drastically. Except for David's son Nathan and for Zerubabel son of Salathiel none of Luke's names are obviously biblical.² Whether or not Luke is averting to a later Jewish identification of Nathan son of David with Nathan the prophet to David,³ he is clearly avoiding the Davidic lineage through the reigning kings of Judah. He has deliberately chosen other "sons of David" for Jesus' Davidic ancestry, sons who never became king, and consequently were never the subject of the curses against the unfaithful kings found in the Deuteronomic history, Jeremiah, (esp. Jer 22:24-30 and 36:30-31), and later biblical books. Therefore, as far as the biblical story goes, there is a gap between Nathan son of David to Joseph Mary's husband. Two strange exceptions are Zerubabel and Salathiel, who are listed as descendants of someone other than the king Jehoiakim, who was cursed by Jeremiah from ever having a descendant on the throne.

Similar gaps from David to Jesus and the Baptist occur in the OT surveys in Acts 7 and 13, which when seen in light of Luke's theme of exalting the lowly and humbling the exalted, seems to imply a statement by Luke that God was preparing a Messiah more through unknown little people than through most of the public figures of the post-Davidic era, such as the unfaithful royal line and Hasmonean-Herodian leadership.

The Acts surveys of the OT relate Jesus not only to his Davidic ancestor but to others who played saving roles in God's people, and delineate epochs in the history of God's dealings with his people. The epochs are demarcated in terms of promise and fulfillment. Thus Acts 7 highlights Abraham, Joseph and Moses so as to portray Joseph and Moses as fulfilling promises to Abraham.⁴ The promise that Abraham's descendants would worship in the promised land (Acts 7:7) is not fulfilled in (either) Temple but with Jesus (Luke 1:73-75). The prophecy of the twice-rejected Moses, that God would raise up a prophet like himself, is fulfilled in the twice-rejected Jesus (Acts 7:37 citing Deut 18:15).⁵

Acts 13 also emphasizes fulfillment of God's promises to the fathers (Acts 13:23 & 32), ultimately with Jesus' resurrection and the consequent forgiveness of sins (13:32-39). The survey divides history into epochs (450 years in 13:20) of the rescue from Egypt and gift of the land, the time of the judges till Samuel the prophet, Saul's 40 years and replacement by the obedient David. "From this man's seed according to promise he (God) brought for Israel a savior Jesus (13:23).

Together, the OT surveys in Acts 7 and 13 complement each other and divide the history of God's dealings with his people into epochs marked by promise/prophecies and fulfillment, with even rejections of his plan subsumed by God to fulfill it. This is obviously a very helpful interpretive framework for Luke's account of the rejection, death, resurrection and followers of Jesus the Savior.

Since Luke's account ends with Paul in Rome in the early 60's, there remained the task of filling out the "biblical time line" from the early 60's to the final Day of the Lord, the ultimate consummation of God's saving plan and public vindication of Jesus as Son of Man and eschatological judge. For this "future history" (future in terms of the limits of Acts) Luke found in his Greek Bible frequent examples of the testament or farewell address and similar kinds of prophecies of the (eschatological) future. Three important instances in Luke-Acts are Luke 21, Luke 22, and Acts 20.

Luke 21 divides the coming time into at least three stages: a time of persecution of Christians (partially fulfilled in Acts), the destruction of Jerusalem (fulfilled between the 60's of Acts and Luke's writing)⁶ and "times of the Gentiles" (21: 24, the time in which Luke is living), and the final stage of the cosmic signs and return of the Son of Man in power (the only stage still to come at the time of Luke's writing). That Luke did not expect this to be centuries away is indicated by the urgency in Luke 17 and especially 18:1-8, where his readers are told in a parable to pray to hasten "the vengeance for his elect." They are assured that if they pray day and night for this, God will vindicate them EN TACHEI (18:7-8, cf. Acts 3: 20).⁷

More clearly portrayed by Luke as Jesus' last testament is Luke 22:15-38. In addition to the important Eucharistic material, Luke has gathered here sayings which Mark and Matthew had placed earlier in their Gospels (Who is the greatest? Be as servant), and some material peculiar to him. The last is most clearly testamental. As Jesus' last words, he notes his disciples' fidelity to him, "and I DIATITHEMAI to you a kingdom, as my Father DIETHETO to me" (22:28-29, cf. the covenant language in the Eucharistic words, 22:20). Promises follow that the Twelve will sit on thrones judging the twelve eschatological tribes of Israel (the ten tribes considered lost in Luke's day would have to be eschatologically restored to make up the promised "twelve tribes").

The next of Jesus' final promises are for Simon: though Satan will sift him like wheat (his three-fold denial), Jesus has prayed for him that his faith not fail, so that after his fall and repentance he will strengthen his brethren (fulfilled in the rest of the Gospel and Acts 1-2).

Finally come changed instructions for the coming new stress (22:35-38), ending with the ironic, "it is enough."

The testament of Paul in Acts 20:17-38 provides one last set of "future" events to be put on Luke's time line after Paul's imprisonment in Acts 28. In a form clearly modelled after a dying patriarch's testament, Paul sends for the Ephesian elders and speaks his final words to them (Acts 20:17-18). After the usual declarations of "mission fulfilled" among them, Paul predicts his imprisonment and trials (fulfilled in the rest of Acts) and the finish of his race and task as witness (20:18-24; Paul's death is fulfilled before Luke writes).

None of them would see Paul again (20:25-27). After his death they are to be alert against wolves who will attack the flock. Even fellow elders will distort the truth and seduce disciples into error (20:28-30). It is likely that the warnings of false teachers both without and within refer to the time of Luke's community. Thus Luke would be living not only in the "times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24) but in what are also times of laxity and false teaching. Living during these hard times, his community have only the cosmic signs and final day to await.

Thus "the things that have been accomplished among us" (Luke 1:1) mostly fall toward the end of the "biblical time line" from Adam to the final day. The activities in Acts are part of "the final days" of Joel 3:1-5LXX (Acts 2:17) when the eschatological Spirit is poured out. From the time after the last event of Acts to the time of Luke's writing, prophecies which had remained unfulfilled in Acts come true, such as Paul's death, continued persecutions, the fall of Jerusalem, and the current "times of the Gentiles" and of false teachers. All that remains for fervent prayer and repentance (Luke 18:7-8, Acts 3:19-21) to hasten is Jesus' return from heaven amid cosmic signs.

II. MAIN INVESTIGATION: HISTORIOGRAPHICAL FUNCTIONS OF GENEALOGIES

The Introduction tried to cull from Luke and Acts a setting within the history or "time line" of all God's deeds among his people for Luke's double account of Jesus and his followers. It isolated three forms utilized for this purpose: the genealogy, the speech survey of biblical history, and the testament or farewell address. For lack of space, the rest of this article will focus on the functions of the genealogy, probably the least discussed of the three forms.

Despite the lack of popular interest in biblical genealogies, recent scholarly studies have increased our understanding of biblical and comparative genealogies and their functions.⁸ The following comparison of the functions of genealogies in Luke's Gospel and the Greek Bible will have four points: A) the placement of the genealogy in relationship to the entire work as it now stands; B) the extension of the genealogy back to Adam; C) the meaning of mentioning God at the head of the genealogy; and D) genealogies as providing a context for the main narrative within the history of God's people.

A. PLACEMENT OF THE GENEALOGY WITHIN THE ENTIRE WORK.

Scholars have frequently discussed the differences between where Matthew and Luke place their respective genealogies, and why Luke's appears after the infancy-youth section. 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 Luke 4:1-13, is commonly known. Not quite so widely recognized are the similarities in placement between Jesus' genealogy in Luke 3:23-38 and that of Moses in Exodus 6:14-17.⁹

Luke precedes his genealogy with a substantial amount of introductory material. After his preface, a form lacking in earlier biblical books but present in later Greek books like the Sirach translation and 2 Maccabees epitome, Luke begins in Greek biblical style, EGENETO EN TAIS HEMERAIS HERODOU... (Luke 1:5)¹⁰. The story of Zachary, Elizabeth and the conception of John the Baptist precede the parallel account of Mary and the conception of Jesus (Luke 1:5-25 and 26-38). That is, Luke sets the stage in expectations of pious Jews before introducing his main figure, Jesus.

Similarly, Exodus 1 gives a transition from the Joseph account 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. (Compare the levitical priest Zachary from the division of Abijah, which is identified in 1 Chr 24:10 and Neh 12:4 & 17, and Elizabeth a daughter of Aaron.)

Both Luke 1-2 and Exodus 2 proceed to describe the births of their heroes, followed by their naming, their being brought up, and their growth. Both relate an event in the youth of their heroes which foreshadowed their later work but preceded it by many years - Moses' attempt to rescue fellow Israelites, leading to his 40-year exile, and Jesus in the Temple at 12, but subject to his parents until about 30.

Only after this do the respective missions of Jesus and Moses begin, both with mention of the desert. When Moses is leading a flock across the desert, God reveals himself to him and commissions him at the burning bush (Exod 3). The word of God comes to the Baptist in the desert, which begins his ministry of preaching and baptizing. When Jesus is baptized, God addresses and commissions him (Luke 3:1-22).

Because of the multiplicity of sources, of which Luke may well have been unaware, there are repetitions in the commissioning of Moses to go to Pharaoh in Exodus 3-6. 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 of them have been "properly introduced," Moses is again told to take God's message to Pharaoh, 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 stated in 7:6, and in 7:7 their respective ages when they spoke to Pharaoh to begin their mission. Only then follows the extended narration of their rescue mission of the ten plagues, which culminated in the death of first-born sons (Exod 7:8-ch.11, followed by the Passover in ch.12).

In a similar placement, after Jesus is named Son of God and 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 of God and his obedience (4:1-13), and finally the beginning in 4:14 of the extended account of Jesus' saving mission beginning in Galilee, culminating in his own death as God's Son (23:34 & 46) at Passover time. One slight

difference is that Jesus' age is mentioned at the beginning of the genealogy, Moses' and Aaron's only after the statement of their obedience and immediately before the plague accounts.

In other words, in relationship to the overall story of God's saving work through Moses and Jesus in Exodus and Luke respectively, the genealogies occur in almost the same relative positions. They are preceded by preliminary accounts of their birth, youth and commissioning, and followed by detailed narratives about their main mission.

Though such parallels can at first glance seem arbitrary, Acts 7:18-37 gives solid evidence that Luke had in mind precisely this parallelism between the structures of Jesus' and Moses' careers, and that he elaborated his parallelism on the basis of the Greek version of Exodus. In a way quite 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 Lukan introductions, summaries, transitions, substitute favorite expressions, and interpretative comments.

The heavy use of verses, phrases and language from Greek Exodus is quite obvious even from the printing of Nestle's 25th edition, which uses bold print for allusions as well as for full verse quotations, and still clear in the 26th edition which only italicizes full quotations. For lack of space we will cite only some of these, inviting readers who so desire to compare the Greek texts of Acts and Exodus more fully.

Acts 7:18 quotes Exod 1:7 about the new king who did not know Joseph, and uses the same combination of words for the oppression by the Egyptians (Acts 7:19 KATASOPHISAMENOS, Exod 1:10 KATASOPHISOMETHA; Acts 7:19 EKAKŌSEN, Exod 1:11 KAKŌSŌSIN; Acts 7:19 ME ZŌ OGONEISTHAI, 3 forms of same verb in Exod 1:17, 18, 22). The same unusual expression is used for the baby Moses in Acts 7:20, EN ASTEIOS, and Exod 2:2, IDONTES AUTO ASTEION (the Hebrew has the very ordinary expression KI TOV).¹¹ For Moses' adoption by Pharaoh's daughter, Acts 7:20 has HĒ THUGATĒR PHARAO... HEAUTĒ EIS HUION, Exod 2:10 TĒN THUGATERA PHARAO... AUTĒ EIS HUION. The account goes on like this, with many coincidences of otherwise unusual words or word combinations which clearly show a deliberate use of Exodus by Acts. 7.

But the parallels are not just in language - more importantly for our question is the deliberate parallelism in structure between the careers of Moses in Acts 7, closely based on Exodus, and of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke, which has been convincingly shown by scholars.¹² 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 & 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 and *passim* for Jesus in the Gospel and speeches of Acts). Both are rejected not just once by their people but twice, and the Acts speeches use similar expressions for Moses and Jesus to describe this rejection of a savior vindicated by God: TOUTON TON MOUSEN, HON ERNĒSANTO... TOUTON HO THEOS KAI ARCHONTA KAI LUTRŌTĒN APESTALKEN (Acts 7:35 and Luke's frequent use of parallelism between the relation HON and demonstrative TOUTON, as in Acts 5:30-31, HON HYMEIS DIECHEIRISASTHE... TOUTON HO THEOS ARCHEGON KAI SŌTERA HYPŌSEN).

Finally and conclusively, the parallelism between Moses and Jesus is obviously alluded to in Acts 7:37. "This" Moses (who worked signs and wonders, 7:36, and was sent as the people's savior, 7:35) prophesied (citing Deut 18:15) the God would ANASTESEI ("raise up," with a pun on "resurrect") "a prophet for you ... like me."

Luke's care in the Acts speeches to show parallel structures for the careers of Jesus and Moses, while respecting the differences in the details of their lives, is confirming evidence that Luke imitated Exodus' structure in the placement of his genealogy. Luke's Acts 7 speech gives evidence that he was conscious of comparative structure in the lives of Moses and Jesus, and that the analogy between the placing of Moses' genealogy in Exodus 6 and Jesus' genealogy in Luke 3 is therefore probably conscious imitation of the Exodus structure.

From this parallel placing of the genealogies of Moses and Jesus just before the beginnings of their saving careers, what can be learned about the narrative functions of each in their respective accounts? Coming after the introductory section on Moses' youth and call, the genealogy in Exodus 6:14-27 functions to situate Moses and Aaron within the priestly line of Levi, and ultimately in their place within God's people, before the narrative of how God actually saved the people through them by the plagues.

Unlike Luke's linear genealogy tracing just a single line of descent, the genealogy in Exodus 6:14-27 is segmented to give the descendants of several sons of one father. An added function resulting from this is that Moses and Aaron are related not only to their direct ancestors and descendants, but also to collateral priestly lines of Levi (as well as from Reuben and Simeon) to which other protagonists of the desert stories like Korah (Numbers 16) belong. In fact, the genealogy is geared more to Aaron than to Moses, and traces Aaron's line through Eleazar to the priestly line of Phineas. It therefore has the additional function of legitimating Phineas' line by grounding it in the saving figures of the exodus.¹³

In summary, the genealogy of Moses and Aaron in Exod 6:14-27 situate them in the priestly line from Levi, and relate Aaron to the priestly lines of his descendants, especially that of Phineas. It also relates Moses and Aaron to collateral levitical lines before relating their roles in the people's salvation.

The similar placing of the genealogy in Luke 3:23-38 suggests a similar function in his Gospel. It supplements the dating from contemporary rulers in Luke 3:1-2, with Jesus' position within the ancestral subdivisions of God's people, and his temporal relationship to the people's history. Thus the genealogy places Jesus in an obscure (vs. the royal) branch of David's line, as Moses and Aaron were placed in Levi's. It puts Jesus as the end of the long saving history of God with his people, traced back to its very beginning in Adam (vs. the Exodus genealogy which also names Aaron's descendants after him, and which began only with the sons of Jacob). This difference in the content of Jesus' and Moses' respective temporal relationships to the history of God's people is very important. Though Luke was one or two generations after Jesus, Jesus still is the end of the genealogical line, unlike Aaron who was in the middle of his. The whole line has led up to its exclusive and definitive fulfillment in Jesus, and now the people of God 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, in terms of function, both genealogies show the temporal relationship of the saviors to their people's history.

Let us now turn to the functions implied by Luke's extension of Jesus' genealogy back to Adam.

B. DEPTH OF LUKE'S GENEALOGY BACK TO ADAM

1 Chronicles 1-9 has in common with Luke 3:23-38 genealogical links from the contemporary generation or hero all the way back to Adam. Though the genealogies in Genesis also go back to Adam, they do not extend forward nearly as far as those in Chronicles, which cover the generations from Adam to his main hero David. It does not seem an unreasonable question to ask whether Luke might have imitated Greek Chronicles in the functions to which he put his genealogy.¹⁴

Comparison between the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 1 and Genesis 5 and 11 indicates probable dependance of Chronicles on Genesis, and therefore mostly similarities. Both are similarly subdivided: from Adam to the three sons of Noe (1 Chr 1:1-4, Gen 5:3-32), and Sem to Abram/Abraam (1 Chr 1:17-27, Gen 11:10-26). But there are small differences, so it can be asked whether Luke 3:23-38 is in general closer to Chronicles or to Genesis. Luke 3:36 has KAINAM between ARPHAXAD his father and SALA his son. Neither the Hebrew Genesis 11 nor 1 Chronicles 1 have KAINAM, but both identify Shelah as son of Arpachshad. In the Greek texts, however, Gen 11:12-13 says ARPHAXAD begot KAINAN, and KAINAN begot SALA (Cambridge text), the same as Luke except for the spelling of KAINAN (and for textual criticism, spelling of names in genealogies is notoriously difficult.) The manuscript tradition behind Greek 1 Chr 1:17-24 is confused, and only the Alexandrian text agrees with Luke 3:36 in listing ARPHAXAD, KAINAN, SALA (Rahlfs). The evidence strongly indicates Luke's dependance, at least ultimately, on a reading from the Greek rather than Hebrew Bible. The evidence is confused about whether Luke more probably used Greek Genesis or Greek Chronicles for his KAINAM, but tips slightly in favor of Genesis unless his text was like the Alexandrian.

Other arguments slightly favor Luke's use of Greek Chronicles over Greek Genesis. Luke agrees with Chronicles in the spelling ABRAAM, instead of ABRAM in Genesis. Also, the names in Chronicles are in simple list form as in Luke, whereas Genesis includes much extraneous information about ages and other children. Luke could have himself done what apparently the Chronicler before him did, namely cull his names from Genesis and simply list the results in genealogical order. But it would have been easier simply to use the prominently displayed genealogies at the beginning of Chronicles. If his Greek version of Chronicles was like the Alexandrian text in including the KAINAN discussed above, he would not have had to consult the Genesis lists at all. A definitive conclusion does not seem possible, but it seems reasonable to suggest that Luke (or his source) used the Chronicles list, with possible reference to Genesis, to extend the genealogy back beyond Abraham to Adam.¹⁵

Even at first sight, the function of gathering in one place all genealogical material from the time of the narrative back to Adam seems to be to situate the narrative within the overall history of God's dealings with humans from the beginning. Closely related to this is the function of spanning

gaps in the traditions narrated, 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 3.¹⁶

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 in Genesis 46 and Numbers 26 connect the sons of Judah with the exodus clans.¹⁷ This function is less obvious for linking David with Adam in 1 Chronicles, but perhaps 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 be used to help show epochs in history according to a pre-arranged plan by God,¹⁸ as in the arrangements of names in multiples of seven 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, with its arrangements of seven from Adam to Jesus which highlight major intermediate figures, than when God has become the first name of the list. With Adam at the head of the list, the seventh figures include Enoch, Abraham, David, Salathiel, and Jesus, which is what one would expect. With God at the head of the list, none of these names are in seventh position, but rather Jared, Terah, Jesse, Neri and Joseph. Nevertheless, the key names would continue to stand out and thus naturally divide the list into epochs marked by Noah, Abraham, David, etc.

Another obvious function of genealogies is simply to identify the individual through his ancestry, and link him to well-known personages from the past, as in 1 Sam 1:1 (Elkanah son of Jeroham son of Elihu son of Tohu son of Suph, an Ephraimite), 1 Sam 9:1 (for Saul), 2 Sam 20:1 (for Sheba), Zeph 1:1, and Zech 1:1. When the genealogy proceeds through sons who were not the 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, and that though Judah became dominant and had a prince descendant (David), the birthright was Joseph's. 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 earlier listed David not as first-born of Jesse but as "the seventh." The notion of God's free choice may be part of the what is implied in Luke 3 by listing Jesus' descent from David through a non-royal line.¹⁹

For readers familiar with the biblical narratives, genealogies also function as "encapsulated history" and a mnemonic device for quick recall of a whole sweep of history in the briefest possible way. This is true of the genealogies in 1 Chronicles 1-9 and in Luke 3. Also, by the contrast between the brevity of the list of names with the full narratives of both Chronicles and Luke, the complete narratives are automatically emphasized in relation to the genealogical overview of preceding history.

C. WHY LUKE MENTIONS GOD AT THE HEAD OF HIS GENEALOGY

Like the Chronicler before him, Luke extends his genealogy back to the first man. Unlike the Chronicler, or as far as I know any other Jewish writer, Luke goes even beyond Adam to God.²⁰ Hellenistic and Roman sources do trace people back to

an origin in some god, and popular Hellenistic philosophy contains the view that the whole human race is descended from the gods or the divine principle. The Areopagus speech, especially Acts 17:26 & 28-29, shows that Luke is aware of such thinking. The verses mentioned argue that all humans are descended from one man (Adam is not named) and "we" (humans) are all the descendants (GENOS) of God.²¹

In its argument and wording, the Areopagus speech exhibits a combination of Stoic, rhetorical, poetic and biblical expressions, concepts and allusions. The "unknown god" is identified with the God who created and is Lord over the cosmos and everything in it. God therefore does not dwell in man-made temples nor need anything from humans, since "he himself gives to all men life and breath and everything" (Acts 17:25 RSV). These are important themes in popular Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish propaganda.

This God made from one human (Adam) the whole race to inhabit the earth, and he set the times and boundaries so humans would seek God (cf. Luke 3:38, Acts 1:7, Gen 1-5 & 10, Deut 32:8 and Ps 74:17).

Verses 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 therefore the GENOS of God..." The word GENOS refers to descendants of a common ancestor, and the expression of humanity as God's GENOS is found in writers like Cleanthes and Dio Chrysostom, as well as in Luke's quotation from Aratus.²²

The background for understanding the combination of Luke 3:38 and Acts 17:28-29 in the context of Luke-Acts seems to be Gen 1:26-27 and 5:1-3. In Gen 1:26-27 God says, "Let us make man according to our EIKONA and HOMOIÖSIN." They (ANTHROPOS 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 EIKÖN and descendants becomes clear in Gen. 5:1-3. The chapter begins, "This is the BIBLOS GENESEÖS ANTHRÖPÖN: on the day God EPOIÖSEN ... TON ADAM, KAT' EIKONA THEOU EPOIÖSEN AUTON." Gen 5:3 then uses similar expressions to describe Adam's begetting of Seth: "KAI EGENNÖSEN KATA TÖN IDEAN AUTOU KAI KATA TÖN EIKONA AUTOU." Just as Adam is KAT' EIKONA THEOU, so is Seth KATA TÖN EIKONA of Adam. Implied in Genesis is a careful distinction between how God is related to Adam from how gods in Greek mythology are related to heroes they beget from human partners. The distinction appears in the choice of verbs used in Greek Genesis. God made (EPOIÖSEN) Adam, whereas Adam begot (EGENNÖSEN) Seth. God's transcendence is preserved, yet a filial relationship is implied by saying Adam was KAT' EIKONA THEOU as Seth was KATA TÖN EIKONA of Adam. The care with which the Greek translators proceeded 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 that God EPOIÖSEN TE EX HENOS PAN ETHNOS ANTHRÖPÖN KATOIKEIN... Although here EPOIÖSEN 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.

In this light, the explanation of Luke's affixing of God to the head of Jesus' genealogy can be attempted. Like the discussion in Acts 17, the designation of Adam as son of God seems to interpret the biblical information in terms understandable to the Hellenistic thought world. Listing a god at the head of human genealogies is a Greco-Roman pagan practice rather than a biblical one. Luke's genealogy itself, however, already contains hints that Adam's origin from God was not by sexual generation, hints which would be obvious to readers familiar with the Bible.

Two clues to look for something unusual in Luke's genealogy are his insertion of the phrases *HOS ENOMIZETO* in the beginning and "of God" at the end of it: "Jesus... being the son, as was supposed, of Joseph of Eli... of Adam of God" (Luke 3:23 & 38). Not only does the first phrase "harmonize" the genealogy with the virginal conception in Luke 1:26-38, but it points to an analogy between Jesus' filial relationship to Joseph and the special kind of filial relationship of Adam to God, which anyone familiar with the Genesis story would know. Neither Jesus nor Adam were sexually begotten by their respective "fathers" in the genealogy, Joseph and God. Rather God made Adam and gave him the divine prerogatives of ruling and naming the rest of creation. In Luke 1:26-38 also, there are echoes of the creation story. Jesus is not sexually conceived in Mary's womb but is created in the womb by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:34-35). For the creative and life-giving functions of the Holy Spirit are widely attested in the QT and well-known among first-century Jews and Christians.²³ Nor are 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.²⁴ 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 the analogy here described between Jesus and Adam as made by God's creative power, and in that non-sexual sense being sons of God. Many have noticed an implied parallel between Adam and Jesus in the temptation of Jesus (Luke 4:1-13). There Jesus is tempted as Son of God by the devil, and contrary to the disobedient Adam in Genesis 3, he acts as an obedient Son. The comparison between Jesus and Adam in the adjacent pericope helps confirm the analogy for which we are arguing in this section on the genealogy.²⁵

On the basis of this evidence, some functions of Luke's affixing God to his genealogy can now be suggested. In the light of Acts 17, adding God to the genealogy and implying that all humanity are children of God through "one man" Adam function as relating 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.

3. The addition of "Adam of God" also functions to highlight the implied Adam-Jesus comparisons as disobedient-obedient sons of God in the following temptation story. All these functions, even those most influenced by secular Hellenistic interests, take place within the biblical perspective of God as transcendent creator of the human race, and of the Genesis story of Adam

D. SITUATING 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 each of those juxtapositions was made from a different main point of comparison, namely the literary placing of the genealogy within the overall work, and the extension of the list back to Adam. A further brief comparison to Ruth 4:18-20 G can help clarify the function of showing where the story fits in the overall history of God's people. The likelihood that Luke consulted Ruth for his own genealogy from Phares to David gives an added reason to compare Luke 3:23-38 and Ruth 4:18-20 G.²⁶

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 which could otherwise stand on its own. As in Matthew and Mark, the temptation story in Luke would be a natural immediate sequel to the heavenly proclamation of Jesus as God's Son. Luke has had to insert the genealogy into his sources' arrangement at this point. Similarly, the story in the Book of Ruth is completely finished by the point at which the genealogy is added, and most scholars hold that it was added by a later hand.²⁷

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. The climactic line is, "A son has been born to Naomi" (Ruth 4:17). With that, the story's internal plot line is resolved. But the text as it now stands goes on to show the wider significance of the story: "and they called his name Obed; this is the father of Jesse the father of David." This simple addition would have been sufficient to insert the story into the larger history of Israel. The still further addition of the final genealogy links the story not only with later generations up to David but with earlier ones back to Phares the son of Judah the patriarch. In so doing, the genealogy shows where the story of Ruth stands on the "biblical time line" from the patriarchs through the exodus generation through the judges to its "fulfillment" in David.

If this is the case, why does the genealogy begin with Phares and not with the better-known Judah? The seventh-generation emphasis seems to be the answer. Boaz, the male hero of the story, is seventh in the genealogy from Phares, but would have been eighth from Judah.²⁸ The link between the Ruth story and Judah the patriarch had already been made earlier in the narrative, which is evidence that it was the person responsible for the canonical version of the story and not some later glossarist who put the genealogy at the end of the book. Ruth 4:12 has the prayer of the elders: "and may your house be as the house of Phares, whom Tamar bore to Judah..." This verse ties the genealogy to the narrative in two ways. First, there is an analogy between the roles of Judah and Boaz, and between those of Tamar and Ruth. In both situations a kinsman of a dead husband provides a childless widow with a child on behalf of her dead spouse (with obvious differences!). Second,

it explicitly identifies Phares as a son of Judah the patriarch, who would be a more obvious first name in a genealogy. The explicitation of the link between Phares and Judah in Ruth 4:12 freed the redactor from having to begin the genealogy in 4:18 with Judah, and thereby enabled him to reserve the climactic seventh place in the genealogy for Boaz. Therefore, the genealogy in 4:18 can begin, "And these are the GENESEIS of Phares."

If this explanation is valid, it follows that Luke and the canonical redactor of Ruth have made similar adjustments in adding a genealogy to their main accounts. Both begin with a story which stood alone without a genealogy (as in Luke's source Mark). Both add the genealogy to the basic story as an obvious insertion or addition. Both stories had previously been furnished with time indicators before the genealogies were added. Thus the story of Ruth is set in the time of the judges: KAI EGENETO EN TŌ KRINEIN TOUS KRITAS... (Ruth 1:1).²⁹ In accordance with Hellenistic taste, Luke's temporal setting in Luke 3:1-2 is more detailed. But in both cases, the genealogy provides not the contemporary time indicator but rather the relationship of the story to earlier biblical accounts of God's dealings with his people.

Another similar procedure is the forging of links between genealogy and story. Luke put his links into the genealogy itself, using the phrase "as was supposed" to correlate Jesus' sonship to Joseph with the story of Jesus' virginal conception, and adding "of God" to relate the genealogy to its context between Jesus' being named and being tempted as Son of God. The redactor of Ruth put his links both in the genealogy and in the story. Instead of beginning the genealogy more obviously with Judah the father of Phares, he gives the "GENESEIS of Phares" so that Boaz can have the privileged seventh position. Then, in Ruth 4:12, the link to Judah is expressed in a way that shows the analogy between the birth of Obed from Boaz-Ruth and that of Phares from Judah-Tamar. Thus it makes sense at the end of the story to append the genealogy of Phares.

Lastly, both genealogies culminate in the person who was for each author 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).

CONCLUSION:

The genealogy of Jesus in Luke 3:23-38 has provided one of several possible examples of how Luke used material and methods found in the Greek Bible, in adapted imitation of the Bible. Lack of space precluded similar comparisons of how OT surveys and the "future history" of testaments or farewell addresses were used by Luke to provide a temporal backdrop from Adam to the final day of judgment for his "narrative about the things that have been accomplished among us" (Luke 1:1). Nor was there room to present further stylistic arguments for Luke's imitation of the Greek Bible, such as his unapologetic use of barbaric names in his genealogy, and of many phrases that are far more common in the Greek Bible than in ordinary Koine, like the extraordinarily frequent EGENETO constructions in Luke-Acts.³⁰

Many names in Luke's genealogy are taken from the Bible and left in their non-Greek biblical forms. Similar methods of placing the genealogy between the call and actual mission of the hero, of extending the genealogy back to the biblical first

man Adam, and of using it to set one's own account within the whole history of God's dealings with his people, are found both in Luke-Acts and in several places in the Greek Bible. Even the one apparent difference from biblical procedure, that of grounding the genealogy in God, has to be understood according to the Genesis account of Adam's relationship to God.

The various functions of Luke's genealogy within his account are found for genealogies in the Greek Bible as well. The main function seems to be to situate Luke's narrative in the history of God's dealings with his people. In this, it functions the same way many biblical genealogies do.

By themselves, these conclusions do not solve the genre question for Luke-Acts, if for no other reason than that the Greek Bible contains several narrative genres. E.g., Tobit is a romance, 1-4 Kingdoms are meant as history in the special sense of the history of God's interactions with his people, yet both use many of the same narrative devices. But our findings do demonstrate a very fruitful source of comparative material for studying Luke-Acts: the Greek Bible, a hellenized part of the "Jewish connections of Luke-Acts."

FOOTNOTES:

¹See, e.g., the work of Charles Talbert, Horst Moehring, James Sanders, Vernon Robbins in the U.S., Eckhard Plümacher, W. C. van Unnik, and Martin Hengel abroad, and the classic theses of Henry Cadbury. The focus is on the Greek Bible because it is almost universally considered to be the Bible Luke used, and can perhaps provide a mediating alternative between the Hebrew Bible and Hellenistic pagan environment as comparative material to illuminate the genre of Luke-Acts. In both the Greek translation and in the later books found only in the Greek Bible can already be found an integration between biblical faith and Hellenistic culture not unlike that in the NT. Nor should the rich store of common language, themes, stories, types, and theologies which the Greek Bible shares with the NT be overlooked. Even Walter Bauer, in the introduction to his lexicon where he discusses the many cultural influences on NT Greek, remarks, "As for the influence of the LXX, every page of this lexicon shows that it outweighs all other influences on our literature" (p. xxi in the 1979 Gingrich-Danker revision, henceforth cited as BGD).

²Some commentators have noticed possible allusions to the Hasmonean Mattathias in the repetitions of that name in the genealogy between Zerubabel and Joseph, but none of Mattathias' sons correspond to those named in the books of Maccabees.

³Cf. pro: M. D. Johnson, The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies (SNTSMS 8; Cambridge: University, 1969) 240-242, and E. L. Abel, "The Genealogies of Jesus Ho Christos," NTS 20 (1973-74) 203-10. Contra: R. E. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977) 92, n. 75; H. Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium (HTKNT 3/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1969) I, 201, n. 96; and J. Ernst, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (RNT; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1977) 156. Regarding the rejected and cursed royal line (Solomon-Jehoiakim), cf. A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke (ICC 28; 5th ed; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922) 104, Schürmann, Lukasev. I, 201, and Ernst Lukas 156.

⁴Still one of the most enlightening brief treatments of this speech and of Abraham in Luke-Acts is Nils A. Dahl, "The

story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in his Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976) 66-86, and also in L. Keck and J. L. Martyn, Studies in Luke-Acts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966) 139-158, now reprinted as a Fortress paperback. See also Earl Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition (SBLDS 41; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), J. Bihler, Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte (Münchener Theologische Studien 30; München: Max Hueber, 1963), E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 275-90, and H. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte (HNT 7; 2nd ed; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1972) 50-58, and their references.

⁵Cf. esp. Luke T. Johnson, The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 70-76.

⁶Cf. David L. Tiede, "Luke 19:41-44 as Vaticinium Post Eventum," privately distributed for the 1977 SBL Luke-Acts Seminar.

⁷Cf. William S. Kurz, "Acts 3:19-26 as a Test of the Role of Eschatology in Lukan Christology," Society of Biblical Literature 1977 Seminar Papers (ed. P. J. Achtemeier; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 309-323; E. Franklin, Christ the Lord (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975) 9-47, 162. I do not see two irreconcilable strands in Lukan eschatology, contra S. G. Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," NTS 15 (1969-70) 330-47. Now also cf. A. J. Mattill, Luke and the Last Things (Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1979).

⁸See esp. R. R. Wilson, "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research," JBL 94 (1975) 169-189, and his Genealogy and History in the Biblical World (Yale Near Eastern Researches 7; New Haven: Yale, 1977), and M. D. Johnson, Purpose (note 3).

⁹Cf. Plummer, Luke, 101-102, and R. E. Brown, "Genealogy (Christ)," IDBSup, 354.

¹⁰For hibernicistic stylistics, see e.g., standard sources like Hawkins' Horae Synopticae, Moulton, Grammar of NT Greek: Vol. 4 on style by N. Turner, both Cadbury's Making and Style, J. de Zwaan, "The Use of the Greek Language in Acts," and W. K. L. Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," in Beginnings II. Compare the judicious recent review of the question and the suggestion of "synagogue Greek" by Fred L. Horton, Jr., "Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts," in Charles H. Talbert, ed., Perspectives on Luke-Acts (Special Studies Series No. 5; Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978) 1-23. Massive evidence of Lukan use of the Greek Bible is now marshalled in the careful study of Earl Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition (SBLDS 41; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978).

¹¹Compare the similar citing of ASTEIOS from Exodus 2 G in Heb 11:23, the only other NT occurrence of the word. In the Greek OT, it appears only here in Exod 2:2, Num 22:32 (in the sense of 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). By the Stoics it seems to be almost equivalent to SPOUDAIOS (Moulton-Milligan, Vocabulary of the Gk Testament, p. 86). For extensive further evidence of Acts 7's use of the Greek Pentateuch, cf. E. Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4 (note 10), pp. 38-140, on Moses esp. 76-102. Our two analyses were done independently of one another and confirm each other.

¹²E.g., L. T. Johnson, Literary Function, pp. 70-76 (note 5). For extensive evidence of Luke's parallel structuring in general cf. C. H. Talbert, Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts (SBLMS 20; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) with references.

¹³An interesting peculiarity of the Lukan genealogy is the large number of names from the priestly tribe of Levi rather than from Judah. This is related to the peculiarity that Elizabeth, wife of the priest Zachary and "daughter of Aaron" is called the kinswoman (SYNGENIS) of Mary 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, only with the emphasis reversed. Whereas Luke gives a Davidic genealogy with levitical allusions, Exodus provides the levitical/Aaronic genealogy with Davidic connections. Exod 6:23 identifies Aaron's wife as Elizabeth (!) daughter of Aminadab and sister of Naasson, who are identified in Num 1:7; 7:12 & 17: Naasson is the head of the house of Judah when Moses and Aaron take the census. The same two also appear in the Davidic genealogy in Ruth 4:20, 1 Chr 2:10, Luke 3:32-33 (and Matt 1:4). Of the four sons of Aaron and his wife from the tribe of Judah (Exod 6:23), two died without heirs and Eleazar and Ithamar were heads of the two major priestly lines. Phineas was son of Eleazar. Thus the priestly line of Phineas is shown to have connections through the wife of Aaron himself to Judah, David's tribe. Providing such Davidical connections for the priestly lines may have been a secondary function of the Exod 6:14-27 genealogy.

¹⁴Lest 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, and Talbert, Literary Patterns (note 12), pp. 1 and 11. For an extensive treatment of the role of rhetoric in Luke-Acts, see William S. Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts," CBQ 42 (1980) 171-195.

¹⁵With several contemporary commentators, I think that Luke had a genealogy among his sources which extended from Adam to Jesus and contained 77 names in 11 groups of seven. To it he himself added the TOU THEOU at the head of the genealogy and also the phrase HOS ENOMIZETO, which qualifies Joseph's paternity of Jesus and harmonizes the genealogy with Jesus' virginal conception in Luke 1:26-38. In adding God at the head of his genealogy, Luke has fitted it into its context between "You are my son" in Luke 3:22 and the temptations as son of God in chap. 4, but he has damaged the clear arrangements of the climactic seventh names like Enoch (cf. Jude 14, "the seventh from Adam"), Abraham and David. Cf. Schürmann, Lukasev., I, 199-204; I. H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 157-165, esp. 160-61; Ernst, Lukas, 154-57; M.D. Johnson, Purpose, 229-39.

¹⁶Wilson, JBL 94, p. 172, and M. D. Johnson, Purpose, 78.

¹⁷M. Johnson, Purpose, 80.

¹⁸ Ibid., 80-81.

¹⁹ Ibid., 79-80.

²⁰ Cf. Schürmann, Lukasev. I, 201-02, "ganz ungewöhnlich!" M. Johnson, *Purpose*, 237 says there is no known parallel in the OT or in rabbinic texts. Compare pp. 239 and 112-14 on Hellenistic and Roman practices of tracing a genealogy back to a god.

²¹ For thorough discussion of these notions with their counterparts in Greco-Roman and Jewish writings, 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; Haenchen, *Acts*, 524-25; Conzelmann, *Apg*, 104-11 and the literature they cite.

²² BGD, p. 156, GENOS, and works cited in note 21.

²³ See the extensive arguments and many texts cited by Schürmann, Lukasev. I, 52-54, Sjöberg & Schweizer, "PNEUMA," TDNT 6:386-87 and 402, Schulz, "SKIA/EPISKIAZÖ," TDNT 7:399-400. (Luke does not mention pre-existence: this treatment of Jesus being created in the womb obviously refers to the human Jesus.) Compare also Justin Martyr's explicit arguments in the mid-second century 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 TEN PARTHENON KAI EPISKIASAN OU DIA SYNOUSIAS ALLA DIA DYNAMEOS ENKYMONA KATESTESE (33:6, Goodspeed, p. 49).

²⁴ Liddell-Scott-Jones 618 & 657, Moulton-Milligan 231-244, Schneider, "ERCHOMAI/EPERCHOMAI," TDNT 2:680-81, Schulz, "SKIA/EPISKIAZÖ," TDNT 7:399-400, Schürmann, Lukasev., I, 52-54. Cf. Isa 32:15 G: HEOS AN EPELTHE₁ EPH' HYMAS PNEUMA APH' HYPSELOU.

²⁵ In addition to the commonly made comparison between Luke 4:1-13par and the stories of Adam and of Israel, God's disobedient sons, in the desert, the further parallel to Jesus' prayer before his passion can be mentioned. In Luke 22:39-46, Jesus prays as Son to "Father," saying, "yet not my will, but yours be done." Jerome Neyrey shared with me a pre-publication draft of his study on Luke 22:39-46 which mentioned Adam comparisons in Luke.

²⁶ The two most likely genealogical sources Luke could have used for the names between Judah and David are LXX 1 Chr 2:3-15 and Ruth 4:18-20. If Luke used Chronicles here, he would have had to cull the names from among many collateral lines. Ruth 4:18-20, on the other hand, is a ready-made list with no extraneous material. Secondly, Luke's spellings and idiosyncrasies seem more easily explained by the Ruth list than by 1 Chr 2:3-15. For Luke's ESRÖM, Ruth has ESRÖN (Alexandrian text ESRÖM in v 18 only), 1 Chr. 2:5 has ARSÖN, 2:9 ESERÖN (Rahlf's). To Luke's ARNI, Ruth's ARRAN is closer than Chronicles' ARAM. Luke's ADMIN seems a mistaken duplicate for the following AMINADAB, which could with equal probability be traced to either source. Luke's SALA is closer to Ruth's SALMAN than to Chronicles' SALMÖN. Both sources have ÖBED for Luke's JÖBÖD. In general, Schürmann, Lukasev. I, 201, Ernst, Lukas, 156-57, and Marshall, Luke, 164-65 prefer Ruth to Chronicles. Some raise the possibility of Luke's use of a Hebrew source. But since most agree that Luke relied exclusively on the Greek and not Hebrew elsewhere, and because of the notorious textual difficulties with names, the explanation

here seems good enough. Note the despairing comment in B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (United Bible Societies, 1971) 136. Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 150-54, has some helpful observations on textual questions in Lukan quotations from the Greek Bible. E.g., he notes that the Alexandrian text, which is the one most in agreement with NT quotations, is also the one most susceptible to Christian editing (p. 154).

²⁷ Cf. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) 479-80, and G. E. Wood, "Ruth, Lamentations," JBC I, 609. A. S. Herbert, "Ruth," PCB 316, disagrees: "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." My own conclusion is that the genealogy was inserted at the level of the canonical redaction of the story, so that although it is not an original part of the story, it is an original part of the book of Ruth, just as Luke's genealogy is an original part of his book.

²⁸ Cf. J. M. Sasson, "Generation, Seventh," IDBSup, 354-56.

²⁹ Note also this typical OT introduction to a story or part of a story (as in Ezek 1:1, Lam tit., 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_I plus the infinitive. It occurs in Luke 1:8; 2:6; 3:21 EGENETO DE EN TŌ_I BAPTISTHĒNAI...; 5:1, 12; 8:40; 9:18, 29, 33, 51 EGENETO DE EN TŌ_I SYMPLĒROUSTHAI TAS HĒMERAS TĒS ANALEMPSEŌS AUTO...EIS JEROUSALĒM; 10:38; 11:1, 27; 14:1; 17:11, 14; 18:35, etc.

³⁰ Regarding the use of barbarian names, compare Luke's genealogy with that in Josephus' *Antiquities* I, 79 (LCL 4:36), which according to Hellenistic historiography tries to put Greek endings on all the names and introduce some stylistic variety instead of a mere listing of names: "NŌCHOS...APO ADAMOU DEKATOS: LAMECHOU GAR ESTIN HUIOS, HOU PATER ĒN MATHOUSALAS, HOUTOS DE ĒN TOU ANŌCHOU TOU JAREDOU, MALAĒLOU DE JAREDOS EGEONEI, HOS EK KAINA TEKNOUTAI TOU ANŌSOU SYN ADELPHAIS PLEIOSIN, ANŌSOS DE SETHOU HUIOS ĒN TOU ADAMOU." See H. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge: Harvard, 1920, reprint 1969), esp. pp. 154-58.

For similarities between Lukan and biblical style, see note 10. For the rare formula and ascending order of Luke's genealogy, cf. Tob 1:1: BIBLOS LOGŌN TŌBIT TOU TŌBIĒL TOU ANANIĒL TOU ADOUĒL TOU GABAĒL EK TOU SPERMATOS ASIĒL EK TĒS PHYLĒS NEPHTHALIM (Rahlfs). These are the closest parallels to Luke in that they preserve the non-Greek endings of names. Contrast the Greek endings in a bilingual inscription: AAILAMEIN HAIRANOU TOU MOKIMOU TOU HAIRANOU TOU MATHTHA and Herodotus IV, 147: THĒRAS HO AUTESIŌNOS TOU TEISAMENOU TOU THERSANDROU TOU POLYNEIKEOS, which are cited in E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangeli-um* (HNT 5; 3rd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1975) 56-57.