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ABSTRACT

Thematic interrelation is an underdeveloped field of inquiry in Lukan studies. The design and elegance of Lukan theology begs for guided investigation into a possible system of organisation that governs history and theology, that is, narrative and theme. Based on the Greimasian Actantial Model, morpho-syntactical structural-critical analysis of Luke and Acts reveals that the covenant concept in its operative aspect of service functions as an organising principle, structuring the narratives and facilitating thematic interrelation.

A survey of representative Lukan research consisting of five methodologically determined approaches shows a commonality regarding Lukan purpose. These all share the “plan of God” as a fundamental concept, thus intimating its plausibility as a common organisational principle in the text. This observation encourages further analysis of Lukan narrative and meta-narrative as relevant subject matter.

Investigation into the purpose and goals of Ancient Jewish and Ancient Greek literature suggests that the concepts of piety/holiness and justness combined with a notion of divine order and expectation demonstrates organisational capacity.

Under the terms and conditions of the Old Covenant three non-exclusive themes/concepts hold organisational functionality and ability to facilitate thematic interrelation: Exodus typology, the covenant concept and the eschaton idea. Exodus typology connects narrative with theme, developing Israel’s story. The covenant idea frames stories using parallelism and gives the meta-story progression. The eschaton idea presents the Day of YHWH as an organisational principle guiding the story of judgment to restoration. It is observed that the covenant concept is the most prevalent of these themes/ideas.

Assuming the conceptual unity of Luke and Acts and adopting a morpho-syntactical structuralist approach, it was observed that the covenant concept in its operative aspect of service occurred as Helper at ten places, determining the development and structure of the meta-narrative. According to the Greimasian Actantial Model, Israel failed to fulfil its covenant-based mandate to serve God and shine God’s light of mercy to the nations. Jesus, Israel’s new Helper, becomes the Subject and by his covenant-based
ministry, characterised as the greatest service, resolves the problem that prevents Israel from carrying out its divine mandate and sets the stage for its fulfilment. In Jesus Israel is given new leaders, an ethical platform of discipleship and the Holy Spirit. The apostle Paul as the epitomised and exemplary witness and servant of Jesus fulfils what Israel could not. He is vindicated in righteousness and shares in the Isaianic ministry of Jesus, to bear witness to leaders and to shine God’s light to the nations. Paul is unhindered in this ministry. Additionally, in thematic-critical terms, the key placement of the covenant concept in its operative aspect of service at plot-defining junctures features its catalytic dynamic as a “template” concept advancing the re-conceptualising of themes and providing a platform for meaningful relation.

The evidence thus suggests that the covenant concept in its operative aspect structures the conjoined narratives of Luke and Acts. It also provides a basis for relation between the divine and humans in the context of the history of God’s salvation, linking history and theology, and makes possible a discernible means to thematic interrelation.

**Key words:**
The covenant concept as an organising principle in Luke-Acts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON THE ORGANISATION OF CONCEPTS IN LUKE-ACTS
2.0 Introduction 5
2.1 Historico-Theological Approaches 6
2.2 Socio-Rhetorical/Literary Approaches 11
2.3 Apologetic Approaches 13
2.4 Literary-Narrative Approaches 14
2.5 Socio-Critical Approaches 22
2.6 Summary 24

3.0 PRINCIPLES OF ORGANISATION OF CONCEPTS IN JUDAIC AND HELLENISTIC LITERATURE
3.0 Introduction 27
3.1 Early Judaic Literature 28
3.1.1 Qumran literature 28
3.1.2 Jewish Hellenistic literature 32
3.1.2.1 Alexandrian literature 32
3.1.2.2 Palestinian literature 37
3.1.3 Jewish literature 38
3.2 Ancient Greek Literature 42
3.2.1 Geometric and Archaic Age 43
3.2.2 Classical Age 48
3.2.3 Hellenistic Age 51
3.2.4 Roman Greek Age 53
3.3 Summary 55
4.0 PRINCIPLES OF ORGANISATION UNDER THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE OLD COVENANT

4.0 Introduction 59

4.1 Old Testament Organisational Principles 59
  4.1.1 Typology as an Organising Concept 59
  4.1.2 The Covenant Idea as an Organising Concept under the Old Covenant 61
  4.1.3 The Eschaton Idea as an Organising Concept 69

4.2 Summary 72

5.0 THE COVENANT CONCEPT’S STRUCTURING AND INTERRELATING FUNCTION IN LUKE-ACTS

5.0 Introduction 74
  5.0.1 Preliminary Assumptions Qualified 75
    5.0.1.1 An Organising Principle 75
    5.0.1.2 The Unity of Luke and Acts 77
    5.0.1.3 The Fundamental Assumption of Conceptual Unity 79

5.1 Delineating the Narrative and Narrative-Level Features in Luke-Acts 82
  5.1.1 Initial Sequence 86
    5.1.1.1 Extraction of the Metadiegetic Narrative’s Syntactical Components 86
    5.1.1.2 Synthesis of the Metadiegetic Narrative and Initial Sequence 105
  5.1.2 Topical Sequence 107
    5.1.2.1 Topical Sequence, Sub-Sequence A 110
    5.1.2.2 Topical Sequence, Sub-Sequence B 113
    5.1.2.3 Topical Sequence, Sub-Sequence C 117
      5.1.2.3.1 Hypo-Sequence C^1 120
      5.1.2.3.2 Hypo-Sequence C^2 124
      5.1.2.3.3 Hypo-Sequence C^3 126
  5.1.3 Final Sequence 128
    5.1.3.1 Characterisation of Paul 129
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>The Covenant Concept and its Function within the Structure of Luke-Acts as a Narrative Whole</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The common author of the two New Testament books known to us as the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles uniquely derived the information contained therein from a variety of sources. Consequently, many significant contributions within Lukan studies have been made to the investigation of the theological themes governing his writings (Talbert, 1974; Squires, 1993; Marshall & Peterson, 1998; Bovon, 2006). The resultant diversity may well be due in part to the differences of approach and emphases by those who have undertaken such a study or simply the product of such varied theological perspectives and concerns. M. Heath identifies similar if not identical difficulties in recovering coherent unifying themes in Greek Poetics (1989: 8).

It cannot be denied, of course, that the results of previous research have provided equally credible and valid conclusions regarding the alleged purpose and central themes of Luke-Acts. What must be considered, however, is not so much whether any one is more worthy of our attention than the others, but if such identified themes co-exist functionally within Luke-Acts.

In my MTh dissertation, *The Covenant in Luke-Acts*, I demonstrated that the covenant concept was basic to Luke’s reasoned presentation of the salvific work of God, and was used also “to evoke a unilaterally defined sense of covenantal identity” amongst his readers (Kovács, 2006: 111). During the course of investigation, however, it was noted that certain occurrences of the covenant idea functioned differently when the context around the covenant concept was read integrally as part of the larger unified narrative of Luke-Acts. In other words, it was observed that the noted rationalising function, concentrated within discourses, was symptomatic of the covenant concept’s overarching organisational function, on the level of the narrative as a whole, facilitating narrative structure and providing an interpretive framework that allows the interrelation of thematic components. This overarching organisational function of the covenant idea became readily apparent when the covenant idea was discerned in terms of its operative aspect, that is, service to God, at strategic points of Luke’s Gospel and Acts as a narrative whole.

It would appear that a working understanding of an organised thematic interrelation within Luke-Acts also requires the assumption of a conceptual unity. Beverly Roberts
Gaventa (1988: 149-157) not only indicates a need for investigation into thematic interrelation, but also emphasises the importance of this conceptual unity for a more complete understanding of the theology of the book of Acts. This component is not just fundamental to narrative criticism, but also for our purposes of ‘thematic criticism’, presented formally as a discipline by Bremond et al. (1995). As such, this necessitates the delineation of the Lukan narrative. Luke presents his work through the hermeneutical lens of pivotal Old Testament covenant events, thereby providing a narrative substructure that interweaves Israel’s ancient history with the contents of Luke’s gospel account and the book of Acts. Green (1996: 288) and Witherington (1998: 69) agree that Luke’s approach is hermeneutical, engaging the larger biblical framework. In this way, the ultimate question of Luke-Acts is addressed – the relation of history to theology (Barrett, 1961) – which is foundational to understanding event-based thematic interrelation.

Attempts at interrelating Lukan themes, whilst worthy of our consideration, have not fully exploited the wealth of Luke-Acts as a literary corpus. Each contribution has seemed to fall short in one way or another: the efforts of Tannehill (1986/1990), whilst substantial, are not explicitly focused on thematic interrelation but the dynamics of salvation narrative; Moessner’s findings (1989), whilst significant, do not extend to the whole Lukan corpus; Squires’ investigation (1993) is methodologically limiting; Marshall and Peterson (1998), whilst admirably categorising the Lukan themes under salvation, make no attempt to unearth a convincing overarching infrastructure; Bovon’s valuable appraisal and the items surveyed (2006) are subject to similar criticism. To date, there seems to have been no concerted effort to explore the interrelation of themes in Luke-Acts in a judicial manner or to determine the presence and character of a satisfactory organising design that does justice to the richness of the narrative. The studies that do take note of the existence of such an interrelation seem to do so only in passing. The central question of this work, therefore, is: “How may one determine the extent to which the concept of covenant functions as an organising principle in the design of Luke-Acts as a unified theological historical narrative?”

The questions that naturally arise from this problem are:

- What approaches have formed the basis for previous research on the organisation of concepts in Luke-Acts?
What principles of organisation of concepts can be identified from within Judaic and Hellenistic literature?

What were the merits – or otherwise – of any principles of organisation that existed under the terms and conditions of the Old Covenant?


The aim of this thesis is to determine the extent to which the concept of covenant functions as an organising principle in the design of Luke-Acts as a unified theological historical narrative.

The objectives of this study must be seen in their relationship to the aim. I intend to approach the subject from the following angles:

i) To examine the different approaches to previous research on the organisation of concepts in Luke-Acts;

ii) To identify the principles of organisation of concepts in Judaic and Hellenistic literature;

iii) To evaluate the principles of organisation under the terms and conditions of the Old Covenant;

iv) To assess the relationship of the covenant concept to the narrative structure, theological interrelation and organisation as found in Luke-Acts.

The central theoretical argument of this study is that the covenant concept in Luke-Acts provides a means of correlation between history and theology, thus making possible the interrelation of the themes, concepts and subject matter in Luke-Acts and, thereby, assisting the development of the narrative as a whole.

This theological study will employ a careful analysis of the relevant scholarly literature available on the subject, an examination of the historiographically defined hermeneutics of appropriate Judaic and Hellenistic literature, an evaluation of the salient features of
the concept of covenant within the Old Testament in accordance with widely acknowledged hermeneutical techniques (Henrichsen & Jackson, 1990), and an assessment of the Scriptures under consideration primarily in the light of recognised literary critical (Peterson, 1978), structural (Calloud, 1973; Patte, 1978; Hays, 2002), rhetorical (Mack, 1990), narrative (Tolmie, 1999) and intertextual methods (Litwak, 2005). The weaknesses of literary criticism have been noted as contributing significantly to the danger of historical, cultural and authorial decontextualisation (Poythress, 1978; Mcknight, 1987). The inherent unity of Luke’s gospel account and the Acts of the Apostles as a two-volume work is accepted in consideration of the issues as identified by Michael Bird (2007). Given that my Christian background is one that finds most sympathy within the broad framework of the Reformed tradition, I propose to give balanced recognition to sources of information that are not written exclusively by those of that persuasion in order – as far as is practicable – to arrive at conclusions that might otherwise be subject to allegations of unnecessary bias.
CHAPTER TWO: PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON THE ORGANISATION OF CONCEPTS IN LUKE-ACTS.

2.0 INTRODUCTION


An organising principle may be defined as a quantifiable concept discernable on the level of the text, which facilitates the structuring of the narrative for the purpose of creating a meta-story matrix enabling thematic interrelation. D. Barley corroborates, “Organisation and organism ... imply a structure of diverse organs and component parts which are related in such a way as to function collectively in the service of an overriding purpose” (1967: 182). Organisation requires the relation of the parts in some way. This relation is accomplished, as proposed, by an organising concept. An organising concept accordingly appears to inform narrative structure. Gary A. Tuttle observes precisely just this dynamic in that the Sermon on the Mount contains “pervasive wisdom antithesis” which is the organisational principle of the sermon, that is, a key to its meaningful structure (1977: 214, 219).

In clear narratological terms an organising principle may be identified with the depersonified concept of the implied author or, as better suits this study, the overall textual arrangement of the narrative (Tolmie, 1999: 7). Structural-critical terminology redefines narratological “textual arrangement” by specifying that narrative structure itself serves as an organising principle (Greimas, 1971: 793), where structure is a system of logical narrative development of a hierarchy of narrative programmes (Patte & Patte, 1978: 24-25). This system of narrative development conforms to a culturally informed translinguistic sequence (Greimas, 1971: 793), which by implication as a template conveys the organising concept(s) or provides a medium for its extraction. The phrase “organising principle or concept” as referred to in this thesis encompasses this gamut of meaning. Precisely where the emphasis falls will be made clear in turn. Methodological necessity, as will be demonstrated, assigns priority to a structural-
critical approach supported in turn by narratological considerations. In Chapter Five an eclectic methodology will reconcile apparent differences in approach if any.

Sifting the literature of Lukan studies for organising principles approaches a Sisyphean task. The sparsity of organisational terminology would appear to result from the lack of its being perceived as relevant to reasonable inquiry. There are, however, exceptions. An organisational principle if not explicitly discussed may be presented as part of the work’s purpose. If this is the case, the chief means of identifying an organising principle within the understanding of a scholar who makes no direct reference to it is to follow observations and conclusions regarding Lukan purpose(s), and specifically theme(s). Importantly, however, it must always be kept in mind that a theme is not a concept, as Claude Bremond correctly argues that they are two distinct notions (1993: 46-59). A concept is a “supposedly defined notion” (1993: 47), “the essence of a notion” (1993: 47) which when placed in varying situational contexts inaugurates a theme, an abstraction (1993: 47, 59). A theme varies (may abstract) concept whilst a concept unifies theme (1993: 47). Organisation may occur at a thematic level. This, however, should be understood as relational positioning, as Bremond makes clear (1993: 53). Themes are analysed in terms of similarity, dissimilarity and logical relation. This mode of structuring should not be confused with the organisational function of a concept. As it will be shown, an organisational concept by definition corrals other concepts, and as a result defines narrative structure and also serves as a link between themes conceptually. In surveying scholarship I will note where ‘organisation’ is seen to occur at a thematic level.

2.1 HISTORICO-THEOLOGICAL APPROACHES

The work of Conzelmann, Fitzmyer, Marshall and Maddox will be examined in this section for their understanding of the dynamics of organisation in both Luke and Acts.

2.1.1 H. Conzelmann

Conzelmann applies a theme of eschatology to redemption-history in order to organise his universally recognised tripartite system. The distinctiveness of Luke’s account is based on his fundamental separation of kêrygma and narrative contra Mark in which the kêrygma unfolds within the developing narrative (Conzelmann, 1960: 11). As a result, Luke is able to reflect on the kêrygma (Conzelmann, 1960: 14-15), “formulations of belief already determined” (1960: 11) before writing. This meditation is guided,
proffers Conzelmann, by concern for the delay of the *parousia* (1960: 14). Such concern is the pebble dropped on smooth waters whose ripples reach the recesses of Lukan theology. “As far as the history of tradition is concerned, this means that Luke employs for his reconstruction of history the traditional material, which is stamped with the view that the last days have already arrived” (Conzelmann, 1960: 96). Eschatology, following Conzelmann’s reasoning, specifically the Lukan understanding of the “last days” as that beginning after the Ascension at Pentecost and being expanded from imminence into the future (Conzelmann, 1960: 95), functions in an organising capacity. A specific eschatological understanding accounts for observable structural features in the narrative. The “last days” as a manifestation of salvation differentiates itself by “the uniqueness of the events of that time” (1960: 14) as the last epoch in redemptive history (1960: 95). The implications of this differentiation are founded upon what Conzelmann discerns as Luke’s understanding of development or change in the story of salvation (1960: 98-131, 209-213, 215). There are certainly elements of continuity, yet “Luke does not wish to reform the present Church by the pattern of the Church of former times” (1960: 15). Similarly, “In order to be able to set out clearly in the person of Jesus a salvation which is timeless, his period must be distinguished from the present period” (1960: 14). Lukan eschatology, the “last days”, re-shapes according to Conzelmann the presentation of the Kingdom of God (1960: 113-119), the role of Satan (1960: 156-157), Christology (1960: 170-206), the church (1960: 209-213), pneumatology (1960: 136, 183, 213-215, 225-226), the Christian life (1960: 226-234) and other aspects (1960: 184). With this re-shaping a three-stage story of salvation emerges (1960: 16-17, 150).

Conzelmann argues that the Lukan redefinition of the “last days”, of *parousia* delay, in itself requires further explanation, “…and this is done by means of the idea of God’s plan which underlies the whole structure of Luke’s account” (1960: 131-132). For Conzelmann the idea of God’s plan undergirds Luke and Acts, as does also the Lukan eschatology (1960: 95). These two ideas combined seem to function together, educing organising principle effects. All events as observed by Conzelmann are results of God’s guidance according to plan (1960: 151-154). This plan is also responsible for the above theological re-shaping with the result of a tripartite redemptive process.

A redaction-critical approach ultimately yields a *theological system*, a system that Conzelmann sees is responsible for structuring. Conzelmann sees eschatology and the
divine plan as foundational in the theological system of Luke. Whether they are actual organisational principles remains ambiguous, as Conzelmann does not directly address this question. His concern with parousia delay is seen as a theory with great difficulties (Marshall, 1971) particularly with the notion of crisis attached to it. One notable criticism is that the salvation-historical plan in Conzelmann’s study is not a Lukan “innovation” (Marshall, 1971: 86; Fitzmyer, 1970(1): 20). In essence this undermines Luke’s motivation for writing. Perhaps Conzelmann has misjudged the prevalence of eschatology’s influence. The plan of God, however, holds some promise as an organising principle in that as a concept it remains seated in narrative contexts, at strategic points, with the possibility of resolving into a theme, though only “fulfilment” as a theme seems probable.

In view of the present thesis Conzelmann has not adequately considered the dynamic of change in the story of redemption. Conzelmann reasonably asserts that it is prophecy, the divine plan, that “…creates the continuity” (1960: 150) between three epochs. The first epoch prophesies Christ, in the second Jesus prophesies concerning the Kingdom of God (1960: 150). The Lukan emphasis on the prophetic word as a unifying and structuring factor appears in the work of P. Schubert (1954), D. L. Bock (1987), B. J. Koet (1989), and P. Mallen (2008). Also the development and separation between the epochs is largely due to Luke’s Christology, setting Jesus at the centre of the salvation story (1960: 170). Yet, Conzelmann’s explanation of Lukan purpose does not fully account for this epochal arrangement, for the richness of narrative development and thereby an organising dynamic. Fitzmyer posits a similar criticism with regard to Conzelmann’s understanding of the richness of narrative development in Luke, questioning whether a sharp contrast between Mark’s unfolding kērygma and Luke’s lack of it is at all justified (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 152). Conzelmann’s reasoning is dictated by his methodology and his particular emphasis on what he deems to have been issues in the church, and this appears to weaken his grasp of narrative dynamics.

2.1.2 J. A. Fitzmyer

Fitzmyer reveals his keystone proposition “…Luke is, indeed, playing the early Christian kerygma in a new key” (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 171). Herein resonates Fitzmyer’s work with that of Conzelmann. Unlike Conzelmann, however, Fitzmyer sees that Luke’s “historical perspective” (1970[]: 175), his “sense of salvation-history” (1970[1]: 178) shapes the eschatological form of the kērygma (1970[1]: 175). This is the Lukan
fulfilment of salvation necessarily according to God’s plan (1970[1]: 179-181). Luke has come to terms with the delay of the *parousia* yet to a degree still holds to an early *eschaton*; he has shifted emphasis from the future to the present in that Christians are to follow Jesus not out of regard for an immanent return but out of a desire for everyday faithful discipleship (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 234-235). The Holy Spirit is given to the people of God not just as a substitute for an early coming of the Kingdom but as a substitute for Christ, God’s presence for discipleship and witness. The Holy Spirit is in fact the one through whom is realized the entire course of God’s salvation-history even in the Church (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 227-231). Interestingly, for Fitzmyer, the successful application of the programme of salvation utilises the principle of reconstitution, applied to the leadership and to Israel (1970[1]: 188, 191).

Fitzmyer garners two chief themes appearing in an organising capacity. The first is the theme of fulfilment, events strung together according to divine plan (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 179-181, 186); the second is reconstitution, redefining participation in Israel on multiple levels (1970[1]: 187-188, 191). These two ideas are employed in logical relation on the thematic level; however, the high frequency of their use is misleading because it suggests that they are concepts when in fact they are generated themes. Falling short of a clear organisation principle, they embellish [embellish what?] on the broad level of theology and Fitzmyer’s system is ultimately confined to Conzelmann’s tripartite division of salvation-history.

2.1.3 I. H. Marshall


It may be inferred that Marshall’s cogent view of the salvation motif appears to function organisationally in that it connects the above five main themes of the Gospel and Acts.
It seems, however, that the motif of salvation may in fact be a metatheme, as it is synoptically dominant. Marshall’s observations tend towards theological formulation as thematic dialogue leads to theological categorisation; organisational principles within the narrative structure seem not to be of chief concern.

2.1.4 R. Maddox

Maddox’s study brings into focus distinctive features of Lukan purpose. All inquiry is directed by this goal, which appears to exclude any awareness of an organising principle within the narrative. Redaction reflects the theological orientation of Luke to address reassuringly ecclesiastical issues based on the Jew-Gentile question. Broadly, Luke shows his readers how the Jewish leaders have excluded themselves from the Kingdom of God and how Christians are rooted in the origins of the Gospel [or gospel?] (Maddox, 1982: 185). In Maddox’s rendering, “…ecclesiology is a leading concern of Luke’s…” (1982: 185) such that eschatology is subsidiary, being salvation fulfilled in the gift of the Holy Spirit (1982: 182-183, 186). Maddox’s work stands under the vault of this thesis.

Yet some observations concerning the “total shape of Luke’s work” (1982: 9) are engaging:

The character of Christian life in the church cannot be understood apart from its foundation in the incarnation, mission, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. Conversely, the story of Jesus cannot properly be appreciated without following it through to its outcome in the church. Hence, the basic scope and shape of the work show a major concern to explore and explain the nature of the church (1982: 10).

Maddox reiterates this in his conclusion (1982: 181, 187). Organisation or arrangement seems the implied operative in the preceding quotation. It would appear then, the force of Jesus’ life provides the rudimentary framework upon which hangs the development of the narrative, the story of Luke and Acts. Can the events of Jesus’ life be conceptualized? Certainly; however, Maddox is not exercised by it.

A theology of purpose is utilised by Maddox “organisationally” on the level of themes. By this he circumnavigates elements in the dynamics of narrative both on a syntactical and semiotic level. Theme-based theological formulations are the context of interrelation, rather than organisation, for Maddox.
It seems that the scholars surveyed in this section would identify the plan of God concept as and organisational principle accountable for the sequence of events in the Gospel and Acts.

2.2 SOCIO-RHETORICAL/ LITERARY APPROACHES
In this section the work of Esler, Green and Witherington III will be examined to measure the efficacy of their approach in identifying organisational principles.

2.2.1 P. F. Esler
Based on the assumption that a dialectical relation exists between religion and society, Esler’s contribution Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts (1987) was precedential in that it filled a lacuna in scholarship, illuminating the influences, political and social, bearing upon the redactor’s purpose and activity. The evidence according to Esler supports not an apologetic agenda but a sociological process of legitimisation (1987: 16, 205-219). Luke’s redaction is, though not exclusively, “…in response to social and political pressures experienced by his community” (Esler, 1987: 2). The evangelist, “…decided to compose a work which would re-interpret existing traditions, … concerning Jesus and the history of the early congregations in such a way as to reassure his fellow-Christians by answering the various objections made to their beliefs and practices” (Esler, 1987: 221). Luke achieves his purpose, Esler submits, by applying the concepts of table-fellowship (1987: 105-109), faithfulness to the law (1987: 128-130), relation to the Temple (1987: 135-163), attitude to the poor and rich (1987: 197-200), and ancestral tradition (1987: 215-219) to the process of legitimisation. Legitimisation via these programmes bears semblance to an organising principle, yet it is a rhetorical technique rather than a text-based concept. Legitimisation may function in the service of themes, concepts and typology, as observed in Esler’s work. It cannot be said that Esler is not concerned with such organisational terminology. However, his concept world is sociologically defined and he is concerned ultimately with the portrayal of Luke’s redaction.

2.2.2 J. B. Green
Joel B. Green’s study The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative reveals a valuable observation: “…with respect to the interpretation of Jesus’ death in the passion account there is one overarching, organising theme—namely, the centrality of Jesus’ death in God’s redemptive plan” (1988: 314-315). Eleven themes
constitute sub-categories congealing under this one organising theme (1988: 315-320). It should be reiterated that a theme is not the equivalent of a concept as they are two distinct notions (Bremond, 1993: 46-59). Whether Green is aware of this distinction or not and the implication of it is unclear. For Green a theme carries organisational force. This should, for the sake of this thesis, be rearticulated as relational arrangement. Circular reasoning weakens Green’s perceived system of organisation, as it is difficult to see the theme as the cause of organisation, for it is ultimately the result of organisational activity.

Green’s conclusions are echoed in his theological commentary on Luke. For Green it is straightforward: the redemptive purpose of God is “an important witness for the fundamental theological and narratological unity of Luke’s two volumes, Luke and Acts” (Green, 2001: 47).

2.2.3 B. Witherington III
Witherington credits J.T. Squires with the observation that events throughout Luke’s two volumes are necessitated by God’s plan (1998: 73). Witherington elaborates, “God’s real plan of spreading the good news about Jesus … is the overall schema …” (1998: 74) expressing Lukan purpose. Furthermore, “the theme of God’s overarching plan of salvation and the breaking in of the kingdom through the ministry of Jesus and his followers” ties together, according to Witherington, the emphases of Jesus’ life, death, resurrection, sending of the Spirit, accessibility of the Gospel, future judgment and resurrection (1998: 100). In addition to this, it is by the Holy Spirit that the universalised gospel-plan is made possible and the Holy Spirit is the key to the “interlocking of themes” (1998: 21, 71, 293, 301, 512). Ultimately, Witherington sees a social premise as the goal of the universalised gospel of God’s plan, which is God’s intent to make one people out of the ethnic diversity (1998: 439, 459, 486).

Witherington states that Luke, as editor of his source material, is concerned with salvation history and his present, but is also interested in the “universal and inclusive potential of the gospel” (1998: 111). Primarily for this reason is Witherington indebted to Squires for the understanding that the fundamental “plan of God” undergirds narrative events (1998: 122). In his concluding comments Witherington asserts that the universal message of the coming of the kingdom and Jesus is the same story repeated

Witherington designates God’s salvific plan as a theme with an organisational ability. The plan of God, recognises Witherington, is articulated in the text as hé boulê tou theou (the plan of God) and as dei (necessary), and gives definitive expression to an idea occurring in varied situations. Hence it is a concept not a thematic abstraction. This concept can be then abstracted to the theme of fulfilment in salvation. The theme of fulfilment may be what Witherington has in mind when referring to God’s saving plan. It seems Witherington has not seen the need to carefully distinguish between the two and has followed instead scholastic usage. Bremond notes this kind of confusion (1993: 47-48). Witherington also notes that the breaking in of the Kingdom through events combined with the plan of God also carries organisational merit. Thematic interrelation is, however, achieved by the activity of the Holy Spirit. Witherington sees organisation in these three.

Witherington, highlighting rhetorical features and patterns in Acts, indicating his particular affinity to Tannehill, deduces his organising principles as the plan of God, kingdom establishment and Holy Spirit function. His analysis does not advance beyond the sociological and theological implications of these. There is no attempt to show how these principles contribute to narrative structure or thematic interrelation. Witherington’s approach is sound in itself; however, in view of the present thesis it is weakened by an absence of a demonstrated understanding of motif, theme formation and the effect of defining concepts in the narrative.

Again, primarily the plan or purpose of God figures strongly as an organising concept for the scholars surveyed in this section.

2.3 APOLOGETIC APPROACH

Although other works that hold to an apologetic approach do exist, I consider that the results of Squires’ work are optimal for this survey.

2.3.1 J. T. Squires

observes, because it is related to pivotal events and it also “provides a means of relating various strands in the story which have to do with the divine guidance of history” (1993: 186). In short, “the plan of God” is a “theme which structures the work” (Squires, 1993: 186) and allows the cohesive integration and presentation of Luke’s narrative (1993: 186). Squires concludes that the central role of “the plan of God” gives structure to Luke’s narrative by interweaving particular themes (1993: 186, 188-189).

Squires’ results are without question valuable; however, they raise unresolved narratological questions. Unlike R. Rendtorff (1989), Squires does not suggest that thematic relation is due to concept-centred structural phenomena. The structure for Squires seems to be interpretive, a logical linking. Structure then depends on a degree of subjectivity. It is up to the reader to make the interpretive linking based on textual clues. Squires would contend that this is an authorial intention. As in the analysis of Witherington’s representative contribution, it is observed that theme has elided with concept in the meanings of fulfilment and/or providence. Squires’ observations need to be developed and sharpened if their full implications are to contribute to our understanding of Lukan theology.

2.4 LITERARY-NARRATIVE APPROACHES

Literary-narrative approaches are rich in representative material; however, only the work of Minear, Tannehill, Talbert, Moessner and McComiskey will be analyzed.

2.4.1 P.S. Minear

Paul Minear’s lectures given between 1973 and 1974 (published in 1976) constitute what C.H. Talbert deems a shift in the methodological approach to Lukan studies (Talbert, 1986: 336-338)—from individual pericopes to larger thought units. For Minear the “coherence of his [Lukan] thought world as a whole” (1976: 7) was important to understanding the details. Minear’s comments, the culmination of 40 years of work, are indeed relevant.

In Luke’s two works it is not just the prophetic figure, Minear contends, but more so the Moses archetype, specifically the rejected prophet type, that integrates themes. Minear’s observation seems to bear the mark of an organising principle (1976: 109, 111). D.P. Moessner has highlighted Minear’s presentation of the prophet’s suffering as integrative (1986: 223). The images of Israel’s memories, hopes of deliverance, the teaching of
Jesus, the portrayal of Jesus as prophet, servant, revealer, ruler, judge, Son of God, deliverer and covenant-maker intersect within Moses typology (Minear, 1976: 108-110). Jesus’ suffering, rejection, ‘exodus’, exaltation, and power to heal, attend and gather God’s people all reflect a grounding in Moses typology (1976: 111). According to Minear, the transfiguration story, the calling and sending of the disciples and the seventy, and the Pentecost event share a Moses archetypal backdrop (110-111, 114). Minear goes as far as to echo C.F. Evans who is quoted as asserting that the Lukan arrangement follows a Deuteronomic sequence (1976: 111).

A “type” is defined by G. Prince as “a static character whose attributes are very few and who constitutes a paradigm case of a given quality, attitude, or role” (2003: 103). Minear’s observations certainly meet this general criterion. It should be remembered that a type is essentially a character-based abstraction, a kind of theme, created and recognised in an event sequence, without which it is a limited contributor to narrative structure. Minear’s investigation does not include the typifying of event sequence. He observes that a type may integrate but he does not re-conceptualize to explain the rationale behind it. For Minear the parallelism of type creates thematic relation. Minear’s insight into the Lukan use of Moses typology is significant in that it re-addresses the Lukan notion of the prophetic office in relation to Jesus’ ministry. The design of Minear’s work does not, however, address narrative structure apart from referencing C.F. Evans as above. Minear’s observations are expanded in Moessner’s major contribution (1989).

2.4.2 R.C. Tannehill
Tannehill views the narrator and implied author as functionally the same (1986[1]: 7). He believes this does not impede the extraction of values and beliefs from the narrative (1986: 7). He also recognises two levels in the narrative: the plot and story (1986: 18).

Tannehill argues that it is God’s purpose of universal inclusive salvation which unifies and motivates the narrative of Jesus and that of his followers (1986: 40; 1990: 7, 354-357). Tannehill seems to imbue God’s purpose with the function of an organising principle. He arrives at this based on his understanding that Luke is writing a longer narrative composed of many smaller events which share a common unilateral direction, the fulfilment of “God’s saving purpose of inclusive salvation” (1986: 12). The structure of the narrative is comprised chiefly of parallelisms and repetitions linked
together by the process of progressive enrichment; the substance of these parallels and repetitions comprises key disclosures that are based on the Lukan reframing of OT promises, patterns and type-scenes (1986: 4). God’s saving purpose organises the progressive linking of parallelisms and repetitions.

Observations based on the Magnificat in the section on the Angelic and Prophetic Disclosure in the Birth Narrative, lead Tannehill to remark, “It is finally the plan or purpose of God which gives shape and meaning to the story of Jesus and his witnesses” (1986: 29). The Magnificat characterises God, yet it is His purpose that forms the continuing story (1986: 29). Simeon announces God’s chief saving purpose, which “unites the narrative and constitutes its central meaning” (1986: 40, 43). Tannehill states that this shows it is “the comprehensive saving purpose of God that stands behind the events of both Luke and Acts… These passages explicitly indicate the purpose that stretches from the beginning of Luke to the end of Acts, holding the narrative together in spite of the departure of major characters” (1990: 7). Purpose, then, according to Tannehill, appears to act cohesively, exhibiting principled organisation.


Tannehill’s analysis relates perspicuously how the purpose or plan of God in salvation undergirds the plot through promise-fulfilment terminology and steers God’s mission, the story (1986: 2; 1990: 343). The plan of God is indeed a text-based concept linking events. Yet is this the dominant vehicle for organisation? Reconceptualising the salvation theme according to Lukan evidence may yield a composite result. Tannehill has not explored other options.
2.4.3 C.H. Talbert

The Gospel, Talbert states, “is a biography written to provide certainty … by telling the story using numerous legitimation techniques” (2002: 4). The governing influence of legitimation, not just as a technique but also as an organising principle, is reflected in the evangelist’s aim, according to Talbert, to “say who Jesus was and is” (2002: 2). The influence of legitimising extends over the dominant theme of promise-fulfilment (2002: 269).

In the Gospel’s first major section (1:5-4:15, Jesus’ pre-ministry story) the effect of legitimation is to develop anticipation of the “future career of Jesus” (Talbert, 2002: 17). For example, “The baptism, the genealogy, and the temptation are linked formally by the repetition of expression ‘Son of God’” (Talbert, 2002: 47). This not only anticipates Lukan exaltation Christology but reveals Jesus as the “first of a new humanity” (2002: 50) who may also gain victory in spiritual conflict. Legitimating Jesus in this way creates in Jesus a “prototype” that connects him to and is developed in the story of Israel and later of the church (2002: 19-20, 35). The apostles, disciples and early church are indirectly legitimated therefore as Jesus’ true followers. Illustrating this connective Luke 9:7-50 contains questions with exposition about Jesus’ identity and developing ministry but also reveals that he is the “one who calls his disciples to participation in the same developmental process” (2002: 107, 109). Talbert states, “The Spirit-anointed Jesus in Galilee functions as a prototype of the behaviour that characterises the Spirit-empowered disciples in Acts” (2002: 55). Jesus’ career is “prototypical for his followers” (2002: 220). In Acts, comments Talbert, the relation to Jesus is underscored as the speeches focus on the Gospel’s account of Jesus’ death and resurrection, as Jesus is the model for Christians’ emulation demonstrated particularly in the trials of Paul (2002: 220, 239-245). It is apparent, states Talbert, the correspondences “constitute the primary architectonic pattern in Luke-Acts” (2002: 218). Thus the Lukan use of foreshadowing creates a prototype of Jesus and His career as seen through the Gospel (2002: 19-20, 53, 81, 82, 90, 101, 122, 194, 223). Reading Talbert, prototype and foreshadowing appear to be primary devices by which legitimation occurs and thus satisfies the purpose of Luke. Legitimation functions toward organising content. Without the legitimation of Jesus, according to Talbert’s presentation, detection of the organisation of the content and structure of the material in and between the two volumes would be elusive.


For Talbert it seems the function of the concept of legitimation (regarding the identity of Jesus, his true followers and the early church) and of the pattern of promise-fulfilment work as organising principles. This understanding appears to be corroborated by the
extensive structural linking in and between the two volumes supporting these purposive concepts (Talbert, 1974: 172-173). In Talbert’s words, “We find in Luke-Acts an architectural pattern of correspondences between the career of Jesus and the life of the apostolic church. … the Evangelist definitely wanted to portray the deeds and teachings of Jesus as the pattern for the acts and instructions of the apostolic church” (1997: 98).

Invaluable as Talbert’s contribution is, he does not delve into the specifics of the link between God’s plan and promise-fulfilment and thereby legitimation. Events merely fulfil typology, prophecy or foreshadowed reality. This is not new to Lukan scholarship for since the advent of literary criticism, particularly the work of P.S. Minear (1976), the dominance of the promise-fulfilment theme is a well-established tenet (Moessner, 1986: 223). Talbert correctly infers that promise-fulfilment controls the plot/story; however, this does not add to our understanding of thematic organisation. Similar criticism falls to him as to Tannehill. The extensive comparative critical information is useful but does not substitute for the articulation of an organising principle.

2.4.4 D.P. Moessner

‘Moses/Exodus’ typology is for Moessner an organising principle originating in the Central Section, Luke 9:51-19:44 (1989: 60, 285). He writes, “Luke sets forth a fourfold exodus typology of the prophetic calling of Jesus which conforms closely to that of Moses in Deuteronomy… This typology in fact becomes the organizing principle for the form and content of the whole of the Central Section” (1989: 60). This fourfold typology, argues Moessner, extends to all of Luke-Acts (1989: 306). The four parts are discussed as follows. 1. As Moses was called to be mediator of God’s words Jesus is called to mediate God’s voice (Moessner, 1989: 60-61). 2. Just as the stubborn people do not listen to Moses but indulge in idolatry so also the people on the plain are reluctant to listen to God’s voice in Jesus on the mount in Luke 9 (1989: 61-66). 3. It is disclosed to Moses at Sinai and during the Exodus that his calling is one of suffering unto death; it is revealed on the mount that Jesus will journey to death in suffering, as in Moses’ case, because of the people’s “intransigent” sin (1989: 66-68). 4. As through Moses and his death God delivers only the renewed children of the mountain, so also do those receive the covenant blessings of Abraham who submit to Jesus, the one who suffers and dies (1989: 60, 68-69). Authorial intent validates the fourfold typology, Moessner contends, by the positive evaluation of four criteria adopted from O.H. Steck (Moessner, 1989: 83-207).
The Mount of Transfiguration, with events preceding and following, parallels the Sinai event and is the context of this revelation. Luke 9:1-50 announces, “that the story of the Prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy is about to unfold in a New Exodus journey to the promised salvation” (1989: 69). Jesus, then, is the journeying Prophet like Moses travelling to Jerusalem, the central location for the culmination of his ministry. Jesus is, however, also a journeying guest (1989: 132-133). Moessner states that “the Deuteronomistic dynamics … tended to converge at meal settings with the Pharisees” (1989: 132). This feature serves as criterion, illuminating the “rejection of Jesus” motif and strengthening the “Prophet like Moses” typology. Resistance to Jesus, developing from Luke 7:18-35, is forcefully illustrated at 11:37-54, where Jesus as guest of a Pharisee is not received (1989: 92-114, 132). Jesus pronounces woes upon the religious leaders, “this generation”, acting in character with the persecutors of the prophets (1989: 145-146). Moreover, Luke 12:54-13:9 includes the crowds with the Pharisees in the number of those rejecting the journeying guest Prophet like Moses (1989:132). This swelling tension, with an increase in opposition and rejection as Jesus moves closer to Jerusalem, rather than a journey itinerary, gives the Central Section its shape (Moessner, 1989: 292). The shape of the central section begins and ends with journey episodes bookending the eschatological halakah, instruction and exhortation to obedience (1989: 127-128, 131). According to Moessner, the Stephen-Philip connection to the Seventy(-two) in Luke’s Gospel forms a literary bridge to Acts and is important to the plot (317-318, 315-322). The story of the Seventy(-two) continues the journey-guest story introducing the role of emissaries of the word of peace through whom the eschatological salvation is present, that is the dynamic presence of God in Jesus, that is to be received (1989: 135-136, 139). “The task of the Seventy(-two) is therefore not to evangelize in as wide an area as possible but to ensure rather that Jesus (and his entourage) find households along his way to receive him” (1989: 139). The story continues in Acts, according to Moessner, as 1:1-5, 8 vouchsafes (1989: 296). A six-phase journeying scheme attests that the journeying people of God emulate Jesus the Deuteronomistic/Exodus prophet proclaiming also the Kingdom of God (1989: 296). In this, Stephen’s speech is a “watershed” connecting with Luke 9:1-50; in taking up the language of resistance it brings together the entire story and foreshadows what follows; Jesus’ reception at the mountain and in Jerusalem is echoed in Stephen’s reception and heralds the rejection of Paul (Moessner, 1989: 304-305). Thus the fourfold pattern of

It seems that Moessner is justified in classifying Deuteronomic/Exodus typology as an organising principle in Luke-Acts. It appears to account rigidly for plot development, bringing a distinct marriage of form and content to the Central Section by relating typologically the ministry of Jesus to a particular OT story. This dovetailing of form and content loses precision when the same typology colours the story of the nascent church as the continuation of the ministry of Jesus. The parallelisation weakens in the face of the developing salvation story. This said, the chief weakness of plot-based typology is its synchronic force, which encourages dominant (and thus limiting) parallelistic comparison. As a result the diachronic mode of relation falls to the side in Moessner’s treatment of the Lukan New Covenant and the covenants. Similar concern may be expressed concerning New Exodus and Restoration parallelism (Pao, 2000; Fuller, 2006).

2.4.5 D.S. McComiskey
McComiskey’s invaluable investigation into the Gospel of Luke’s narrative structure bears out I.H. Marshall’s proposal that “salvation” is its theological “thrust” (2004: 318-319). This is essentially theological purpose. Separate from this, according to McComiskey, an organising principle operates. He finds that the Gospel contains four narrative cycles; each cycle begins with reference to Jerusalem and ends with the themes of Jesus’ death and resurrection (2004: 324). He observes that Luke’s compositional arrangement of four cycles, sequentially matching narrative content, culminates in the Jerusalem ministry and provides an organising principle for the central section (2004: 322). It would seem this applies to the Gospel as a whole based on McComiskey’s comment that Luke’s compositional methodology “reflects a desire to portray his [Jesus’] entire ministry against the backdrop of the passion” (2004: 324). The Jerusalem ministry then, the theme of Jesus’ death and resurrection would seem to function for McComiskey as an organising principle.

This analysis of the Gospel is profound yet incomplete. If Jerusalem and Jesus’ death is the end in itself, that is, the focus to which the narrative progresses, as the structure of cycles evidences, then the contribution of the infancy narrative to this goal does not seem to fit tightly with the overall scheme. If there exists such a thorough system of
cycles in Luke’s Gospel, should not the infancy narrative also share in the same level of
design significance? This is perhaps beyond the scope of McComiskey’s study of

The plan of God, promise-fulfilment, legitimation, Moses typology and the death of
Jesus all appear to function organisationally in the direct and implied assessment of the
scholars surveyed in this section.

2.5 SOCIO-CRITICAL APPROACHES
The scholars surveyed in this section represent liberation theology (Baker and Nardoni)
and feminist studies (Seim).

2.5.1 C.J. Baker
Baker seeks to integrate successfully the covenant concept with Liberation Theology
(1991: 3, 6, 308-310). Reading the covenant concept in the context of a fulfilled and
fulfilling promissory covenant(s), argues Baker, enriches Liberation Theology (1991: 3,
313-314). The mode of Baker’s emphasis does not appear to subject the organising
phenomenon of the covenant idea to his analysis but only as its relation to a theological
system.

Baker clearly states that the Exodus paradigm is the primary model for Liberation
Theology (1991: 4). By emphasising the concept of covenant, represented canonically
as covenants linked by promise-fulfilment, Baker provides a sense of historical
progression and a meta-historical context for the inner-biblical Exodus paradigm of
God’s liberating grace for a community working for liberation. This is illustrated in
Baker’s chapter on Luke and Acts. Baker shows in a number of points the direct
connection between the new exodus and the new covenant (1991: 230-232, 235-238,
244).

Baker’s analysis is dominated by an agenda for harmonising biblical themes. As such it
operates on the platform of systematisation. Apart from the sense of history and meta-
history provided by the covenant concept, its structuring dynamic in literary terms does
not seem to appear specifically within Baker’s theological purview.
2.5.2 E. Nardoni


2.5.3 T.K. Seim


To this end, it is fundamental for Seim that the Lukan social system is not individually based but “collectively focused” (1994: 250). Males and females find their identity within the community. It is the community, Seim observes, that has “inherent gender-dividing organisational patterns” (1994: 250). Yet, the community of Jesus’ followers is united not only by complimentary paralleling, but also by contrasting corrections (Seim, 1994: 250-260). The gender-determined parallelism fosters the illumination of such themes and motifs (Seim, 1994: 251-259) as service (1994: 57-96), proclamation (164-184), worship locality (118-147) and ascetics (185-248) contributing to the clarity of Lukan theology.

Seim’s analysis is profound. She identifies the conceptual basis of a structural phenomenon, gender specific participation in the community and similar events, and sees the derivative thematic and theological expressions. Gender-determined patterns or
gender-division suggests the function of an organising principle, according to Seim’s evaluation of her findings, however, this is limited in purview. It is limited to community-based expressions without transverse connection to salvation-historical concerns. This highlights the perception that in Luke and Acts the organising principle is a non-singular idea. Organising concepts appear to function collaboratively.

2.6 SUMMARY
Examining Lukan literature for a principle of organisation that may not be expressly intended as a constitutive component runs the danger of introducing foreign ideas. This is not to say that such a principle does not exist. The identification of said principle must consider a thought system in its entirety and maintain its integrity.

Scholarship understands the distinction between semantic categories. Idea, concept, motif, leitmotif, theme and purpose are semantically distinct. Comparatively they are more or less distinguished, but a grasp of their functional interrelation remains somewhat elusive.

An organising principle is a text-based narrative dynamic. Hence it is no surprise that scholarship steered primarily by redaction critical methodology struggles to account for narratological features. This is the observed case with the historico-theological approaches. Lukan redaction is an important indicator of purpose and system, and this is a strength of the historico-theological approach. It is noted, however, that its representative exponents do not delve into the richness of narrative phenomena. Any organisational principles are necessarily restricted to the redactional plane of theological dialogue. The representative consensus identifies the plan of God concept as accountable for the sequence of events in the Gospel and Acts. It can be said that the plan of God is afforded organisational ability. Upon this basic platform is placed a varied combination of notions. Conzelmann’s identification of the plan of God is taken up by Fitzmyer and yoked with the theme of reconstitution. Marshall and Maddox, recognising the plan of God in terms of promise and fulfilment, see it portrayed in the efficacious events of Jesus’ life and his followers, providing the basis for a thematic framework.
As can be expected, a socio-rhetorical or literary approach reveals rhetorical devices among which legitimation figures dominantly in the formulation of themes. Green argues for thematic arrangement centred, however, in Jesus’ death fundamentally supported by the plan of God. The plan of God concept for Witherington comes to the fore, to which is combined the “interlocking” activity of the Holy Spirit as well as the theme of Kingdom advancement.

Squires’ apologetic approach unfurls the text-based concept of the plan of God using comparative analysis. He recognises the concept’s narrative structuring function in that it links divinely guided events in the story. What this structure looks like and its implications are not explored. Squires is sensitive to the relation of concept and plot development hence his observations indicate an organisational principle in the plan of God concept.

Those approaching Luke’s Gospel and Acts from a literary-narrative point of view are united by a common starting point: the integrity of the text rests on the unity of the plot. Both Tannehill and Talbert see the significance of God’s plan and promise-fulfilment revealed in correspondences between the Gospel and Acts. These two act, in the eyes of these two scholars, as an organisational principle. Talbert also gives the rhetorical device of legitimation organisational currency. Rather than taking the purpose/plan of God concept as backdrop, Minear and Moessner seek background for the Gospel and Acts in typology. Minear re-assesses the rejected prophet type, the Moses type, in the Gospel and Acts and observes its integrative function. Moessner couches Minear’s observations in Moses/Exodus typology, arguing that it operates as an organising principle. Type functions on the abstract level, arranging themes on the basis of parallelism. Typology is always limited by parallelistic range. Thus, the narrative’s plot or structure may not be addressed as a whole. Type may organise to some extent but it is limited in applicability. McComiskey argues that salvation is the theological thrust of the Gospel, yet the theme of Jesus’ death and resurrection provides structure to the narrative. It is suspected that McComiskey has exchanged theme for concept. Jesus’ death and resurrection is not an abstracted notion but occurs within varying situational contexts and as such qualifies as a concept, one which exhibits organisational ability within the limits of Luke’s Gospel.
Of those taking a socio-critical approach, Seim has identified an organisational principle in the gender-dividing organisational patterns, that is, gender specific participation in the community.

The results of this survey reflect the continuing diverse but similar development of scholarship in Lukan studies. Certain concepts have been identified as possessing organisational ability. Dominant is the plan of God concept, which has been at times approached differently but typically yoked with other themes and devices in order to account for plot development. *This scholarly consensus implies, importantly, that structure and organisation may be found at the level of the story—‘history’ and theology seem to be connected at this level.* For some, however, typology has replaced the concept of God’s plan. Concept based patterns, McComiskey’s death and resurrection of Jesus and Seim’s gender specific participation, have also been identified. Thematic arrangement has been noted by all scholars, however, not in clear articulation.

Redaction criticism has laid emphasis upon the redactor’s theology. Literary criticism obviates questions of historicity, directing exegesis in the extraction of meaning from the literary characteristics of the extant text. Other methodological approaches have made their offerings on the altar of inquiry. It cannot be said, though, that this survey has left no stone unturned. There appears to be a need to continue to investigate the process whereby the narratives of Luke and Acts generate meaning and structure. This survey suggests that an eclectic approach is advantageous. Considering, however, the questions posed by this thesis, there is a strong case for reliance on predominantly literary criticism, followed by other methodologies as required. Specifically, the extent of the subject matter and the nature of the investigative questions commend a structural critical approach for optimal results. Literary criticism has much to offer in this task, as it should address those issues in Luke and Acts that should promote the understanding of the concepts used to traverse the realm of text to that of story and the organisation thereof.
CHAPTER THREE: PRINCIPLES OF ORGANISATION OF THOUGHT IN EARLY JUDAIC AND ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter, which arises from the central question of this work, is to identify principles of organisation within Early Judaic and Hellenistic literature so that comparisons can be made with the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. Organising principle terminology seems to be a patent particularity of modern theology and literary study. Is this, however, an anachronistically invented concept alien to the mind of ancient writers? The evidence suggests that organisational concepts do exist; however, as M. Heath elucidates, “an interpreter sensitive to the historical mutability of taste should wish to explore the possibility that Greek literary practice worked with a concept of unity somewhat different from that at work in most modern criticism” (1989: 9), where the integrity of literary form is central. Similarly G. Vermes indicates that “the systematic exposition of beliefs and customs is not a traditional Jewish discipline” (2004: 67). Therefore, imposing contemporary theological categories may distort Judaic conceptions under investigation (Vermes, 2004: 67). The following analysis must then take these thoughts as a general caveat. This caution tempers yet upholds the merit of further analysis of the relation between the Lukan corpus and ancient literature (Talbert, 1974; McComiskey, 2004).

The stipulations for the detection of organising principles remain the same as that in Chapter Two. Primarily the purpose of the author(s) is still the initial field of investigation as it provides a broad enough thought context for the extraction of contributing concepts functioning organisationally and thematically. Hence the main theme in an Early Judaic or Ancient Greek composition suggests itself as the starting point for tracing the question of the influence of a concept on design. Reconceptualising the themes or express purposes then may reveal any narrative structuring and any inter-relational features.
3.1 EARLY JUDAIC LITERATURE

E.P. Sanders (1976: 11-44) rendered a comparative sketch of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism, illustrating how the two are alike and different, thus in measure correcting a perceived imbalance. Sanders examined primarily the Pseudepigrapha and Apocalyptic literature and concluded that the covenant concept functions as a “soteriological category” (1976: 15). This observation suggested that the covenant concept bears not only great significance but also that it occupies a specialised position with an inclusion/exclusion function. It appears to figure centrally yet it also seems to take on an instrumental character. The following analysis of Qumranic, Jewish Hellenistic and Jewish literature should provide illumination on this phenomenon and on the function of related concepts.

3.1.1 Qumran literature

Qumran literature has a number of concepts or themes, which are axiomatic to its system of beliefs (Vermes, 2004: 67-90). Among them are: the dichotomy of good and evil, the Law as defined by the Teacher of Righteousness, the covenant of the community, obedience to the Law, judgment and final justification, eschatology and the figures and events leading up to the End of Days. Is there a basis for the relation of these concepts and themes? Is there an organisational design?

As mentioned, prior to the Middle Ages Judaic theology was not systematised (Schiffman, 1995: 145). Yet, there were two fundamental categories: the one God as creator and ruler of the universe and the human duty to serve God and fulfil his decrees (1995: 145). This basic belief system rests upon the central notion of the covenant. It is essential to recognise, however, that the covenant concept in the sectarians’ writings is understood in its bilateral expression as covenantal law (VanderKam & Flint, 2002: 263; Kovács, 2006: 30-35). There is, therefore, a predominant emphasis on human covenantal responsibility, particularly the concept of piety/righteousness, which, formulated in terms of impurity/purity/defilement, seems to emerge dominant in organisational capacity.

Eyal Regev avers that one of the major themes in the literature of the Qumran sectarians is that of atonement (2003: 269, 270-271, 277-278; 2007: 73, 75-76, 122-124). Although atonement and thereby holiness is the sectarians’ goal, their system of atonement and thus holiness rests upon their conception of impurity/purity (Regev,
Qumran literature is saturated precisely by these two themes. Morality and purity “serve as their major structures of signification” (Regev, 2007: 95). It is a known fact that purity is consistently important in all Early Jewish Literature. In Qumran sources, however, the emphasis falls on moral over ritual purity (2007: 95). Moral purity, in comparison, “is relatively neglected in rabbinic sources” (Regev, 2007: 97). The fundamentality of the conceptions of morality and purity is also seen in the dilation of their organising function into one of interrelation of themes, for example, the themes of divine revelation, eschatology, social identity with dualistic tension (basic to all of them) (Metso, 2002; Harrington, 2004: 129-131; Regev, 2007: 117, 377-378, 381-383). Regev explains that the sectarians’ notion of moral purity/impurity is a result of their dualistic worldview (2007: 117). This view needs qualification considering the emphasis of the Qumranic view of a defiled Temple, the inception of the sect as a whole, the sectarians’ distinctive pesher interpretation, and seriously questionable ties to Zoroastrianism. It is not impossible that Qumranic dualism was encouraged by the concept of morality and purity. That component of the bilateral aspect of the covenant, then, the concept of ritual purity/impurity and moral purity/impurity, in an influential association with atonement and dualism, seems to present itself as an organisational principle in the Qumran writings.

This is seen clearly in the 4QMMT scroll, which provides insight into the early stages of the sect. John Strugnell argues, however, that MMT does not give us a representative picture of Qumran doctrine, specifically of any community organising or theological principles (1994: 64). He states, “The language used to describe the later sect and the language that shows its sectarian, dualistic, and apocalyptic nature is missing in MMT” (Strugnell, 1994: 71). Missing is the organisational (social) and theological terminology of the Teacher of Righteousness (1994: 71). The same general observation applies, according to Strugnell, to the Temple Scroll (1994: 71). They are both from approximately the same date and reflect possibly an earlier form of the sect (1994: 71). Strugnell’s observations are correct if a portrait of the sectarians is desired. Yet his conclusions are not entirely valid if a characterisation of the sect’s motivational concepts is of concern. Terminological evidence beyond that of the Teacher of Righteousness should be countenanced, like the great frequency and consistency with which the Hebrew roots for ‘pure’ and ‘impure’ occur in the Qumran scrolls (Regev, 2003: 243). Most likely, the Qumranic conception of holiness was established early on, as Regev demonstrates from MMT and the Temple Scroll (2006: 87-112). The concept
of holiness in these documents is closely related to purity and piety. Each has its function. The concepts of purity and piety seem to govern the possibility and means of attaining the goal of holiness. Notably it is not holiness, purity or piety that characterises the Qumran sect, since in these and other points similarities do exist with prerabbinic halakhah as discussed in the following section on Tannaitic writing (Baumgarten, 2006: 1-11; Noam, 2006: 67-85). Instead, it is the rigor of the sectarians in tohorah (pure food/drink/property of community), in purity as recorded in their texts, that distinguishes them (Harrington, 2004). Their rigor is due to a particular conception of holiness that is dynamic, based perhaps on the Priestly Code’s development of holiness, where it is an entity that is “sensitive and dangerous, and therefore … access to the sacred should be restricted” (Regev, 2006: 89). This is differentiated from the static conception of holiness by Phraisaic and rabbinic halakhah, where holiness is a status (2006: 87-112). The Qumranic rigor then is expressed in the activity of purity. The merit of MMT and the Temple Scroll as seminal documents is evident.

Tradition divides MMT into three parts, a calendaric (A), a legal (B) and a hortatory section (C) (Strugnell, 1994: 61). The principal theme of the letter is impurity (Regev, 2007: 103). The halakhic section (B) addresses ritual impurity; the seventeen laws in this section are united by the implied conception of a defiled Temple and a desecrated Temple cult (Regev, 2003: 245, 249). In the hortatory section (C) the critical nature of MMT escalates as the section addresses the moral impurity of the ‘multitude of the people’ (Regev, 2003: 249-252; Regev, 2007: 101-104). Section (B) and (C) are juxtaposed by the concern the authors of MMT have for the welfare of addressee and that of Israel (MMT C 27) and also the concern that the priests would bring sin on the people (MMT B 12-13, 26-27). In a sense the impurity of the people is in significant relation with the impurity of the Temple cult. Effectively, the concept of purity/impurity governs and organises the argument of MMT and provides the context for the relation of themes; this concept’s function apparently continues through the majority of the Qumran documents.

The Temple Scroll, according to David Altshuler, treats the issues of the holy Temple, city and land (3-51:10) and that of the holy nation (51:11-end), making it “an essay on the spatial nature of holiness” (1982: 8). The sectarians left Jerusalem separating themselves from the multitude of the people, for the Temple, according to them, had been defiled. They replaced the Temple, as the centre of holiness, with their
community. The sectarians made possible this shift by focusing upon Deuteronomistic passages, redacting the Priestly literature of Leviticus and abstracting the theology of the divine presence (Shemesh, 2000: 372-379). The scroll is careful to place God’s name or glory at the Temple rather than God himself, and is quick to locate God himself dwelling among Israel; the significance of this is born out in descending degrees of sanctity from the Temple, decreasing in order from the Temple city, to the land of Israel and finally to the land itself; however, the sanctity of each is independent of the sanctuary (Shemesh, 2000: 376-377). As the standard of holiness is not determined primarily by geography, this logic necessitates the re-conceptualisation of purity and impurity and elevates them in importance. Purity and impurity, then, are the subject of the sectarians’ rigor. As Altshuler states regarding purity, the Temple Scroll “deletes little from the Torah but adds much” (1982: 10). The concept governs the logic of the Temple Scroll and so organises its form.

The Thanksgiving Hymns, Tohorot, and the Rules of the Community also provide useful information on the beliefs of the Qumran community and its conceptual principles (Schiffman, 1995: 145). Hannah Harrington argues for the centrality of the concept of purity in the Qumran documents (2004, 2006). The Thanksgiving Hymns, 1QH, write of the sufferings of the righteous, but also of their ultimate vindication. Harrington observes that the righteous are holy necessarily by their purity (Harrington, 2004: 56). Themes and structured logical development hinge on the concept of purity. The topic of 4Q Tohorot is conveyed in its title “Purities” and the document is a formulation of the sectarians’ notion of purity. The “hallmark” relationship between sin and impurity is also found in the 4QTohorot (2004: 59). Holiness and purity are the central ideas with which the Rules of the Community is concerned (2004: 54). The community is a “house of holiness”; the rules of entrance to it and maintenance of it are governed by strict purity/impurity boundaries (2004: 54). There is still much debate on the specifics of the Qumranic conception of purity, for there is still discussion on whether it is based on a conflation of ritual and moral impurity categories (Haber, 2008: 47-71).

The covenant idea is without a doubt prominent in the writings of the Qumran community, though it cannot be said to eclipse other concepts. It seems that the significance of the covenant idea hinges on the community’s conception of holiness/purity as it reaches full expression in apocalyptic messianism characterised by full dualism. Purity/impurity seems to inform covenant understanding and may have
contributed to an increasingly dualistic perspective. Surprisingly, a concept of purity rather than a concept of covenant appears to function overtly in an organising capacity. It would seem that the buoyancy of holiness, purity and piety carries along the entire theology of the Qumran sect, governing the structure of its writings and the relation of themes. The identity and life of the community, the identity of the “opposition”, new covenant membership, interpretation, teaching, their view of biblical history, election, salvation and eschatology in the Qumran writings all appear as a function of purity. Furthermore, it seems that interrelation of the ideas is again only real through a purity concept. To speak meaningfully of these ideas as a collective whole is only possible in the language of purity/impurity as defined by the community.

3.1.2 Jewish Hellenistic literature

The works examined in this section are Alexandrian and Palestinian Jewish Hellenistic literature. The former representation consists of the literature of the better known writers Pseudo-Aristeas, Aristobulus and Philo. Josephus will be examined as an example of Palestinian Jewish Hellenistic literature.

3.1.2.1 Alexandrian Literature

3.1.2.1.1 Aristeas

The Letter of Aristeas, or Pseudo-Aristeas, records an account of the Jewish Law’s translation for King Ptolemy and the Alexandrian library. The document divides into five obvious sections indicated by the narrator’s transitions. In the proem, Aristeas recounts to Philocrates his memorable visit to Eleazar, High Priest of Jews, with all the motives and objects of his mission, the result of Aristeas’ devotion to acquiring religious knowledge (Letter of Aristeas, 3) (Aristeas, 1904: 6). Aristeas justifies three times his writing to Philocrates that it is due Philocrates’ disposition. He is distinguished as not just brother to Aristeas in blood but in character, as one in the pursuit of goodness (7) (1904: 6). Philocrates is disposed to holiness (5) (1904: 6), devoted to the study of the things which can benefit the soul (322) (1904: 55) since it is by learning that the soul receives the noblest elements and is purified in the aim of piety, the noblest good (2) (1904: 5). The letter is occasioned for the goal of piety: a cultural theme that follows a statement of intention to narrate. Piety in this section derives from the study of virtuous matter. This pairing occurs three times, structuring the proem and hence indicating a key to composition.
The second section relates how the need for the translation of the Jews’ laws came to
the attention of King Ptolemy and what official decrees, diplomacy and preparations
were made to meet the need. Interjected curiously into the story is the emancipation of
those Jews taken from Judea by King Ptolemy’s father and others at other times. When
this supplement is understood as a character-building episode the narrative trajectory
becomes clearer. King Ptolemy’s character is established as just and pious; he is a ruler
whose actions are guided by magnanimity in service to God (16, 19, 21, 26) (1904: 8-
10) and by “motives of justice and piety” addressing unfair servitude (24) (1904: 10).
Aristeas suggests that if King Ptolemy would have the Jews’ law translated he then is
bound by divine justice to free them (14-16) (1904: 8). The king states reportedly, “For
we are resolved that in this we are doing a pious action, and we hereby dedicate a thank-
offering to the most high God, who has preserved our kingdom in peace and in the
highest esteem throughout the whole world” (37) (1904: 13). The characterisation of
the king as magnanimous, pious and just is a matter of necessity for the continuation of
the story. Thus the goal of piety becomes a central concept for event sequence. Piety
and justness are derived from actions promoting fairness and justice in light of divine
justice. It is observed that the official decrees, letters and preparations are all seasoned
by this same goal or theme, hence building its prevalence and establishing a logically
linked, ordered and developing plot.

During the king’s deliberation Aristeas explains that God brings purpose to fulfilment
(20) (1904: 9). This comment suggests that divine fulfilment may be a thematic factor.
This possibility is diminished as Aristeas explains that God-given success of plans
fulfilled is contingent on pure motives (18) (1904: 9). Predicated actions take centrality.

The plot advances once the matter of emancipation has been dealt with. The king
moves to address the conditions and protocol for the translation of the Jews’ books into
Greek. Demetrius, president of the king’s library, justifies the translation task by
claiming that the books are “divine” and that they are “full of wisdom” (31-32) (1904:
11-12), implying that they are worthy as subjects of study towards the goal of piety.
The king then orders that Eleazar be notified of the request, the motive for which is
determined by information on the emancipation of Jewish slaves. Eleazar recognises
the motive as righteous, high-principled (43) (1904: 14) and guided by devotion to God
(42) (1904: 14). Ptolemy prepares gifts and monies buttressing his motive and securing
the success of the mission (33) (1904: 13); his wealth is distributed fairly and
generously in this endeavour. The king’s request to translate the books is clearly associated with his action of emancipation. Piety and justice derive from fairness in service to God and people and guide the motive and actions.

The third section describes Aristeas’ observations in Jerusalem and his interchange with Eleazar. What was seen at the Temple and in its service reflects sanctity and piety, imparting a similar effect (95-96, 99, 107) (1904: 22-24).

The fourth section focuses on Eleazar’s selection of translation candidates and explanation of the principles governing the meaning of the Jews’ books. Eleazar’s commentary seems to emerge as the narration’s fulcrum. The books of the Jews are shown as that very object of study facilitating the goal of piety as set forth in the proem (171) (1904: 34). Eleazar’s lengthy reply is prefaced and concluded with a statement indicating the “principles of piety and righteousness” that are contained in the laws for the practice of them (131, 168-169) (1904: 29, 33-34). Ritual purity teaches in symbolism the practice of righteousness (142-143, 144-154, 147, 148, 150-151, 161-162, 169) (1904: 30-34), practicing justice and virtue (147, 151) (1904: 31) for “righteous dealings between man and man” (169) (1904: 34). Interestingly the offering of sacrifice teaches against arrogant self-consciousness (170) (1904: 34). Piety is achieved by the understanding and practice of justice in the laws’ enactments.

Aristeas describes in the fifth and last section the events on his return to Alexandria with the contingent. A banquet is held in honour of the seventy-two (50) (1904: 15) and of Ptolemy’s naval victory over Antigonus. During the feast the translators are asked a long list of questions. The answers to the questions illuminate the practice of fairness, fair distribution of wealth and justice in judgement primarily as serving God in the art of ruling (205, 210, 215, 294) (1904: 39-51). The questioning establishes the character of the translators as those excellent in virtue and knowledge (200) (1904: 38). Eleazar reveals the principles of piety and righteousness in the law and the questions demonstrate the practice of piety and righteousness. The law itself is developed as a source of learning for the practice of righteousness unto piety. Piety leads to the law and the law leads to piety. The qualified translators finish their task to the praise of all.

To summarise then, piety as a theme is derived from motive and actions promoting and based on fairness and justice (24, 37, 131) (1904: 10, 13, 29). Hence their writings
“have a certain sanctity and holiness” (31) (1904: 11) which demonstrate the recurrence of the concept of piety as a motive governing action and connecting individual intention. The king is pious in his intention and orders, Eleazar and the Jews display piety, and Aristeas interprets the law as to lead to virtue. The concept of fair actions seems to order the sequence and provides a context for and link between learning, service to God and society. Particularly the concept of piety and that of virtue, righteousness apparently controls interpretation and provides organisation control.

3.1.2.1.2 Aristobulus
Aristobulus of Paneas lived in the mid second century BCE and argued that the basics of Greek philosophy were essentially derived from Jewish sources. Hence, according to Eusebius, who quotes his work in Evangelicae Praeparationis 8.10.3, Aristobulus indicates that Moses wrote “by adopting phrases applicable to other things, I mean to things outward and visible” (1903: 407). What is significant for the purposes of this thesis is the very clear articulation of what for Aristobulus functions as an organising principle. Eusebius writes in Evangelicae Praeparationis 13.12.8, quoting Aristobulus again, “For all the philosophers agree, that we ought to hold pious opinions concerning God, and to this especially our system gives excellent exhortation; and the whole constitution of our law is arranged with reference to piety, and justice, and temperance, and all things else that are truly good” (Eusebius, 1903: 720). Aristobulus’ meaning is transparent: the concept of piety etc., organises the system of the law, giving it form.

3.1.2.1.3 Philo
Philo’s writing belongs to the Middle Platonic era. Philo is well known for his allegorical interpretation of Scripture; consequently his writings lend themselves to an interesting although straightforward analysis. Philo’s writings, unfortunately, resist systematisation and his philosophy is inconsistent at times (Schenck, 2005: 3, 8, 66). As with Aristobulus, however, Philo has in common the preeminent approach of incorporating Greek philosophy into a Jewish interpretation of Scripture. This can be put more trenchantly. Philo’s motive is unassuming and straightforward, as Kenneth Schenck elucidates: “…he used the biblical text as the foil for his thought, the categories of the thought itself were more often than not the categories of Greek philosophy” (2005: 43). What are these categories and is an organising concept identifiable? The categories are clearly those of the Middle Platonic philosophical system. As the majority of Philo’s work is exegetical it is no surprise that the Platonic
purpose is the goal of his writings: “becoming just and holy with wisdom” (Schenck, 2005: 66), wisdom being ultimately the knowledge of God. Philo’s purpose then suggests that the organising principle common to his writings is ethical in nature.

Valentin Nikiprowetzky argues (1977) that for Philo the laws of Moses were equal to philosophy and that Greek philosophy merely provided the terminology to facilitate the extraction of allegorical meaning. Scheck adjusts this, saying that for Philo Mosaic laws were more of a window upon the “ideal philosophy” (2005: 5). With this understanding, Philo’s statement on his purpose in *The Special Laws* (3.6) becomes increasingly transparent: “I venture not only to study the sacred commands of Moses, but also with an ardent love of knowledge to investigate each separate one of them, and to endeavour to reveal and to explain to those who wish to understand them, things concerning them which are not known to the multitude” (Philo, 2008: 594). Philo’s “investigation” and “revelation” is dominated by his philosophy. Throughout his writings God, according to the three-tiered representation of Middle Platonism, is in the place of “extreme transcendence” (Schenck, 2005: 57). Perhaps *De Opificio Mundi* (8) gives a good representation of this, referring to God as “the intellect of the universe, thoroughly unadulterated and thoroughly unmixed, superior to virtue and superior to science, superior even to abstract beauty” (Philo, 2008: 3). Schenck elucidates: “In addition to transcendence, the goodness and graciousness of God are also key characteristics of God that appear regularly throughout Philo’s writings” (Schenck, 2005: 57). God is gracious to sinful humans and to his creation out of providence, as seen in Philo’s combination of the Greek Stoic idea of a directing force in the universe and the Jewish understanding of God’s goodness (2005: 57). God is characterised primarily in terms of goodness, and since human purpose is to attain a likeness to God, (*De Opificio Mundi* [143]: Philo, 2008: 20), Philo’s concept of piety is influential in his thought system. The significance of this is seen in concluding phrase of *De Opificio Mundi* (172), in which those who apprehend all that Philo discusses concerning God, His nature, creation and His plan “will live a happy and blessed life, stamped with the doctrines of piety and holiness” (2008: 24). This happy and blessed life Philo characterises frequently in four virtues: prudence, courage, self-control and justice (Schenck, 2005: 66-67). Of significance is the observable pattern that the conclusions to each of Philo’s writings share this common logical ending structure.
In support of this direction is Burnett’s article, which states, “When one speaks of \textit{paliggenesia} in Philo, one speaks simultaneously of what is perhaps the organizing centre of his thought, viz., the migration of the soul toward immortality” (1984: 447). Burnett examines occurrences of \textit{paliggenesia} and concludes that it is “rebirth of the soul into incorporeal existence. Although the migrating soul can envision the intelligible world and experience an ethical rebirth while still in mixture with the body, it is after the mixture is dissolved … that \textit{paliggenesia} occurs in any metaphysical or essential way” (Burnett, 1984: 470).

A life in contemplation of the knowledge of God, then, leads to a true vision of God, which in turn should lead to piety. This appears to be Philo’s governing logical system as evidenced in the texts seems to carry organisational functionality.

3.1.2.2 Palestinian Literature

3.1.2.2.1 Josephus

Generally Josephus’ writings are seen as having an apologetic purpose. This, however, is a simplification of his literary intentions. A survey of interesting viewpoints on Josephus such as those of Henry St. John Thackeray (1968), Morton Smith (1956), and George Sterling (1992) quickly suggests that Steven Mason’s (1998) observations are slightly more attuned not just to Josephus’ historical context but also to its philosophical \textit{milieu}. Mason contends that Josephus is writing to promote the superiority of the Judean constitution at a time when much concern about social corrosion and the subject of governance existed (1998: 80-82, 86-87). The development of Josephus’ case, according to Mason, arises from the repeated assertion that the perfect constitutional form is the priestly aristocracy that has been established by Moses and that applies the Judean constitution, one that rests on universal laws and God’s order (1998: 82-84, 87). From Moses, Aaron received the Law, the Judean constitution, which was preserved by subsequent high priests (1998: 80, 82). Since Josephus is careful to note the high priests serving in each period up until his own time, a narrative structure is created supporting its chief purpose (1998: 80, 82). High priestly succession marks turning points in the narrative whilst each section contributes to the overall design. Mason cites the following instances: 4.152, 5.318, 6.122, 242, 10.150-152, 11.73, 90, 121, 158, 297, 300, 306 (1998: 82). A succession list is also found at the end of the \textit{Jewish Antiquities} (20.224-251) further revealing the importance of this for Josephus (1998: 82). This
significance begins, however, with the proem to the *Antiquities* illuminating the crucial function of the high priest reflected in the model of the high priest Eleazar who was part of the LXX formation (1998: 79). Josephus decidedly “imitates the magnanimity of … Eleazar” (1998: 79), stating that, “I thought it became me … to imitate the generosity of our high priest” (1.12). The priestly aristocracy are, as Moses was, the true revealers and elucidators of the law of God. This is the fundamental axis of Josephus’ argument. To the priestly rank can be added a person like Joshua (3.49) as one exerting a similar beneficial ruling influence as Moses on the Hebrews. Others are also characterised as virtuous above their contemporaries when the occasion demands although Moses is not mentioned. Perhaps this is a result of the typifying propensity of Josephus as noted by Moessner (1989: 85-87). Hence Jewish history as a whole chronicles the effect of such governance by Judean constitution. The adherents of the Law, both individual and corporate, reap piety and virtue, which in turn are rewarded by God (Mason, 1998: 84, 94). Josephus’ redaction then is guided by the determinative concept of Mosaic legislation, which is translated into piety and virtue.

The organising concept then is an amalgam: the pious life, the life of individual and corporate well-being, is the direct result of obedience to the Judean constitution founded upon God’s laws. This is not a new direction, for this seems to echo the concepts and governing notions found in the writings of such as Aristeas.

3.1.3 Jewish literature
The literature of the Tannaim examined in this section will be exclusively the oral Torah, that is, the Mishnah.

3.1.3.1 Mishnah
The overt purpose of the Mishnah is primarily mnemonic (Neusner, 1982: 123). All themes share the same formal patterns of rhetoric, grammatically related syntactical constructions of framed sequences of formalised language (1982: 122, 123). It is a striking proposition, as Neusner comments, that “the Mishnah’s susceptibility to memorization rests principally upon the utter abstraction of recurrent syntactical patterns, rather than on the concrete repetition of particular words, rhythms, syllabic counts, or sounds” (1982: 122). Herein lies the differentiating characteristic of the oral Torah’s organising principle(s) for the way structure is imparted. Ancient Greek literature operates with different compositional rules of rhetoric, facilitative for memorisation, as is represented by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his On Literary Composition (Roberts, 1910). For this reason, “Form and structure emerge not from concrete, formal things but from abstract and unstated, but ubiquitous and powerful relationships” (Neusner, 1982: 124; Neusner, 2002: 14).

It would seem, as Jacobs notes, that the style of the Mishnah is held “in a severely logical arrangement in which the rules follow a neat sequence” (Jacobs, 1991: 102). He points out throughout his work that this is in contrast to the post-mishnaic material which is structured by literary design (1991: 18-30). [Apart from some straightforward observations, the serious weakness of Jacobs’ scholarship has been duly noted by Neusner (1993: 253-256).] Inasmuch as the Mishnah is highly logical, even more significant is what Jack N. Lightstone’s analysis reveals (he builds on the precedential work of Jacob Neusner), that the Mishnah is indeed structured by rhetorical methodology and is responsible for topical closure, unity and completeness of its “chapters” (Lightstone, 2002: 178). Lightstone argues with Neusner that the mishnaic tractates’ major subdivisions and chapters are generated “whole” and “complete” with topical closure (2002: 62). Lightstone’s fundamental observation reveals that rather than “logico-argumentative” the Mishnah’s terminology is “conjunctive” (2002: 62). The following are repeated techniques used in the Mishnah “to impart unity, coherence, boundaries, and a sense of completeness and closure to rhetorical-topical ‘chapters’ and subsections of ‘chapters’” (2002: 65):

1. concatenating conjunctive terminology
2. morphological repetition, especially of verb forms and participial nouns
3. several hierarchically organised, encompassing or bounded levels of homophony, homosemantics, and antisemantics (2002: 63, 64-65,178).
Lightstone observes particularly that the second and third techniques serve to demarcate larger thematic units (2002: 63). That is, a thematic unit’s beginning and ending, junctures between the two and definite subunits are discernable by morphological repetition, and repetition of phrases, words and paired opposites (2002: 63). Not surprisingly, this technique imparts a “lyrical” quality (2002: 63). Lightstone gives a fictive illustration of a Mishnaic “chapter” where M is a morphological marker and the other letters are homophonic and or antisemantic markers (2002: 63):

pericope 1. M and b and c;
pericope 2. [(c, d) and (c, not d’)] | [(not c, d’) and (not c, d)];
pericope 3. M and b and c;
pericope 4. [M, b, e] | [M, e, b];
pericope 5. M and b and c.

Pericopes 2 and 4 are rhetorically linked to 1, 3, 5, thus creating a complete unit (2002: 63). Thus, “Mishnah is formulated within a few tightly disciplined formulaic patterns” (Neusner, 1977: 27).

The Mishnah assumes the Temple cult. The Mishnah’s rhetoric, therefore, serves to construct the “ideal world” in which “the Temple and its related institutions of cult, national governance, administration, and judiciary … constitute the centre” (2002: 68-69). The principles of formation for this “ideal world” (a picture of their holiness willed by God) as revealed by a full analysis of “units” yields the observation that three areas of category-formation interact: (1) Restoring Eden, (2) Man’s attitude, (3) Sanctification and Uncleanness (Neusner, 1998: 177). Thus the oral Torah’s three principal category themes emerge “at its most creative intersect: [1] Sabbath and creation, [2] issues of intentionality and attitude and will, and [3] explicit invocation of the extremes of sanctification and death” (1998: 179). The interaction and logical flow is as follows: God’s people are meant to be holy, which is to be expressed in cleanness (the indicator of its “natural condition”, the “ideal”); this has been lost in the fall; God’s purpose must be carried out otherwise uncleanness is the consequence; Israel’s intentionally must engage God’s will; the effect of this is God’s will taking over, producing sanctification, thus realising the purpose for which God’s people are meant (1998: 177-178). Human intentionality is key in the Mishnaic system, for intentionality in the Mishnah provides a means to the relativisation and revision of the priestly world in that it empowers the non-priestly group of society by making their own the priestly
vision of reality (Eilberg-Schwartz, 1986: 199-200). Intentionality elevates the significance of holiness and purity as a thought-governing concept for all relevant groups.

It is argued that the Mishnah originated in its Division of Purities (Neusner, 1998: 229). As Neusner specifies, “It then would appear that the ideas ultimately expressed in the Mishnah began among people who had a special interest in observing cultic cleanliness, as dictated by the Priestly Code … the context for such cleaness is the home, not solely the Temple” (1998: 229). The subject of cleanliness, the “critical act and occasion” (1998: 230), was the eating of food. So followed necessarily rules about agriculture, rules about social gatherings like the Sabbath and festivals, rules about social identity, that is, marriage (1998: 231-232). “It was in that intimate aspect of life that they firmly established the outer boundary of their collective existence” (1998: 232). Social differentiation was established on the basis of food, sex and marriage (1998: 232). Cleanness in these areas was the controlling factor. Regev observes, therefore, that from the early second century BCE to the late second century CE non-priestly purity was a common observance not just for the Pharisees but for “other groups, classes, and sects” (Regev, 2000: 244) making it a major trend in Judaism (2000: 223-244). Of course the notion of this non-priestly observance was entirely dependent on the sages’ understanding of holiness. Regev sees a contrast between the strictness in Qumranic texts and the leniency of Pharisaic and rabbinic thinking regarding the concept of holiness (2006: 99). The mishnaic conception of holiness (Pharisees and rabbis) is static as opposed to dynamic (2006: 99). By static holiness Regev means that “holiness is only a status, not an entity” (2006: 102) such that “the sacred rituals, sacred domain, and holy food are not as sensitive to pollution and desecration” (2006: 102). Regev argues that the exegesis in the Mishnah is “motivated” and “directed” by “an overarching concept of holiness” (2006: 106). This is true inasmuch as holiness is the goal, defining ideal; the texts, however, seem to favour the concept of purity, that is, activity contributing to the goal of holiness, as the primary organising concept.

It would seem that, “Clean and unclean rhetorically are the end of the story and generate little beyond themselves” (Neusner, 1982: 128). As was stated above, in Qumran sectarian literature, even though moral and ritual purity appear conflated (Haber, 2008: 41-71) moral purity is emphasised over ritual purity, but in the Mishnah the opposite seems true as moral purity “is relatively neglected in rabbinic sources” (Regev, 2007: 222-224).
The emphasis of the Mishnah’s purity falls on the ritual aspect particularly as translated over to non-priestly purity.

The re-conceptualisation of the theme of sanctification is as follows: “first, distinguishing Israel in all its dimensions from the world and all its ways; second, establishing the stability, order, regularity, predictability, and reliability of Israel in the world of nature and supernature in particular at moments and in contexts of danger” (Neusner, 1987: 4), thus “the sanctification of Israel, the people, in its everyday life” (1987: 3). Apparently Neusner later reformulates this adumbration, attributing the ordering and arranging integrative logic of the Mishnah to the justice of God (Neusner, 1999: xi-xvi), since “the theology of the Oral Torah conveys the picture of the world order based on God’s justice and equity” (1999: xii). This is accounted for in that Neusner eclipses the function of organising concept with that of overriding purpose. The text-based concept of Israel’s sanctification is merely the means by which the justice of God and world order theme congeals.

3.1.4 Provisional Summary

The Early Jewish literature analysed divides into three parts: Qumran literature, Jewish Hellenistic and Jewish literature. There is a notable contrast of particularism versus universalism between Qumranic and Jewish/Jewish Hellenistic literature (Altshuler, 1982: 11). In this regard, though the observations of Terence L. Donaldson (2008) are correct, his conclusions seem to overstate the reality that Palestinian Judaism was certainly “friendly” to outsiders, so that he emphasises a peculiar universalism, which seems only to characterise the polemical Hellenistic Judaic writings. It can be inferred from Altshuler’s observations that the Qumranic texts “emphasise the particularity of Israel, a cult and nation set apart from the abominations of foreigners” (Altshuler, 1982: 11), whereas Josephus “tones down biblical themes of exclusivity and heightens instead laws that are universalistic and ethical in nature” (1982:11). The very same can be said for Philo, Aristeas and Aristobulus. This contrast seems to be controlled by purity and holiness conceptions.

3.2 ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE

It is agreed that Ancient Greek literature generally maintained a significant level of relation between form and meaning. C.H. Talbert (1974) surveyed the architectonic
designs of Homer, Herodotus and Virgil, and observed their prevalence as a source of influence upon Lukan narrative structure. The use of architectonic design to convey meaning is not an issue, but the extent of its influence is. For this reason a number of Talbert’s observed structural patterns and correspondences in Luke-Acts have been justifiably scrutinised. Still the architectonic design in the Lukan corpus is basically recognised. Ancient Greek writings do yield information on composition and structure. Representative writings from four ages will be surveyed—Geometric and Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic and Roman Greek ages—which, considering the richness of Ancient Greek literature, can only be considered an inchoate analysis.

3.2.1 Geometric and Archaic Age, 800-500 BCE (approximate dates)
The literature of this age is characterised by a paratactic style of composition where sentences are not subordinated one to another by logical relations but strung together in equal importance with the subject being the plot (Thalmann, 1984: 4). Unity in this literature is found primarily in the enclosure of antithetical extremes with juxtaposed but interrelated content (Thalmann, 1984: 3). There exist in this period of literature (early epic poetry) four models serving the principle of composition and the association of ideas: hysteron proteron, ring composition, spiral structure and parallelism (Thalmann, 1984: 6-7, 8, 22). Ring composition in small and large contexts is known to be an organising device in poetry and plot of this age (Louden, 1999: 1).

3.2.1.1 Homer
The relevance of Homeric literature derives from the tenet that “two Homeric epics formed the basis of the education of everyone in ancient Mediterranean society from at least the seventh century BCE” (Hall, 2008: 7). Homeric poetry is replete with compositional patterns; significant among them is ring composition. As an example Thalmann (1984) cites the well known “recognition scene” from the Odyssey, and Penelope’s wish for death provides another complex example. As form and meaning are closely allied, Louden’s observation following A.B. Lord’s is correct: “the structure of Homeric epic is essentially thematic” (1999: 48). Thus, theme and structure will help elucidate any concepts generating organisation.

3.2.1.1.1 Odyssey
The introductory deliberation of the gods gives a pre-knowledge of plot development. The precedential outcome in Agamemnon and Orestês’ case, justified by Athena, and
the religious devotion of Odysseus, beg that he be served justice, for Odysseus, after having left Troy, is waylaid *en route* home to Ithaca and made captive of Calypso on an island. His whereabouts remain unknown to his son Telemachos and wife Penelope who still hope for his return, unlike the band of aristocratic suitors who have descended upon and daily consume Odysseus’ estate by outrage and violence. This injustice is the concern introduced (1.91-92, 368-379) and addressed by the return and vengeance of Odysseus (22.64, 24.351-352, 480). The structure for this appears to be ring compositional. The governing theme linked to structure seems to be general retributive justice.

R.K. Balot avers the concept of justice is central to Homeric and other Greek compositions (2001). In simple terms justice and injustice understood in an ancient context are couched in the critique of greed (Balot, 2001: 5). As a Greek citizen one would share “in the political, economic, and religious life of the community” (2001: 5). Regarding then the divisible goods of the community possessed in common, greed and injustice are therefore “the excessive desire to get more—more than one has, more than others have, and especially more than one deserves as a matter of distributive fairness” (2001: 4-5). Distributive fairness exists only within recognisable communities where “the group has claims on the individual” (2001: 62) and operates according to the citizen’s “relative worth and merit in promoting the common good” (2001: 7). Penelope’s aristocratic suitors reject the customary principle for their own appetites, dishonouring Odysseus (1.91-92). Their behaviour is an outrage, making even their feasts unacceptable, offending the gods (2001: 69). In consuming the estate of one only assumed to be dead, they are described as proud (*agénoras*, 1.106, 1.144, 2.235, 2.299, 4.658, 17.105, 23.8), arrogant (*huperphialoisin*, 16.271, 18.167, 23.356), shameless (*anaïdesi*, 1.254, 20.386), insolent (*hubris*, 1.368, 4.321, 4.627, 15.329, 16.410, 17.169, 17.565, 23.64, 24.352), disgraceful (*lôbên*, 24.326), abusive and irresponsible (2.50-54), evil insolent (*kakôs huperénoreontes*, 2.266), evil doers (*kaka erga*, 23.64, 24.326), sinners (*huperbasiês*, 3.206), riotous/wanton (*hubrizontes*, 3.206), no fear of gods’ wrath (*ouk opida phroneontes*, 14.82), devouring (*katedousin*, 13.428), consuming wastefully (*ekeirete*, 2.312) and violent (*bin*, 15.329, 17.565). Thus the suitors’ unjust behaviour cannot rightly be classified as mere greed. Hence a more fittingly related encompassing term is in order, that of insolence, arrogance or *hubris*. Balot confirms this characterisation, also identifying gluttony (2001: 70). Greed and *hubris* are closely related, where the former in its later conceptual development is a facet of *hubris* (2001:
Significantly, retribution is made according to the *hubris* of the suitors (24.352, 22.64).

The means of justice, however, is not left to the citizens of Ithaka, for they have not responded to the urging of Telemachos and Mentor to fulfil their ethical responsibility (2.239-241). The gods act with and for Odysseus in the cause of retributive justice, as he is deemed a deserving recipient (1.65). His merit is based mainly on his character, which is variously contrasted to the behaviour of the aristocratic suitors. Throughout the narrative Odysseus is clearly characterised as wise, as pious, remembering to respect and to honour the gods with sacrifices. Odysseus’ character is built after each stage in his journey, this in addition to the strengthening of his cause, which finds fulfilment in the end.

Contrary to Thalmann’s contention that the *Odyssey* is open ended in contrast with the circularity of the *Iliad* (1984: 76), Louden’s observations confirm that the beginning and ending of the *Odyssey* conform to the ring-composition pattern (1999). Moreover, he observes by thematic analysis of structure an extended narrative cycle, which he describes as occurring in “three different sequences” (1999: xvii) and which are “in interlocked ring-compositional order, A₁, B₁, C₁, C₂, B₂, A₂” (1999: xvii). The following pattern repeats more or less similarly in A, B and C. Odysseus arrives disoriented on an island; he is assisted by a divine helper and by a powerful female who after testing him directs and grants access to the next phase of his journey; conflict ensues between Odysseus and a band of men who abuse him violating divine interdiction; the band of men are punished by a wrathful god according to prophecies of demise; death and destruction are limited by the gods (1999: 2). The three sequences take place on the three islands, Aiaian, Skherian and Ithaka (1999: 2). The lordly suitors’ behaviour, who abuse Odysseus and offend the gods, is paralleled in the two other components of the extended narrative, by Odysseus’ crew and the Phaiakian athletes (1999: 31). The suitors, however, are “the most fully developed multiform of the entity *band of young men who abuse Odysseus in various ways*” (1999: 25). It is the pious character of Odysseus which links and integrates the sequence parallels in the ABCCBA extended narrative pattern. In the beginning Athene, disguised, visits Odysseus’ palace and is offended by the suitors’ violence, prompting her to speak of their demise; then in the end Odysseus, disguised, fulfils what Athene declared would come upon the suitors, acting as in the place of Athene an agent of wrath (1999: 25-27).
Louden notes, “the opening theoxeny points to and initiates the closing one” (1999: 27). It is the motif of provoked divine wrath upon the insolent concluding each sequence, which suggests connection to “a specific subgenre of myth, in which a wrathful deity demands the large-scale destruction of offending mortals” (1999: 131). This is of fundamental importance as the epic has “centred the sequences of this narrative pattern” around this motif (1999: xvii). Divine retributive justice, applied in terms of personified piety, reflected in fulfilled duty to the gods, and combined with vengeance for *hubris*, seems to be the controlling concept in the *Odyssey*.

### 3.2.1.2 Iliad

Owing to the introductory phrase, *Mêviv aeide, thea, Peleiadeô Akhilêos*, book 1, verse 1, the *Iliad*, like the *Odyssey*, promises to entertain the theme of the *hubris* law and divine retribution. This, however, is not so straightforward, as the story of the *Iliad* varies in plot and design from the *Odyssey* (Thornton, 1984: 51). They both have an ethical theme, but in the *Iliad* it is “more complex because it is worked out within the spirit of one man, not between two parties, one villainous, the other just” (1984: 142).

Consensus dictates a three-fold division of the *Iliad* (Kim, 2000: 69; Louden, 2006: 2): the initial sequence (Books 1-7), the middle sequence (Books 8-17), and the final sequence (Books 18-24) (2006: 2). Bruce Louden avers, as he does in his commentary on the *Odyssey* (1999), that there exists in the *Iliad* an “extended narrative pattern, which is repeated three times, in three sequences” (2006: 1). The initial sequence introduces the main themes of the narrative whilst the middle and final sequences focus and restate the main themes (Louden, 2006: 5). Each sequence, however, reveals a two-part division, the introductory pattern in which Achilles features prominently, and a principal pattern in which Achilles is absent and the best of the Akhaians are portrayed in battle (2006: 3). Repeating type-scenes and motifs link the three sequences (2006: 286). Louden argues that Book Three is distinct in that it not only separates the introductory pattern from the principal pattern but that it introduces “key motives of the narrative pattern” (2006: 3). What is significant to these sequences, Louden observes, is that, “Central to the narrative pattern, in each of the three sequences, is an *aristeia* ... by the ‘best of the Akhaians’” (2006: 2). *Aristeia*, according to Louden, as a concept is the transcendent level of skill, ability of a warrior, attained or given by a god, enabling them to be unstoppable for a time on the battlefield (2006: 317). As an epic composed of subgenres of myth, the *Iliad* effectively communicates moral instruction with an
emphasis on moral behaviour (Louden, 2006: 6, 9-11). Strife is the kernel of the *Iliad*, represented in the Greek and Trojan strife and the conflict between Achilles and Agamemnon, which parallel the strife of the gods yet differ in that they provoke divine wrath and punishment (2006: 11). A clearer meaning of the *Iliad’s* narrative pattern crystallises, according to Louden, by comparative critical analysis with Near Eastern mythic subgenres, particularly OT and Ugaritic traditions. This reveals that conflict, *eris*, focused by the *aristeia* concept is the primary mythic subgenre characterizing the *Iliad*; it is primarily a tragedy rather than a romance, and in this way it is similar to the *Odyssey* (2006: 149-239, 288). As a caveat is must be mentioned that at the heart of Louden’s work lies an interest in source critical questions.

Agathe Thornton’s contribution precedes Louden by many years, already noting the structural and thematic frequency of *aristeia*, yet it observes that a ‘call for help’ or supplication is used in a lesser but equally significant degree to structure the narrative (1984: 74-86, 87-92, 113-142). Thornton posits the *Iliad* is composed “by a fourfold use of the motif-sequence of supplication” (1984: 121). The first sequence occurs in the prelude, Books Α-Δ, the second is intertwined with the final stages of the prelude, the third is intertwined with the second sequence and the fourth is that of Priam to Achilles in Book Ω (1984: 121-124, 141-142). This whole structure serves the purpose that Achilles’ great wrath is finally subdued, resolved by the supplication of Priam to Achilles for the body of his son Hector; this sequence is instigated by Zeus who is the “protector of suppliants” (1984: 119, 141, 142).

Interestingly Jinyo Kim makes a distinction between supplication and pity, in that supplication leads to pity, i.e., Patroklos appeals to Achilles’ pity (2000: 17-29). She avers that Achilles’ pity is the central theme, which by virtue of formulaic repetition gives structure to the poem (2000: 5, 7, 17). The structure is tripartite and is as follows: initial sequence, Books 1-8, Achilles’ pity for the Greeks is turned to pitilessness after his conflict with Agamemnon, the middle sequence, Books 9-16, Achilles’ pitilessness to Greeks yields to pity for his friends, and final the sequence, Books 17-24, Achilles’ pitilessness to Trojans is resolved in pity for Priam (Kim, 2000: 69). Pity is an action, a response to emotions in a circumstance always directed to friends and not enemies (2000: 66-67). Pitying means saving friends afflicted by the enemy, avenging slain friends, healing wounded friends or properly burying dead friends (2000: 67). To be pitiless is to refuse these things to those whose are eligible (2000: 67). Achilles’ *mēnis*
(wrath) is the “thematic equivalent of his pitilessness; it is the thematic obverse of his pity” (2000: 173). This connection between pity and wrath reveals the relational network in the heroic code (2000: 181-182). According to Kim then, the concept of pity governs structuring and thematic relation in the *Iliad*, and bringing the plot to resolution.

As Louden surmises, conflict is at the heart of the *Iliad*, specifically strife created because of transgressions (Thornton, 1984: 116). As Paris transgressed against Menelaus by assaulting the rule of hospitality and taking Helen, so Agamemnon transgressed against Achilles and the Greeks by ignoring the rule of distributive fairness. The implication of the conflicts becomes tragically complex and convoluted, precipitated by personalities in the context of a divine economy. Accounting for plot dynamics seems possible only if an amalgamation of the above concepts is countenanced. These three, *aristeia*, supplication and pity when associated together provide a basic grid-work on which to see how in the context of tragedy justice prevails and honour is salvaged.

### 3.2.2 Classical Age, 500-323 BCE

Characteristic of this age is a compositional style wherein exists “subordination to one controlling idea, a carefully observed proportion of the part to the whole, and clearly stated connections between parts” (Thalmann, 1984: 4). Herodotus’ work is a foremost example of archaic parataxis rivalling the *Iliad* in scope (Immerwahr, 1966: 7,12).

#### 3.2.2.1 Herodotus

Miles and Trompf state that in Herodotus’ account of the Persian Wars the major unifying theme is that of divine retribution (1976: 260). Miles and Trompf, however, should have acknowledged the need for this to be seen in the context of Herodotus’ overall endeavour, as Henry Immerwahr’s (1966) timeless yet very technical contribution argues, whom Miles and Trompf cite in support of their argument. Seeing as Herodotus exercises the inherited conception of a close relation between form and meaning, and also the understanding that coherence is found in thematic plurality on a formal level rather than thematic unity (Heath, 1989: 150), the theme of divine retribution requires qualification.
Keeping in mind an ancient Greek readership, we note that Herodotus’ *Histories* portrays the Greeks as resilient over against the Persians. Immerwahr writes, “The *Histories* begin and end with Greek relations with the East: first enslaved by Croesus, Greeks finally defeat the Persians on Greek soil” (1966: 42). In between the beginning and the end is related the unification of Asia, with Greek material contributing to this, and Salamis, the power of Darius as the centre point of the middle material (1966: 42, 78). Rise and fall, by which world history and order is perpetuated, holds together the external structure of the work: it is the pattern of history (1966: 15, 307, 308). In addition, Immerwahr sees that an internal structure comprised of moral, religious, ethnographic and anthropological ideas serves the external structure (1966: 15, 308). Short individual sections are placed in sequence as a chain, primarily military actions, cumulating in larger sections such that the individual stories are in relation to others (1966: 7, 13, 20). The chain of individual items is arranged according to an action-counteraction principle and as larger sections they are framed usually by introductory and concluding sentences (1966: 40, 325). The whole work is organised according to action-reaction sequence (1966: 307). Moreover he is careful to emphasise that “morality, theology, natural science, and ethnography must be considered in their relations with the historical patterns developed by Herodotus” (1966: 323). Individualisation in terms of cultural norms, nomos, occurring in the pattern of rise and fall, is caused by the “principle of the identity of opposites” which establishes the unity and diversity of history (1966: 307, 319-324). Thus, the concept of injustice, adikiê, is to be viewed not just as causative historical action but primarily in the dynamic of justice, dikê, resulting in the “interplay” of action and reaction (1966: 324).

Importantly for Herodotus the divine (gods for Herodotus are abstracted) guarantees world order, that history develops in accordance with the principles of order, that balance is preserved, the divine is concerned with the distributive function of separation and “preserves the order of society by preventing conquest and absolute rule” (1966: 311, 312-313). This is realised in general by historical events involving some divine causation paralleling human initiative (1966: 312). The defeat of Xerxes is, therefore, divinely sanctioned so as to return order in the “re-establishment of the separation between continents” (1966: 326). R.K. Balot, drawing on a number of scholars, states that in the *Histories* violation of the divinely ordered natural boundaries constitutes *hubris* and is sacrilegious (2001: 102). This violation derives fundamentally from Herodotus’ association of *arête*, valour, with primarily defensive military action as
opposed to aggression denoted by the term *hubris* in the account of the Persian Wars (Immerwahr, 1966: 309, 310). This violation is illustrated in the admonishment of Xerxes by his uncle Aratabanus (Herodotus, 1996: 516-518, 520-521) and also in the warnings of moderation delivered by Solon and Amasis (Immerwahr, 1966: 310).

The beginning of the series of unjust acts against the Greeks starts with the assault of Croesus of Lydia (1966: 18). Immerwahr sees in *Histories* “the cycle of *hybris*-koros-atê (in which destruction overcomes the wrongdoer through his own folly)” (1966: 310), and which promotes rise and fall, “growth and decay” (1966: 310). This cycle governs the Croesus *Logos* (Immerwahr by *logos* refers to sections of story [1966: 15]), which apparently previews structuralising principles extending to the rest of the work (1966: 18, 43, 310). Of the concepts in this cycle *hubris*, however, figures prominently in the *Histories* (1966: 310). Expansionism, immoderation and a disregard for separation lead to not only the downfall of Croesus but ultimately to the defeat of the Persians. In the pattern of Greek history, in the struggle between city states, impiety and injustice resulting from *hubris* functions advantageously for the growth of Athens such that she can function for “the good of Greece” (1966: 213) at Salamis (1966: 213-237, 310). Noteworthy, therefore, is the understanding that morality for Herodotus is marginalised such that it is suited to the context; its value corresponds to its historical function (1966: 310). Herodotus adapts Solon’s understanding of *hubris*, taking it largely from a city state community context and applying it internationally (Balot, 2001: 99-100).

As Herodotus’ work assumes that there exists a natural order of unity and diversity, equality and separation based on the pattern of rise and fall, and action-reaction, the Persians’ expansionism as absolutism, as *hubris*, violates this basic existential pattern of history (1966: 43, 45, 306-307, 310). “The importance of the divine in Herodotus is precisely that it guarantees the world order” (1966: 312). It is for this reason that Herodotus refers to “an oracle predicting the Persian defeat at Salamis: ‘Bright Justice will quench strong Koros, the child of Hubris, fearful, eager, planning to swallow up everything [dokeunt’ ana panta pithesthai’ (8.77)]” (Balot, 2001: 103). It is the preservation of the natural order as a concept that controls divine retribution and contributes to the story structure and unification of Herodotus’ conceptions. Divine retribution is, however, a result of the fundamental concept of opposites in the pattern of rise and fall.
3.2.3  **Hellenistic Age, 323-146 BCE**

Among the variegated writings of this period, such as those of Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius of Rhodes, the work of Callimachus provides an interesting analysis sample.

3.2.3.1  **Callimachus**

Callimachus’ writings—six hymns, epigrams and fragments such as *Aitia, Hecale* and *Iambi*—reflect genre development in Greek literature. The period of time following Alexander’s conquests, a time of peace and stability, brought about newness, which entailed evaluation of the ‘old’, i.e., literary tradition (Bing, 1988: 144; Fain, 2008: 89). “In such circumstances there was an enormous opportunity for innovation, yet at the same time a strong pull towards the past” (Bing, 1988: 144). A case in point is the work of Callimachus, whose style and form are influenced even by dedications and sepulchral inscriptions (Fain, 2008: 89-138). Notably, Callimachus’s poems are greatly shorter that the traditional epic, since Callimachus has a “programmatic aversion to ‘big’ poems” (Haslam, 1993: 116). His use of the elegiac style rivalled the traditional style for epic in conciseness (Fain, 2008: 9). Organisational concepts, however, may have been inherited, entrenched in traditional Greek ideology.

3.2.3.1.1  **Hymns**

The *Hymns* of Callimachus are richly programmatic and share a common strategy. Among them the hymn to Apollo will be treated.

The Apollo hymn is ring-compositional (Haslam, 1993: 117). The repetition of “…*hiê paiêon hiê paiêon akouê*” (Mair & Mair, 1921: 51) at line 21 (Mair & Mair, 1921: 51) and “*hiê hiê paiêon akouomen,… hiê hiê paiêon…*” (1921: 56) at line 97 and 103 (1921: 56) is significant. Other structural features include a reversion to the third person at the end and personified emotion (Haslam, 1993: 117). In the hymn Callimachus “aligns himself with Apollo by aligning Apollo with him” (1993: 117). He greatly lauds Apollo, even making him speak, but this again is only to advance Callimachus’ programme: those who praise Apollo and to whom he draws close are exceptionally virtuous. This in a sense is as a self-fulfilling prophecy for Callimachus:, he desires justification, he aligns Apollo with himself, and he is therefore proved to be virtuous.
and pious. Of course, this also serves to legitimate his innovative genre in contradistinction to traditional epic. Callimachus intersects divine performance with his own performance (Henrichs, 1993: 146). This is a denoting feature of the hymns. The concept of human activity bearing divine purpose in order to establish virtue seems to structure and organise the content.

3.2.3.1.2 Epigrams
There is great variation in the structures of Callimachus’ epigrams, which can be as short as a distich or as long as a series of couplets (Fain, 2008: 103). Callimachus uses antithesis, temporal contrasts, conditional clauses, parallel structure and analogies to organise his poems (2008: 104-113). The poems are “organised by a rhetorical or logical scaffolding” (2008: 113), however, it would appear that pious claims or the lauding of virtue are the organising concepts behind the epigrams.

3.2.3.1.3 Fragments
It is beyond the purview of this thesis to examine all the fragments. The Aitia will be taken as a representative analysis.

3.2.3.1.3.1 Aitia
The fragmentary Aitia or “Causes” is ring-compositional (Harder, 1993: 99). One finds that the Argonautic theme of the return journey of the Argonauts near the beginning of the work is matched by an outward journey near the end of the work (1993: 99). The figure of Androgeos appears significantly in Books One and Four (1993: 99). Harder also notes that Books Three and Four are framed by poems dedicated to Queen Berenice (1993: 99). In addition, “The whole of the Aetia is framed by passages concerning the Muses and Hesiod (fr. 1-2 and fr. 112)” (1993: 99). The grouping of the gods together at the beginning and at the end seems to lend framing structure to the Aitia (Harder, 1993: 102). Programmatically Callimachus seeks legitimation as a poet, legitimation of his virtue. This he seeks by ring compositional framing of the whole work and within the work. Framing the Aitia as a whole with the Muses and Hesiod is to say that the source of the poet’s knowledge is divine (1993: 101). Framing using the Argonaut theme (Argonauts founded a cult of Apollo Aegletes at Anaphe) highlights the role of Apollo as the guardian of the poets and of specifically Callimachus (1993: 102). This intersection of divine performance with the poet’s performance occurs also in the Hymns (Henrichs, 1993: 146). Henrichs states this may be part of a “global pattern of
concerted action and joint performance on the highest level of divine and human society” (1993: 146). The concept of human activity bearing divine purpose in order to establish virtue seems to establish a structure to the Aitia.

The general intellectual atmosphere of the Hellenistic age was characterised by an integration of Platonism and Stoicism, the effect of which was a religion where the virtue of the soul was knowledge. “He who knows is good and pious” (Dodd, 1963: 14). Knowledge of God was salvation and was expressed primarily in praise and thanksgiving and in service, the practice of virtue, and refraining from evil (1963: 10-14, 25). These conceptions seem to govern within the work of Callimachus.

3.2.4 Roman Greek Age, 146 BCE- 330 CE
The compositions of this age include that of Polybius, Virgil, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, and Timaeus. Significant among these is Virgil’s Aeneid. Polybius’ Histories will only receive very brief mention.

3.2.4.1 Virgil

3.2.4.1.1 Aeneid
Homer’s influence upon Virgil is generally known (Hunt, 1973: 12, 103; Farrell, 1991). Homeric images and themes appear in Virgil interpretively transformed. In the Aeneid, “Vergil assimilates Homeric epic to a panegyric of the Augustan regime” (Farrell, 1991: 329). Virgil is a philosophical poet who understood Homer as a poet of natural philosophy (1991: 326). As such, Virgil saw the epic as an emulation of the cosmos yet the congruence of sense Virgil created was, however, only partial (1991: 327). The Aeneid imparts cosmic significance to Roman history but the work can also be characterised metaphorically as a spiritual progression resulting in a parable of the human soul (1991: 3, 13, 83, 329). Farrell states that Virgil uses the “forms and procedures of Homeric poetry and of the panegyric tradition that derives from Homer to conduct a searching critique of the heroic ideal which that tradition celebrates” (1991: 331).

Virgil uses three architectonic devices in the overall structure of the Aeneid: rhythmic alternation of books, a division of these into two panels (division of the work in half)
and a three-part division of the work of four books each (Duckworth, 1962: 11, 63). These devices focus his themes and purpose. The work can be divided into two parts, Books 1-6, akin to Homer’s *Odyssey*, and 7-12, akin to Homer’s *Iliad* (Duckworth, 1962: 3; Hunt, 1973: 6-8). This is the most obvious division: Aeneas journeys from Troy to Latium, followed by his adventures and victories (Duckworth, 1962: 2-3). Through the two parts runs a rhythm of alternation, a fluctuation between tragic, even numbered books, and lighter natured, odd numbered books (1962: 2). By this Virgil gives force to the tragic events and the character of Aeneas (1962: 2). Between the two parts are considerable corresponding parallels, especially between the Dido (1 and 4) and Turnus (9 and 12) books, casualties to Aeneas’ mission; Book 6 figures significantly as the centre between the two halves (1962: 5-7, 8; Hunt, 1973: 11, 83). In Book 6 Aeneas visits the underworld, which is latent with philosophical, religious and national significance unlike the episode in the *Odyssey* (1962: 5). Duckworth sees in Virgil’s own description (at VII, 44 ff.) that Books 7 to 12 are the chief part of the work, the implication that Books 1 to 6 are an “amplified prelude to his main theme” (1962: 7). This draws attention to the striking correspondence between Books 6 and 12 created by the concept of justice: Aeneas’ father Anchises instructs him in summation that the Roman’s duty is to spare the humbled opposition and decimate the proud; this instruction is fulfilled by Aeneas as he avenges the death of Pallas, executing justice upon haughty *superbia* Turnus (1962: 7). “Aeneas as a symbol of the ideal Roman thus fulfils the words of his father in VI, 853” (1962: 7).

In itself the two-part division can become artificial, according to Duckworth, who sees a further tripartite structure to the *Aeneid* heightening the significance and meaning of the work: Aeneas at Carthage, Books 1-4, arrival in Latium and preparation for battle, Books 5-8, and the conflict itself, Books 9-12 (1962: 11, 13). The threefold division of the *Aeneid* reflects Virgil’s “treatment of epic material” (1973: 12): the first and third panels, the tragedy of Dido and the tragedy of Turnus, frame the middle in which longer Homeric sections (funeral games in Book 5, underworld scene in Book 6, magic shield in Book 8) are used to project the glorification of Rome (Duckworth, 1962: 11-13; Hunt, 1973: 12). It is startling that the same introductory passage at Book 1, lines 8-296, “anticipates and symbolises the main theme in each of the three parts” (1962: 11). The theme of Rome and Carthage frames the first panel (1962: 11). Jupiter’s prophecy anticipates the middle panel dealing with Rome, its history and destiny (1962: 11). The mention of imprisoning “impious Fury” (Book 1, lines 294-296) is indeed realised in
the third panel as vanquished in the defeat by Aeneas of Mezentius in Book 10 who "symbolises impietas" (1962: 11, 13) and Turnus who symbolises "violentia and furor" (1962: 11, 13). In addition to the central panegyric on Rome, the correspondence between Dido’s and Turnus’ tragedy in the tripartite structure re-emphasises Anchises’ speech on individual Roman responsibility and four cardinal virtues as written on Augustus’ golden shield, “vir{2}tus, clementia, iustitia and pietas” (1962: 12, 14). The nationalistic theme is conjoined to the individual “task of the Roman” (1962: 12; Hunt, 1973: 12). Aeneas, who in a sense symbolises Augustus, fulfils the latter and catapults Rome into its glory. Aeneas and his mission, however, are ultimately the result of divine plan and divine reconciliation (Duckworth, 1962: 12; Hunt, 1973: 85). The Aeneid accounts for history as a dynamic of divine will fulfilled by honourable human agents.

3.2.4.2 Polybius

3.2.4.2.1 Histories
Even though Polybius’ historiography deemphasises the intervention of the gods, Polybius apparently unifies his composition in the depiction of the operation of the laws of Fortuna (Witherington, 1998: 33). Polybius, in Chapter One, Book Four, is clear that historical events are ordered by fortune and this he takes into account in structuring his work (Polybius, 1823[1]: 320).

3.3 SUMMARY
The results of the foregoing analysis seems to suggest that primarily the concept of piety, as defined in its particulars and nuanced variously by respective contexts, yet also at times as it is aligned with other equally important concepts such as holiness, justice, honour and divine will/expectations, functions as organisational principle in Early Jewish Literature and Ancient Greek Literature.

Analysis of Qumranic literature suggests that the concept of purity/impurity, particularly moral purity (or a conflation of moral and ritual) serving a dynamic holiness, governs and organises the argument of, and provides the context for, the relation of themes not just of MMT but for the majority of the Qumran documents. Purity/impurity seems to inform the covenant idea so the concept of purity rather than a
concept of covenant appears to function overtly in an organising capacity. As stated, it would seem that the buoyancy of holiness, purity and piety as concepts together carry along the entire theology of the Qumran sect, governing the structure of its writings and the relation of themes.

The concept of fair action in the Pseudo-Aristeas letter seems to order the letter’s content and provide a context for and link between learning, service to God and society. Specifically the concept of piety and that of virtue, righteousness informed by fair action, apparently controls interpretation and provides organisation control.

Aristobulus clearly states by what principle his writings are organised: the concept of piety organises the system of the law, giving it form.

Generally the endings of Philo’s writings articulate in varying ways the logical underpinning of the work. Namely, that a life in contemplation of the knowledge of God leads then to a true vision of God, which in turn should lead to piety. Philo’s central conception of immortality and the migration of the soul support this argumentation. These concepts amalgamated appear to characterise the operation of an organisational principle for Philo.

In similar fashion for Josephus the organising concept then is an amalgam: the pious life, the life of individual and corporate well-being is the direct result of obedience to the Judean constitution founded upon God’s laws.

In the Mishnah, as with the Qumran sectarians, holiness is the goal, the defining ideal; the texts, however, seem to favour the concepts of ritual purity and non-priestly purity, activity contributing to the goal of static holiness and atonement, as primarily the organising concept.

In the Geometric and Archaic Age of Ancient Greek literature, the literary device of ring composition in small and large contexts is known to function organisationally, specifically in poetry and plot of this age. Divine retributive justice, applied in association with personified piety and reflected in fulfilled duty to the gods, combined with vengeance for hubris, seems to be the controlling concept in the Odyssey. In the Iliad the concepts of aristeia, supplication and pity when associated together provide a
basic organisational grid-work on which to see how in the context of tragedy justice prevails and honour is salvaged.

In the Classical Age of Ancient Greek literature, it is observed in Herodotus’ *Histories* that the preservation of the natural order as a concept controls divine retribution and contributes to the story structure and unification of Herodotus’ conceptions. Divine retribution is a result of the fundamental concept of opposites in the pattern of rise and fall. Herodotus’ work assumes that a natural order exists of unity and diversity, a natural order of equality and separation. This natural order is based on the pattern of rise and fall, action and reaction. With this understanding it is clear that the Persians’ expansionism as absolutism, as *hubris*, violates this basic existentially based pattern of history.

In the writings of Callimachus of the Hellenistic Age, it is the concept of human activity bearing divine purpose in order to establish virtue that seems to structure and organise the content. In the epigrams it would appear that pious claims or the lauding of virtue are the organising concepts. The concept of human activity bearing divine purpose in order to establish virtue seems to establish structure in the *Aitia*.

The *Aeneid* accounts for history as a dynamic of divine will fulfilled by honourable human agents. There is striking correspondence between Books 6 and 12 created by the concept of justice: Aeneas’ father Anchises instructs him in summation that the Roman’s duty is to spare the humbled opposition and decimate the proud, this instruction is fulfilled by Aeneas as he avenges the death of Pallas executing justice upon haughty *superbia* Turnus. The nationalistic theme is conjoined to the individual “task of the Roman” (1962: 12; Hunt, 1973: 12). Aeneas who in a sense symbolises Augustus fulfils the latter and catapults Rome into its glory. Aeneas and his mission, however, are ultimately the result of divine plan and divine reconciliation.

The brief note on Polybius reminds us of the significant and developing view that historical events are ordered by fortune; this structures Polybius’ material.

Analysis of Early Jewish literature and Ancient Greek literature reveals a plausible field of comparison with Lukan literature. The analysis strongly suggests (as Chapter Five should demonstrate) that the Lukan concern for righteousness, ethical living as service,
in light of God’s plan and the Gospel of the good news of the Kingdom of God, may be a part of a common trans-cultural interest that existed, as the written evidence attests. The concern for piety and justness combined with a notion of divine order variously articulated in the written manuscripts is formidable and requires serious consideration as an influence spanning generations.
CHAPTER FOUR: PRINCIPLES OF ORGANISATION UNDER THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE OLD COVENANT

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Arising from the central question of this work this chapter asks, “What were the merits, or otherwise, of any principles of organisation that existed under the terms and conditions of the Old Covenant?” As the Lukan use of the Old Testament (OT) is substantial it seems prudent to ascertain plausible routes of conceptual influence. My investigation suggests three primary OT means of organising thought and, as a consequence, content: typology, the covenant concept and the eschaton idea. The following chapter identifies representative results, distils the findings and assesses the formulations. It will be found that these ideas have a similar dynamic within the context of a linear progression of redemption attempting to account for the integration of history and theology in concept-based “structural” ways.

4.1 OLD TESTAMENT ORGANISATIONAL PRINCIPLES

4.1.1 TYPOLOGY AS AN ORGANISING CONCEPT

Although it is generally thought that typology is strictly an instrument of New Testament (NT) hermeneutics, as the hallmark works of C.T. Fritsch (1946, 1947) and L. Goppelt (1982) have established, both type and antitype do occur organisationally in the OT. Friedbert Ninow argues effectively for this, which distinguishes him from most scholars; he observes and shows that typology operates within OT boundaries (2001). Ninow builds his study on the work of Richard M. Davidson and begins his analysis by quoting from Davidson’s 1981 dissertation, Typological Structures in the Old and New Testaments, restating that typology is “a New Testament study of the Old Testament salvation historical realities, or types (persons, events, institutions), that God designed to correspond to, and predictively prefigure, their intensified antitypical fulfilment aspects (inaugurated, appropriated, consummated) in New Testament salvation history” (Ninow, 2001: 78). Ninow’s exegesis which follows (a definitive work on the subject) does indeed prove the OT authors intentionally included typology proper, type and antitype, in their writings, which constitute for us the OT corpus.
Personality and institution based typologies immediately recommend themselves as candidates for organisational principles, yet the Exodus event motif dominates the OT typology landscape. This is not surprising as the Exodus is the defining event in the life of Israel and is the basic assumption of Ninow’s work (2001: 98, 243). Ninow demonstrates that Exodus typology is an exegetically identifiable concept present in the Pentateuch as well as in the Prophets, which meets Davidson’s four basic criteria of typology: “the historical structure, divine design, the prophetic structure, Steigerung (escalation) and eschatology” (Ninow, 2001: 97). Ninow reveals that in both the Pentateuch and the Prophets Exodus typology connects the past with the future, the historical events with a definite singular eschaton (2001: 153-156, 237-239). Exodus typology seems to provide then the connective framework, which enables the creation of a story, a metadiegesis. The basis for the connection of the past and the future is twofold: a prophetic indication and direction to a single eschatological fulfilment point (2001: 154).


The prophetic books and passages examined are Isaiah 11:10-16; 35; 40:3-5; 41:17-20; 43:1-3, 16-21; 49:8-12; 51:1-52:15; Jeremiah 23:5-8; 30-31; Hosea 2:16-17; 12:10; Micah 4:9-10; 7:14-15; Zechariah 10:6-12 (2001: 157-241). Ninow concisely asserts, “The prophetic writers stand between the past and the future. They function as links that connect the historical event of the Exodus from Egypt with the future redemption that is yet to come” (2001: 237). The factum of the Exodus event is the Vorbild (type) that through Steigerung will find eschatological fulfilment as the Nachbild (anti-type) (2001: 237-238). In relation to Pentateuchal Exodus typology the emphasis is eschatological fulfilment. The Promised Land antitype undergoes further Steigerung such that the eschatological fulfilment consists of the Messianic kingdom characterised by universalism, the new creation and complete Messianic redemption (2001: 240-241). For this reason Ninow refers to the antitype as the new Exodus because it shall be radically new in comparison to the old one (2001: 237-238). The relationship,
therefore, between the *Vorbild* and *Nachbild* has the historical event on the one end and eschatological redemption fulfilled at the other (2001: 238).

To summarise then, the OT biblical record contains a prevalent Exodus typology that deliberately informs the development of the nation of Israel and the story of humanity. Ninow shows, therefore, that Exodus typology in both the Pentateuch and the Prophets connects the past with the future, historical events with a definite singular eschaton. In this organising dynamic Exodus typology is a “connective”, both narrative/structural and thematic, by which the grand story of Israel is strung together. The weak point of this organisational strategy is that pre-national “history” is left somewhat outside of the limits of the Exodus story.

### 4.1.2 THE COVENANT IDEA AS AN ORGANISING CONCEPT UNDER THE OLD COVENANT

The fundamental role of the covenant concept for OT theology has long been recognised by scholarship. The collection of essays in honour of E.W. Nicholson attests to this reality and to the progress of research on the subject (Mayes & Salters, 2003). Those scholars who have contributed explicitly to the understanding of literary characteristics, especially the structuralising ability of the covenant concept, are less numerous. This section treats the results of a few scholars who have made distinct attempts to identify the covenant concept’s narrative traits, particularly its organisational efficacy.

#### 4.1.2.1 Rolf Rendtorff

An article by Rolf Rendtorff (1989) provided the initial catalyst for this thesis. Rendtorff, taking what would be termed a canonical approach to the OT, examines “the text as we have it before us” (1989: 386), and finds that the covenant concept emerges as “a central aspect of the first two books of the Pentateuch” (1989: 386). The covenant idea’s centrality is evidenced in the parallel structure it renders between the Primeval History, Genesis 1-11, and the Sinai Story, Exodus 19-34, thereby linking them via a common theological message and providing their mutual interpretation as a continuous story of Israel’s existence (Rendtorff, 1989: 393).
As mentioned, Rendtorff takes a canonical approach by investigating the Old Testament texts unified as they are in their present form (1989: 385-386). Rendtorff, a student of Gerhard von Rad, may make this assumption in order to be able to extract systematised theology from the text and so circumvent the impasse to this end presented by Julius Wellhausen’s historicism (Barton, 2003: 23-26). It seems that Rendtorff along with many others has inherited the importance of his initial position from Walter Eichrodt. In this way, OT history and theology are meaningfully related by the covenant concept (Barton, 2003: 28).

In both stories, God’s original gift (creation/covenant) is spoiled by human sin and so God intends to destroy those culpable. However, one man (Noah/ Moses) intervenes and the covenant is re-established and a sign (circumcision/Sabbath) is provided (Rendtorff, 1989: 389, 393). The covenant idea makes this parallel possible by functioning as what Rendtorff describes as a “structuring concept” (1989: 385). Within each story assorted components are dependently related to bērît (covenant) and these relations are mirrored between the stories. As Rendtorff surmises, the covenant idea is the juncture where “all the lines meet, and only from here can the whole story be interpreted” (1989: 388).

In order for Rendtorff to argue his case it is necessary for him to identify a fundamental continuity between the first two canonical books. This Rendtorff finds as God’s merciful preservation in that His grace guarantees the existence of humanity/Israel (1989: 390). Rendtorff finds this continuity expressed specifically by a restorative development in the Primeval History and the Sinai Story both separately and as a combined whole. Both accounts share the same basis for divine restoration in that the original intention for creation, expressed by Genesis 1:31 as creation being very good, is endangered by human sin depicted in Genesis 3-4 (Rendtorff, 1989: 386). What follows in both accounts is identification of the consequence of sin and the monergistic restoration of God’s preservative grace via a favourable individual in a covenant re-establishment event.

The effect of sin in the Primeval History reaches a zenith in Genesis 6 as “the world is no longer ‘very good’, and God decides to destroy it” (Rendtorff, 1989:86). Restorative forbearance, however, is secured solely in the exception of Noah and accomplished by covenant establishment with a confirming sign in Genesis 8 and 9 (1989: 386-387, 388).
Thus, Rendtorff argues that Genesis 1 to 9 forms an interpretive frame “surrounding the first main part of the Primeval History” (1989: 388).

The Sinai Story parallels the Primeval History if it is taken to extend from Exodus 19 to 34 (Rendtorff, 1989: 388-389). Human sin with the golden calf seems to nullify the covenant as established previously in Chapter 24; as a result God is intent on the destruction of Israel (1989: 389). Moses intercedes (Chapter 34) retaining the favour of God, and the covenant is re-established with a sign (Chapter 35) thus securing His preservative grace. In view of these observations Rendtorff is careful to demonstrate the consistent use of the word ḥêrît in the rest of Genesis and Exodus (1989: 391-392).

In both cases covenant establishment guarantees the preservation and continuation of His people and humanity—the underlying common theme. As stated, Rendtorff sees this restorative development expressed not just separately, paralleled in the Primeval History and the Sinai Story, but as a combined whole. The parallels are to be viewed diachronically as a totality. The covenant concept and its dynamics seen in this way do not just parallel but they mark development and progression, precipitating the apprehension of a continuous story of a shared preservation. The relation to creation is reconfigured with the assumption of sin, thus the promise of land grows in significance along with the sign of God’s promise. The covenant events mark these alterations in preservation as structuring points.

In addition to the Genesis-Exodus parallel, Rendtorff observes that the covenant formula (“I will be God for you” and “You shall be a people for me”) provides the relational basis for Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah (Rendtorff, 1998: 13, 70-78). The caveat to this: “In the Pentateuch the structuring function of the covenant formula is clearly detectable, while this is not true for the other complexes to the same extent” (1998: 88). Less distinct structuring on a micro level does occur but for the most part the covenant formula “contributes essentially to the expression and differentiation of the thematic field … termed ‘covenant theology’” (1998: 92). Structurally speaking, Rendtorff reveals the characteristic usage of the covenant formula is to designate “either the beginning of the relationship between God and Israel or its eschatological future” (1998: 90). Rendtorff’s analysis confirms that the covenant formula occurrences are to be understood in relation to each other (1998: 69).
Deuteronomy, Rendtorff observes, deals uniquely with the covenant formula, hence it is treated separately from the rest of the Pentateuch (1998: 87). In Deuteronomy the covenant formula undergoes tailoring, in that predominantly the second part of the formula (“You shall be a people for me”) is integrally associated with the theme of election (7:6; 14:2), deliverance from Egypt (4:20; 7:6), keeping of God’s commandments (27:9; 26:16-19; 28:9) and the term b’rît (29:11f) (1998: 51-52, 63-69). The first part of Deuteronomy emphasises the election of Israel whilst the ending of Deuteronomy emphasises God’s command that Israel obey (1998: 55). Notwithstanding, the covenant formula is presented less methodically and therefore lends no structuring function to Deuteronomy (1998: 54).

Rendtorff discusses the function of the covenant formula in the Prophetic books, stating that Jeremiah first applies it in the context of God calling His people to listen to Him (7:23; 11:7f); specifically God reproaches Israel for not listening (1998: 55). The first occurrence of the covenant formula in Jeremiah echoes the Deuteronomic presentation, however, the Egyptian deliverance is married to the call to listen, and this precedes the covenant formula (1998: 70). Jeremiah 11:3-5 expresses this “interweaving” with greater clarity (1998: 70). Rendtorff states that in these first two occurrences the covenant formula is expressed in a new aspect (1998: 70). With the occurrence of the covenant formula in Chapter 24 the tempo changes as God addresses Israel’s failure: “God will bring them back from exile and will give them a heart to know him, and then the covenant formula follows” (1998: 55). This emphasis continues in Jeremiah and appears similarly in the book of Ezekiel (1998: 55). God’s restorative work becomes focused in Jeremiah 31:31-34, where Israel “will no longer be able to break the new covenant, because God is putting it into their hearts. This promise is sealed through the covenant formula (v.33b)” (1998: 55). The covenant formula is in the centre of the “theological programme” (1998: 73) and characterises the relation between God and Israel (1998: 73). The details surrounding the occurrence in Chapter 32 is similar to that of Chapter 20 (1998: 74).

Rendtorff avers, “In contrast to the book of Jeremiah, in the book of Ezekiel the covenant formula can be encountered solely in salvation oracles pointing towards the future” (1998: 75). Particularly, in Ezekiel 36 it is recorded that God will give a new heart and spirit to Israel that they may obey him. This is followed by the covenant formula functioning as a summary and a transition to God’s future restoration (1998:
In Ezekiel 37:15-28 the covenant formula occurs both in the context of Israel’s future purification and also God’s dwelling among His people (1998: 77). At this point Rendtorff makes the observation, “we again see here an important parallelism between the ‘bringing out’ from Egypt and the ‘bringing back’ from exile” (1998: 77). This would appear to be a structuring feature. In Zechariah 8:8 the covenant formula as in other cases is the seal on the restorative promises of God (1998: 78).

A diachronic and synchronic reading of covenant formula representation suggests a steady progression from a predominantly bilateral to an overwhelmingly unilateral emphasis. The progression appears to be based upon the restorative/transformative dynamic of the new covenant/new heart/new spirit concepts. The progression is depicted below.

Deuteronomy:  election/ deliverance/ obeying commands/ b’rît

Jeremiah:  deliverance/ call to listen/ judgment/ restoration/ new covenant

Ezekiel:  future salvation and purification/ new heart/ new spirit

Zechariah:  unilateral restoration promises

In this sense the covenant concept as featured by the covenant formula imparts a “logical structure” within the thematic field of salvation.

Rendtorff has demonstrated that the covenant concept does indeed provide the basis of structuring within individual parts of Genesis and Exodus and that it also generates paralleling between the two books. This structuring and paralleling reveal that covenant establishment is an indication of guarantee for the underlying theme of preservation and continuation of God’s people and humanity. The parallel between Genesis and Exodus encourages a diachronic reading of the texts, for an understanding of a continuous story of a shared preservation. Rendtorff’s presentation of the diachronic reading which the covenant concept generates appears inchoate. The diachronic element needs to be better developed in order to elucidate the structuring dynamic of the covenant concept. Rendtorff’s analysis of the covenant formula attempts to reveal diachronically the OT
presentations of the respective covenant ideas, yet his investigation ultimately becomes a theological systemisation.

4.1.2.2 Harold Fisch

Harold Fisch, who writes previous to and yet is not mentioned by Rendtorff, argues similarly for the structuring dynamics of the covenant concept, although clearly from a structuralist reading and analysis (1982). Fisch, however, examines the “Ruth-corpus” rather than the first two books of the Pentateuch. The Ruth-corpus is the Book of Ruth along with parallel narratives of Lot, his daughters and Abraham, and of Judah and Tamar (1982: 427). Fisch attempts to address a general diminutive regard for the historical dimension, a residue of the structuralist approach, precisely by invoking the dynamics of the covenant (1982: 426). He argues that the “Ruth-corpus ... gives us in miniature the very essence of all Heilsgechichte” (1982: 433) by representing the separation of Abraham and Lot, the following declension and the reparation and unification of patriarchal bonds (1982: 435).

Synchronic analysis reveals that the four stories parallel each other in eight categories exhibiting a common syntagm (1982: 429). The eight categories can be grouped into four antithetical dialectic pairs (1982: 429). The paired categories are progressively related beginning with “material improvement and tragic loss” (1982: 430), then followed by “widowhood (or loneliness) and redemption” (1982: 430), to this comes private behaviour of the woman and public behaviour of the male, and finally is exhibited the “contrast within the kinship pattern of ban and blessing” (1982: 430). This syntagm conveys the “diastole of exile and restoration” (1982: 432) and ultimately such patterns as fullness and emptiness, order and disorder, life and death (1982: 432).

In addition to synchronic analysis of the texts, it is diachronic analysis of the transformations in the syntagm on a temporal axis that reveals the nature and course of the progression of reparation (1982: 433-435). Fisch’s analysis reveals a “moral advance”, an increase in moral sensitivity and awareness (1982: 434). This, he states, points to a greater historical dialectic, such that with the moral progression a point of retrospect is arrived at where there is a looking back to an ideal era and the return to patriarchal origins (1982: 435). The reunion of Ruth and Naomi “redeems” the separation of Abraham and Lot placing it in the Heilsgechiachte pattern (1982: 435, 436). What is the basis for this? Fisch comments, “There are delicate but insistent
signs throughout the book pointing to a continuing covenant history beginning with the patriarchs and culminating with the royal house of David whose name forms the last word of the text” (1982: 435). The entire progress is governed by the memory and promise dynamic of the covenant, which gives a “sense” of history (1982: 426, 429-435). The covenant concept or motif as referred to by Fisch lends aggregating structure, drawing out the larger symmetry of the totality of the text, and also makes room for abstraction and the derivation of meaning. Importantly, Fisch in his article suggests the possible extension of the structuring covenant dynamic to other texts in the biblical record (1982: 436-437).

4.1.2.3 Bernard Gosse

Gosse avers that Ezekiel, specifically Chapters 18 and 20, has influenced Jeremiah’s conception of the New Covenant in Jeremiah 31:31-34 (Gosse, 2004). Even though the two books’ conceptions of salvation differ generally, the New Covenant at Jeremiah 31:31-34 “fait appel à la conception du salut telle qu’elle est présente dans le livre d’Ézéchiel. Ce salut correspond à un salut intérieur exprimé notamment par le vocabulaire du cœur nouveau” (Gosse, 2004: 570). Gosse argues that Jeremiah is influenced chiefly by Ezekiel in the areas of internalised salvation, the new heart, the opposition of fathers to sons, personal accountability and the theme of entrance into the promised land (2004: 574). Particularly, however, the “image du cœur nouveau” as a concept appears to govern the relation between the New Covenant concept and the idea of internalised salvation borrowed from Ezekiel (2004: 579). The shared vocabulary, expressions and redactive tendencies suggest slightly more than just influence between Jeremiah and Ezekiel but a degree of parallel, imparting once again structure in the thematic field (2004: 569-570).

4.1.2.4 Richard J. Bautch

The covenant idea organises for the prophets the patterns of God’s relation to His people and to the nations (Meier, 2009: 171). R.J. Bautch opens his article with the general observation that the Abrahamic covenant was a significant concept for not just the exilic period but the postexilic period as well (2009: 42). The exile prompted the Priestly writer and Jews to seek “an enduring framework” (2009: 42-43) by which to interpret their relationship with God; the Abrahamic covenant, therefore, “became a catalyst for theological developments” (2009: 43). Traditionally the Abrahamic covenant is taken as the “key to understanding the system of covenants” (2009: 44),
hence the Abrahamic covenant is given priority over other covenants and the Sinai covenant is subordinated to it (2009: 43, 44). Notwithstanding, Bautch calls into question Abraham’s role in the postexilic covenants (2009: 44).

Based on three biblical passages, Trito-Isaiah 63:7-64:11, Nehemiah 9:6-37 and Leviticus 26:1-46, Bautch states that the examination of these the three texts “leads to the conclusion that there are significant witnesses from relatively early in the Second Temple period that mention Abraham but undercut his importance for covenant” (2009: 44). He finds in these texts that the conditional covenant of Moses is clearly asserted in comparison to the “unconditional” Abrahamic one (2009: 44). The result of this is the promotion of dimensions of the Mosaic covenant: “other concepts that serve as the foundation for a restored covenant after the exile” (2009: 44), namely the topoi, confession of sin and the imagery of creation (2009: 44, 62-63).

Bautch finds that in Trito-Isaiah 63:7-64:11 the covenantal synonyms hesed and zâkar are used in place of b'rit, that references are made to the Exodus and Sinai, the Abrahamic covenant is “bypassed” with direct familial connection with God as father, and the call for God “to create” new things reflects Sinai imagery (2009: 46-47, 48, 49). In addition, Bautch observes that in 64:4b-6 the Mosaic covenant is in trouble owing to human sin and alienation from God, and leads therefore to the confession of sin in anticipation of covenant restoration (2009: 51). Bautch states, “If the Mosaic covenant were to be restored, it would be largely on the basis of this God’s person rather than that of Abraham” (2009: 51-52). Thus, Trito-Isaiah’s approach to covenant restoration, according to Bautch, differs from the Priestly writer who emphasises God’s oath to Abraham (2009: 53). The approach to covenant restoration in this section of Trito-Isaiah emphasises confession of sin, and familial connection to God and His power (2009: 53). As Bautch states, “The prayer of Trito-Isaiah augurs the reestablishment of the Mosaic covenant on the basis of confessing sin and revisiting the theophany at Sinai” (2009: 53).

The prayer of Nehemiah 9:2-37, which postdates Isaiah 63:7-64:11, evidences that “Like Trito-Isaiah’s prayer, the prayer of Nehemiah 9 is using creation imagery in a constructive manner to explore the nature of the divine-human relationship that was revealed at Sinai and that is foundational to a theology of covenant” (2009: 56). The prayer contains an admission of sin that has alienated the people from God, and that is
to be restored by the first step of confession of sin and also by the transcendence and

Postexilic Leviticus 26-1-46 is, according to Bautch, the likely work of Priestly
redactors, and expresses an interest not just in the Abrahamic covenant but other
ancestral covenants and especially the Sinai covenant (2009: 58). At the climax of
Leviticus 26 is recorded God’s vow not to abandon His sinful people or the land
because of the Sinai covenant (2009: 58). Bautch sees that Abraham is but a “segue” to
the Mosaic covenant (2009: 58). The argument is that the Priestly redactor “integrated
the Abrahamic covenant into the Mosaic” (2009: 59) such as not to deny the Abrahamic
but to assert the Mosaic in the interest of covenant reactivation (2009: 59-60). God will
remember the Abrahamic as a consequence of confession of sin and once satisfaction
has been made for the land in the enjoyment of its Sabbath rests (2009: 60).

Confession of sin, argues Bautch, is fundamental to the reestablishment of the covenant,
and the imagery of creation guarantees restoration in covenant reestablishment (2009:
62-63). Bautch’s study implies these two themes derived from the Mosaic covenant are
determinative for postexilic theology, and do exhibit an organisational capacity in the
respective contexts (2009: 51, 54, 57, 58).

This section examined four representative contributions. Each scholar identified the
covenant idea as a distinctive organising dynamic. Rendtorff and Fisch observed the
covenant concept as it functions in the foreground of the narrative, whilst Gosse and to
an extent Bautch observed the dynamic of the covenant concept operating in a less
pronounced manner. The covenant concept in its structuring and organisational ability,
according to the scholars, expresses the main idea of restoration, in conjunction with
judgment and preservation, for God’s people.

4.1.3 THE ESCHATON IDEA AS AN ORGANISING CONCEPT
This investigation into the principles of organisation under the Old Covenant seems to
benefit from the collective analysis of the Minor Prophets, Hosea to Malachi.
Representative scholarship shall be examined together in this section. Of course,
collective analysis of these prophetic works as the “Book of the Twelve Prophets”
should not diminish the merit of scholarly investigation of individual books. Collective
analysis, however, is particularly significant to this chapter because the Book of the
Twelve Prophets “is a very unusual literary composition that functions simultaneously as a collection of twelve individual prophetic works and as a single prophetic book” (Sweeney, 2005a: 165). A possible explanation for this may be found in Ehud Ben Zvi’s analysis of these books that reveals a de-historicising tendency presenting Israel and God as transtemporal entities such that the books reflect and communicate a metanarrative (2006: 37-44, 45). This metanarrative consists of four parts, “(a) Israel grievously sinned in the past; (b) its punishment was announced to it at the time of its sinning by prophets, who at times unsuccessfully called it to repentance; (c) Israel’s punishment was fulfilled; and (d) an utopian future already decided by YHWH was explicitly announced by godly speakers … and was announced to Israel at precisely the time of and despite its seemingly incurable sin” (Ben Zvi, 2006: 44). Ben Zvi explains that the texts ask the readers to “de-emphasise mimetic approaches” or a historicist approach, and that they “consistently point readers only to other texts in the book” (2006: 46). That is, there is little “temporal anchoring” of sin; instead, a paradigmatic depiction persists (Ben Zvi, 2006: 45). The result is that the texts are filled with these “markers” linking other texts or units to it that suggest that “rereaders … should read each text of a book in a way informed by the others and thus create networks of meanings that are deeply interwoven in the book” (Ben Zvi, 2006: 46).

Sirach 49:12 gives already a constituting “conception of the Twelve Prophets as early as the mid-second century B.C.E” (Sweeney, 2005b: 177). Following the lead of ancient writers and rabbis, James Nogalski and Aaron Schart gave contemporary scholarship the impetus for further investigation into the Twelve Prophets as a corpus (Redditt, 2007: 185). The rationale for the sequence of the books was to be found grounded in thematic factors more so than chronological principles (Sweeney, 2005b: 180, 186); “thematic factors appear to play a role in the organisation of the Book of the Twelve” (2005b: 186). Having recognised that “no common material binds the twelve together”, Sweeney maintains though that “the theme of the Day of YHWH as a day of punishment for both Israel/Judah and the nations when YHWH’s sovereignty is manifested at Zion permeates the books of the Twelve Prophets in both versions [LXX and MT]” (Sweeney, 2005a: 167-168). The day of the Lord is not a monolithic occurrence, “a single final judgment”, but the evidence suggests that “more than one event may be classified as the ‘day’ in the same writing” (Sweeney, 2007: 125). The time frame for the Day of YHWH ranges from imminent to distant temporal (2007: 126). This theme seems to fit the function of an organising principle, one that lends
inner-biblical structure and logic linking books. However, restoration from judgment is arranged differently in each (2005a: 168). Specifically, though, there appear to exist differing subsidiary thematic factors in the LXX and the MT versions (Sweeney, 2005b: 186). Chiefly, the LXX presents first Hosea, Amos and Micah, emphasising YHWH’s judgment “against the northern kingdom (Israel), the implications of judgment for Jerusalem and Judah, and the potential for Israel’s restoration in Zion” (2005b: 186). Next in Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Nahum the focus is on the judgment of the nations and restoration of Zion, followed by Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai and Zechariah concentrating on Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile as a purging necessary prior to restoration, with universal and cosmic significance, as indicated by Temple rebuilding (2005b: 186-187). Quite remarkably Malachi “rehearses the themes of the Twelve and presents a renewed call for Israel’s repentance and observation of the covenant, thereby recapping the themes introduced by Hosea” (2005b: 187). The MT differs from the LXX in that the first six books mix the stages of the LXX concerns, presenting them as a continuum (2005b: 187). In this way the MT version emphasises the role of Jerusalem and the purging of Jerusalem as the centre of YHWH’s universal sovereignty (2005b: 188). Taking the differences into consideration, the text still suggests that the eschaton, the theme of the Day of YHWH, retains such dominance as to function organisationally in the Minor Prophets.

To this main theme James D. Nogalski adds three more governing possibilities: “fertility of the land, the fate of God’s people, and the theodicy problem” (Nogalski, 2007: 125). Nogalski refers to the fertility of the land as a recurring topic and describes the squandering of its resources as the basis for God’s judgment of infertility by natural calamity or war (2007: 128). The theme is also tied to restoration; return of the fertility of the land is a sign of God’s restoration (2007: 129). The fate of God’s people is actually a complex of other thematic elements and for this reason it does not seem to commend itself organisationally. The literary function of the problem of theodicy is efficacious in the Book of the Twelve as Exodus 34:6-7 is strategically used as backdrop for several texts (2007: 132).

The specifics and sequence aside, what is striking is that both versions of the Book of the Twelve Prophets “share an intertextual relationship with the book of Isaiah” (Sweeney, 2005a: 172), namely, an understanding that divine purpose is related to world events (2005a: 172). This seems plausible, as Isaiah’s basic themes are
punishment and restoration for Jerusalem (2005a: 50). Precisely, the concept of divine judgment, the Day of YHWH, under the idea of the eschaton seems to create not only logical structure within individual books but also this inner-biblical link between corpuses.

4.2 SUMMARY
In the forgoing analysis the evidence suggests that typology, the covenant concept and the eschaton idea are prominent organising principles in the OT canon. In no sense is their exclusivity proffered.

As Ninow observed, in both the Pentateuch and the Prophets Exodus typology connects the past with the future, historical events with a definite singular eschaton, and seems to provide then the connective framework, which enables the creation of a story, a metadiegesis. The basis for the connection of the past and the future is two fold, a prophetic indication and direction to a single eschatological fulfilment point. The OT canon contains an Exodus typology, which appears to facilitate the development of the nation Israel and humanity’s story. As such, Exodus typology is a connective, both narrative and thematic, stringing together Israel’s story.

As understood by Rendtorff, Fisch, Gosse, and Bautch: judgment, restoration and preservation are the shared purposes of the covenant idea, which tends to use degrees of parallelism and integrative concept centralisation to structure its material as is presented inner-biblically in the OT. This ultimately suggests the Heilsgeschichte pattern. The covenant idea, in both synchronic and diachronic dimensions, effecting judgment, restoration and preservation, seems to be a governing principle, for the covenant concept provides the story framework and the promise of future resolution after deteriorative/destructive situations. As such, the covenant idea not only frames stories but also links consecutive stories, generating a progression. In this way, the covenant idea apparently functions strongly as an organising principle in OT writings.

The eschaton idea supplies the Day of YHWH as a thematically organising principle, specifically in the exilic/post-exilic material, in the Book of the Twelve Prophets. Restoration from judgment appears to be arranged differently in each book of the Twelve, yet their relation to the Day of YHWH is determinant for logical/thematic development.
The analysis of the OT corpus for organisational principles reveals a number of conceptions along with their sub-conceptions. Among them, however, the covenant idea appears to be the most adaptive and as a result the most prevalent. This bodes well as a possible influence for the Lukan two-volume work, which is commonly held to possess substantial OT ties, predominantly an Isaianic connection.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE COVENANT CONCEPT’S STRUCTURING AND INTERRELATING FUNCTION IN LUKE-ACTS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

The fourth question and objective arising from this work’s central question and aim addresses the Lukan corpus by assessing the relationship of the covenant concept to the corpus’ narrative structure with a view to organisation and theological interrelation within it. After attending to preliminary assumptions, narrative and narrative level features will be delineated in Luke’s Gospel account conjoined with the Acts of the Apostles, identified occurrences of the covenant concept and its function in the narrative will be evaluated, the covenant concept and its function within the structure of Luke and Acts as a narrative whole will be discussed, and finally the covenant concept’s resultant function in theological interrelation and organisation in Luke and Acts will receive attention.

In my M.Th. dissertation I established that the covenant concept is indeed a significant part of Lukan thought. This understanding is expressed chiefly in terms of promise-fulfilment and is used to justify God’s salvific work in Christ, to evoke a covenant identity based on the unilateral redemptive work of God in Jesus Christ and to integrate the believers into faithful Israel (Kovacs, 2006). The observations of this thesis suggest, however, that the Lukan covenant idea extends beyond the above understanding. The covenant idea also appears to be presented unilaterally in terms of its operative aspect, namely service to God. As such, the concept takes on an organisational function.

The literary merit of Luke’s two-volume work is apodictic and will not receive separate attention. Literary design is, however, central to this thesis. In my introduction I noted that Luke seems to appropriate the ancient history of the Jews not only to justify but to interpret the story he is telling (Witherington, 1998: 69). In order to shape the appropriated tradition Luke not only follows a kata genos style of arranging his material, geographically and well as chronologically (Witherington, 1998: 34), but it would also seem that Luke makes use of the architectonic designs of ancient Greek literature. C.H. Talbert vigorously argues this point (1974). The observable
architectonic patterns seem, however, indicative of a comprehensive design, one that is perhaps best discernible and extracted by the morpho-syntactical aspect of Structural Criticism. What has been observed is that the Lukan story spanning the Gospel and Acts evidences a succession of sequences as described primarily by A.J. Greimas. Greimasian story analysis identifies three sequences: the initial sequence (Lukan references comprising a pre-story), the topical sequence (Luke 1:5-Acts 12:25) and the final sequence (Acts 9:1-28:31).

A problem regarding service to God, the operative aspect of the covenant, is identified in the initial sequence and is addressed in the topical sequence and presented as fundamentally resolved in the final sequence. Interestingly this tripartite structure is noted by Peter Mallen, who observes key Isaianic scripture references in the prologue, transition between volumes and conclusion of Luke-Acts, yet does not fully extract the form and meaning of this structure, as it is beyond his purview (2008: 99-100). This “narrative substructure” of sequences interweaving Israel’s ancient history with Luke’s Gospel and Acts also seems to provide a platform for thematic interrelation. The evidence suggests that the covenant idea figures significantly in each sequence, not only facilitating the work of subjects but also connecting the meanings of their work to each other, thus in the role of an organising concept, promoting the relation of themes.

5.0.1 Preliminary assumptions qualified
The assumptions fundamental to the argumentation of this work are: the definition of an organising principle, the nature of unity between Luke and Acts and the notion of conceptual unity. These will be treated in respective order.

5.0.1.1 An organising principle
As presented in Chapter Two, an organising principle may be defined simply as a quantifiable concept discernable in the text, which facilitates the structuring of the narrative for the purpose of creating a meta-historical matrix enabling thematic interrelation. D. Barley corroborates, “Organisation and organism … imply a structure of diverse organs and component parts which are related in such a way as to function collectively in the service of an overriding purpose” (1967: 182). An organising principle then appears to inform narrative structure. Similarly Gary A. Tuttle has found that the Sermon on the Mount contains “pervasive wisdom antithesis” which is the
organisational principle of the sermon, a key to its meaningful structure (1977: 214, 219). In narratological terms, an organising principle may be identified with the depersonified concept of the implied author or the overall textual arrangement of the narrative (Tolmie, 1999: 7). In structural-critical terms, however, narrative structure itself serves as an organising principle (Greimas, 1971: 793). The organising concept is inseparable from the structure, as the structure conveys within itself the principles of organisation, where structure is defined as a system of logical narrative development of a hierarchy of narrative programs (Patte & Patte, 1978: 24-5). Narrative structure understood structurally conforms to a culturally informed translinguistic sequence (Greimas, 1971: 793), which as a template conveys the organising concept(s) or provides a medium for its extraction. Calloud affirms that the analysis of the narrative dimension syntagmatically can elucidate the organising principle (1979: 134). The phrase “organisational principle/concept” as referred to in this thesis connotes this gamut of meaning and this analysis will separate theoretically structure from the organising concept. Methodological necessity, as will be demonstrated, assigns a defining priority to the structural-critical view that is then supported by narratological considerations.

An organising principle is perhaps not a readily discernable feature. A view of the narrative purpose may be observable on the deep structure level or on the level of what may be termed the fabula, story or metadiegetic narrative. The narrative structure lies at this deep level (Greimas, 1971: 794), however, it is also “verifiable” (Greimas, 1971: 794) on the surface structure level or level of the plot, discourse or diegetic level (although independent of it). This because, according to Greimas and Courtés, “surface structure can be defined only with respect to deep structure, and a surface sentence is the form that results from a transformation … carried out upon its deep organization” (1982: 323). Of course plot and fabula/story are an undivided whole, for any division is theoretical (Bal, 1997: 78). In theory organising principles seem to emerge as the examination of the totality of the text leads to an understanding of the overall textual arrangement, which should also be a key to the narrative’s structure. The interchange or juncture between structure level/plot and deep structure level/fabula seems to be where organisation takes place and thematic inter-relation becomes possible. According to Simon Bar-Efrat, this seems plausible, as narrative structure may be derived from particular textual arrangements on the verbal, narrative technique, narrative content and conceptual content levels (1980: 157-172). Considering this and Francois Tolmie’s
position that an organising principle narratologically defined is derived by “analysing the total textual organisation of the narrative text including all the aspects … narrator and narratee, characters, events, time setting and focalization” (1999: 7), leads increasingly to the appeal of Structuralism. As will be seen, the structuralist approach will assist in delineating the textual limits, describing the overall textual arrangement and eliciting an organising principle. This approach combined with narratological methodology should identify any derivative design in the text and so the meaningful relation of themes.

The justification for investigating the presence of a Lukan organising concept is twofold. The first, already mentioned, is the lacuna in scholarship on the interrelation of Lukan themes. A second justification arises out of the distinctive hermeneutical nature of Lukan redaction, posing fundamental questions formulated according to the theory of knowledge (Green, 1996: 288; Witherington, 1998: 68-69). Anthony C. Thiselton identifies this in his discussion of Schleiermacher’s hermeneutical theory, stating that his “hermeneutical understanding is concerned not with logical deduction alone, but with the inter-relation between the general [logical deduction] and the particular [individual particularities of human life]” (1992: 213). The knowledge and justified belief building process detailed by Robert Audi apparently corroborates this position (Audi, 2003). It seems the very process of knowledge creation necessitates holistic inter-relational organisation. The interdisciplinary importance of this dynamic again commends the relevance of this thesis.

5.0.1.2 The unity of Luke and Acts

The mention of a unity between Luke’s Gospel and Acts in the current academic climate begs explanation. To begin with, it is common knowledge that scholarship is generally divided over the nature and degree of relation between Luke’s Gospel and Acts; however, it is equally correct that scholarship is generally agreed that some kind of connectedness does exists, as scholarship does not seem keen on its ultimate dismissal. Michael F. Bird’s (2007) scholarly assessment corroborates this evaluation even in view of recent contributions such as that of Patricia Walters (2009). Thus to write of “unity” in its most tenuous form is not unjustified. To be clear, the assumed argument for Lukan unity in this thesis is not an argument for authorial, genre, canonical or theological unity but primarily narratological unity, defined in terms of discourse/diegetic as well as the story/metadata levels. With a view to the evidence
of disunity represented by Parsons and Pervo (1993: 46-81), J. Hur has defended the narrative discourse unity of the Lukan writings (Hur, 2001), where discourse is defined as, “the expression plane of narrative” (Prince, 2003: 21). The contributions of Tannehill (1986/1990), Talbert (1974, 1997, 2002) and Marshall (1993) provide seminal observations on the types of discourse level literary devices that evidence relation, that is, a unity between Luke’s Gospel and Acts. Assumed is also an argument for unity between the two on the story level or metadiegetic level. Just as the synoptics are distinct but parallel discourses with a common story, so also it can be contemplated that Luke’s Gospel and Acts, though distinct but interconnected discourses, are unified in story. Tannehill reminds us regarding Luke’s Gospel that “24:50-53 is the ending only of the story of Jesus, not of the larger story of God’s saving purpose for all flesh. Furthermore, it is a happy ending only in a partial sense” (1986 [1]: 301). In the case of different discourse versions of a narrative Barbara Herrnstein Smith rejects unity on the story level and so also rejects Chatman’s position (Smith, 1980). Smith, however, mistakenly assumes that narrative unity at the story level requires direct authorial intention, that the story level is unquantifiable, existing separately from the discourse, and that Chatman’s choice of versions is indiscriminate. Smith does not adequately consider the prevalence and effect of “mythology” as an influence in literature, for which Northrop Frye has argued persuasively and successfully (1990). Also, Parsons and Pervo have stated that a story level unity does not depend on generic unity or, for that matter, flawless discourse unity (1993: 21, 83, 122-123).

Cadbury’s 1927 (1999) work on Luke and Acts and A.C. Clark’s assessment of the linguistic difference between the two (1933) tilled the soil for the development of the current divisions in scholarship over the unity question. I.H. Marshall categorises scholarship into four chief theories: 1. separate works by two different authors, 2. separate works by the same author, 3. a two-part work composed as a whole, 4. one continuous work, later separated into two works (1993: 165-172). From a discourse level, based on the similarity of the two prologues, intentional links between the two stories and the overlap between them, Marshall argues that “the Gospel was published as the first part of a two-volume composition” (1993: 176) and that “they form two parts of one work, conceived in its final form as a unity” (1993: 182). He cites Josephus’s *Contra Apionem* as a close parallel to the two-part compositional design of the Gospel and Acts (1993: 182). Marshall’s thinking is paralleled by F. Bovon who sees Luke 1:1-4 as the prologue to the “entire work” (2002: 24), the Gospel and Acts, as does

The position in this thesis is that Luke’s Gospel was written as the first of two documents that may be viewed as two volumes. This thesis does not assume that Luke and Acts were intended to be read continuously as one seamless narrative; this thesis does assume that they were intended to be perceived as conjoined.

As a result this study indirectly addresses the question: In what way(s)? does the author of Luke’s Gospel and of Acts conjoin the two documents, particularly on the level of story or metadiegesis.

**5.0.1.3 The fundamental assumption of Conceptual Unity**

The two books have different dates of composition, are of non-identical genres, and have varying styles and theological emphases. Is intentional conceptual unity, therefore, a sufficient basis upon which to analyse the text of two books as conjoined in plot *via* the reading event?
As mentioned above, scholarship perceives some form of literary connectedness between the two volumes, ranging from the trivial to the substantial. For Northrop Frye this would apparently demonstrate the existence of a text-based “conceptual unity” (1990: xii). Frye’s analysis of the Bible’s function in English literature has led him to reject the perception of the Bible as a grab-bag anthology in favour of the view that it is a source for a period’s “mythology” (nota bene Frye’s definition of mythology) which expresses a meta-belief informed within a cultural and psychological context (1990: xii-xxiii, 31-52). Even though he views the Bible as a library of very different books Frye deems conceptual unity necessary for understanding the story communicated by texts with literary affinity (albeit according to Frye, culturally and psychologically determined) (1990: xii).

Conceptual unity is discernable inasmuch as a common story is embedded in the plot(s). Certain concepts, as will be suggested, such as the covenant concept, retain fundamental story elements that enable the establishing of commonality. In the reading event on the level of narrative, the plot and story contained in the text are distinguished by identification of their integration. Tannehill maintains the distinction between plot and story (1986 [1]: 18), which is ultimately a product of Russian Formalism (Éjxenbaum, 1971: 16). This distinction of at least two levels within the narrative is theoretical as Mieke Bal states what is “inseparable” is “temporarily disjointed” in analysis (2004: 7). For instance, reference to the covenant, promise-fulfilment terminology and the use of the Old Testament are primary indicators of plot and story coalescence and are markers for theoretical separation.

Conceptual unity is fundamental to the work of a number of scholars such as R. Morgenthaler (1949), M.C. Parsons (1987), J. Dupont (1978), G. Wasserberg (1998), L. Alexander (1999), M.P. Bonz (2000), P. Mallen (2008), and C.B. Puskas (2009), and as a result provides a unified precedent for a “text” delimited beyond the compositional unit. Morgenthaler, for instance, treats the Gospel and Acts together on the basis of the observance of shared doublets and parallels of various sorts, leading to the idea of a dual witness motif supporting the reliability of tradition: “Wir haben in unsern Listen der Ikor. Doppelworte eine mit Namenpaaren. Was steht hinter diesen Doppelnamen, wenn nicht der apostolische Grundsatz des Doppelzeugnisses?” (1949 [2]: 8). Alexander, building on the work of J. Dupont (1978), sees Acts 28 as a closure to the Gospel and Acts, suggesting the existence of a “paratexte” (1999: 421, 423) located within the narrative,
in the prologue (Luke 1-4) and the epilogue (Acts 27-28), which provides entry and exit into and out of the narrative world characterised by the supernatural (1999: 421, 439, 442-446). The prologue and epilogue frame the narrative by the reappearance of Rome as a location, the tension within the Jewish community, the use of Isaiah 6 and the Proclaimers and Proclaimed (Alexander, 1999: 423, 424-438). Marianne Palmer Bonz compares Luke-Acts as a story unit to the Ancient Greek epic, seeing the Pentecost event as its centre (2000). Peter Mallen assumes the literary unity of the Gospel and Acts because of significant narrative connections between the two volumes; equally important, however, is that he assumes a conceptual unity based on the key placement of significant scriptural references to Isaiah (2008: 99-100), which is “an interpretive framework to guide the reader” (2008: 60). The significant references occur in the prologue, the link between the two volumes and the conclusion (2008: 99-100). These strategically placed references are hermeneutically united. The logic of Dionysius of Halicarnassus is, however, fundamental to all this scholarship, in that he noted that the paramount importance of the “standardised” unifying form that governed historical writing consisted of an appropriate beginning and ending (Heath, 1989: 77-81). This, as Dionysius implied, significantly applies to an individual work and also to a collection of works.

Assumed in this thesis then is an identifiable story-based conceptual unity. With this a priori is the text of both volumes analysed together.

The length of the material, however, may pose a methodological concern regarding text fragmentation. Suffering from this is McComiskey’s stellar work (2004) on the structure and composition of Luke 4:14-24:53, that leaves the reader pondering the dissimilarity of Chapters 1-3 in relation to the structure McComiskey observes. McComiskey claims that the Jesus-John parallelism of Chapters 1-3 couples to the structure of the whole Gospel (2004: 204) yet it is hard to see how it contributes to the overall theological programme presented by McComiskey’s structure. In the case of a larger text the exegete may become, as Routledge states, “lost in a complex maze of possibilities” (2004: 203) and for this reason “is encouraged to look at the bigger picture” (2004: 203). The bigger picture in this case should be viewed on the contiguous conceptual canvases of Luke’s Gospel and of Acts, and as suggested, through a structural-critical lens.
To restate the main assumptions of this section: an organising principle is defined as a quantifiable concept discernable in the text, which facilitates the structuring of the narrative for the purpose of creating a meta-historical matrix enabling thematic interrelation; assumed also is that Luke’s Gospel was written as the first of two documents that may be viewed as two volumes, though they may not have been intended to be read continuously as one seamless narrative; also assumed in this thesis is an identifiable story-based conceptual unity.

5.1 DELINEATING THE NARRATIVE AND NARRATIVE-LEVEL FEATURES IN LUKE-ACTS


Theoretically conjoining the plot of Luke’s Gospel and Acts is supported precisely by syntactic observations from the field of Structural Exegesis, applying particularly the “modèle actantiel” (Calloud, 1973) of A.J. Greimas (1983). This methodology identifies and extracts a logically dependent structure spanning the two books. The suitability of this type of analysis hinges on the inseparability of the text’s plot, from a clearly developed story (fabula), and the programmatic “elucidation of certain characteristics of the overall text” (Patte, 1990: 10). The validity of analysing the conjoined texts’ plot in the reading event is bolstered by D.L. Bock’s work (1987) wherein he maintains the Lukan technique of OT interpretation is not just a **midrash** but a **haggadah** “exposition of events” (1987: 55), comparing events “in terms of promise and fulfilment and in terms of the pattern of divine action in history” [emphasis added] (1987: 55).

Richard B. Hays (2002) examined Galatians 3:1-4:11 using the morpho-syntactical analytical strategy of Greimas’ structural methodology and identified a narrative substructure informing the character of Paul’s theology. Jean Calloud has analysed the Gospel of Mark in a structural-critical manner (1979). Calloud was concerned primarily with the semantic dimension of the text rather than the narrative dimension as he found generally that “elaboration of a descriptive model of the whole remains more problematic” (1979: 135). Daniel Patte and Judson F. Parker structurally analysed Genesis 2 and 3 (1980). They recognise a correspondence between the narrative
organisation and the symbolic system, yet are focused on extracting deep values, the
semantic universe (1980: 55-57). Robin Routledge applied the Greimas Actantial
Model to the Book of Isaiah in order to demonstrate the viability of a structural
approach for gaining an overarching view of the entire text in relation to its components
(2004: 183-204). Routledge identified a narrative structure beneath the non-narrative
text of Isaiah (2004: 183-204). Admittedly the approach has “an element of circularity”
(Routledge, 2004: 183-204), which, Jean Calloud explains, is because structural
“analyse avance sur plusieurs plans à la fois et que, souvent, des obscurités persistantes
à un niveau sont réduites par une prévision des étapes ultérieures” (1973: 14).

Advantageously, this method prevents the exegete from being overrun by a multitude of
possible directions for inquiry and fosters analysis within view of the text’s main theme
(Routledge, 2004: 203). Wright also sees deliberate thoroughness as an advantage
(1992: 70). Matthias Wenk uses the Greimas model effectively to elicit the overarching
function of the Lukan characters, specifically the socio-ethical role of the Holy Spirit in
quantifying primarily the Helper and its role, so the sequential progression of the story
remains un-deciphered. The question of the relation between Paul’s christology and the
formation of Christian identity has lead Samuel Byrskog to identify a narrative
substructure in Paul’s letter to the Romans by following an intertextual approach along
with Hays’ methodology (2008). This section of the present thesis will follow the
morpho-syntactical aspect of Greimas’ structural approach as interpreted and
synthesised by Hays (2002). The methodological approach of Structural Criticism is
somewhat variegated and Hays’ presentation resolves this complexity.

Aristotle, as Hays notes (2002: 84), asserts that “well-ordered plots” have a beginning,
middle and end (Ackrill, 1989: 546). This narrative development is called a (complex)
syntagmatic or syntactic system (Patte, 1990: 54-55). This system exists on the deep
structure level; as Prince states, it “consists of global syntactico-semantic
representations determining the meaning of the narrative and is converted into surface
structure” (Prince, 2003: 18). A narrative then, at the deep structure level, is a
succession of three sequences: initial sequence, topical sequence and final sequence
(Hays, 2002: 84-85; Wright, 1992: 71). The initial sequence describes a task or order
that was disrupted (Hays, 2002: 84). The final sequence correlates with the initial as it
completes the interrupted task or re-establishes the disrupted order (Hays, 2002: 84).
The topical sequence, which may be more than one, is the body of the narrative (Hays,
2002: 84) “in which the central character tries to solve the problem” (Wright, 1992: 71). The (complex) syntagmatic system then is governed by a main transformation, “the plot being the passage from an initial situation of lack to a concluding situation in which the lack is fulfilled through the intermediary of secondary transformations” (Patte, 1990: 55). According to Greimas’ system, each sequence usually contains three syntagms, elements which must occur in logical order (Hays, 2002: 85), “le syntagme contractuel”, “le syntagme disjonctionnel”, “le syntagme performanciel” (Calloud, 1973: 24). In the contract syntagm “the protagonist is charged with a task to perform” (Hayes, 2002: 85); in the disjunction/conjunction syntagm “the protagonist sets out on the quest to carry out the “contract”’’ (2002: 85); in the performance syntagm “the protagonist carries out or fails to carry out the task” (Hays, 2002: 85; Routledge, 2004: 186; Greimas, 1983: 239-240).

Hays diagrams this as follows (2002: 85).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial sequence</th>
<th>Topical sequence</th>
<th>Final sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a note, this succession of three sequences is termed differently by Greimas as a succession of “trois épreuves” (Calloud, 1973: 24), tests of qualification, principle and glory (Calloud, 1973: 24). Following the rationale of Greimas’ theory each syntagm consists of “narrative statements” (2002: 85; Routledge, 2004: 186) which are reduced to “canonical functions”. The contract syntagm is reduced to contract statement one (CS1, mandating/acceptance) and two (CS2, communication/reception) (2002: 86). The disjunction/conjunction syntagm is reduced to arrival/departure or departure/arrival statements (DS) (2002: 87). The performance syntagm is reduced to confrontation statement (PS1, domination/submission) statement (PS2), and attribution/deprivation statement (PS3) (2002: 87). It should be noted that there should not be an attribution PS3 statement in the Initial Sequence by virtue of the situation of lack; nothing has been attributed to the receiver, however, in order to have binary correspondence the PS3 canonical function has been termed the deprivation statement in the Initial Sequence, in which the results of the unfulfilled/broken mandate are stated (2002: 88-89).

To this syntagmatic system belong six actants, agents and objects, elements of the narrative and the actantial model that systematises the relation between them.
(a) The *Sender* is the figure who establishes the mandate in the contract syntagm.

(b) The *Subject* is the figure who receives the mandate. (The Subject is usually called, in the language of literary criticism, the hero or the protagonist.)

(c) The *Object* is the thing or quality that the Sender wants to communicate to someone.

(d) The *Receiver* is the figure to whom the Sender wants to communicate the object.

(e) The *Opponent* is the figure or force that seeks to prevent the Subject from carrying out the mandate.

(f) The *Helper* is the figure or force that aids the Subject in carrying out the mandate. (Hays, 2002: 90-91)

The following diagrams the relations between these elements within a sequence according to the three axes of volition. This is the Actantial Model. The Actantial Model gives a stereoscopic view of the sequence as a whole, the combination of the C, D/C, and P syntagms (2002: 91).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sender} & \rightarrow \text{Object} \rightarrow \text{Receiver} \\
\uparrow & \\
\text{Helper} & \rightarrow \text{Subject} \leftarrow \text{Opponent}
\end{align*}
\]

There are three axes in this Model. The top line is the axis of communication, the centre vertical is the axis of volition and the bottom line is the axis of power. When combined with the three sequences the following general depiction emerges (Hays, 2002: 93). There is only one Actantial Model for each sequence (2002: 91).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial sequence</th>
<th>Topical sequence</th>
<th>Final sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sender}^1 \rightarrow \text{Object}^1 \rightarrow \text{Receiver}^1$</td>
<td>$\text{Sender}^2 \rightarrow \text{Object}^2 \rightarrow \text{Receiver}^2$</td>
<td>$\text{Sender}^3 \rightarrow \text{Object}^3 \rightarrow \text{Receiver}^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\uparrow$</td>
<td>$\uparrow$</td>
<td>$\uparrow$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Helper}^1 \rightarrow \text{Subject}^1 \leftarrow \text{Opponent}^1$</td>
<td>$\text{Helper}^2 \rightarrow \text{Subject}^2 \leftarrow \text{Opponent}^2$</td>
<td>$\text{Helper}^3 \rightarrow \text{Subject}^3 \leftarrow \text{Opponent}^3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is of course some variation to this depiction. The actants in the initial sequence, for example, Subject$^1$, may reappear in the final sequence. The topical sequence may consist of subparts. Not all elements may be present, for example, the contract established in the initial syntagm may only be implied in the discourse unit. The relation of the deep structure to the surface structure or fabula to plot, based on the Greimasian model, is that “actants and actantial relations would be elements of the deep structure, actors and actorial relations would be found at the surface structure level” (Prince, 2003: 96).
The construction of sequences and syntagms begins in the reading event with the elucidation of reading units called *lexies*, which are defined as units wherein an encompassing fundamental happens and relation is created (Calloud, 1973: 13). This is perhaps the most simple but challenging step in the method of Structural Criticism, as narrative needs to be reduced into its normative fundamentals of actors and processes (1973: 13-14). From this identification process emerges the sequences and syntagms.

### 5.1.1 Initial Sequence

The initial sequence introduces a situation of lack where an order or mandate has been disrupted. That something for some time is not as it should be in the life of Israel, which is affecting its current and future state, is indicated clearly, for example, in the angelic announcement to Zechariah (Luke 1:16-17), in the *Benedictus* (Luke 1:71-75) and in Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:51-53). These texts and those presented below articulate a basic common *lexie* from which the initial sequence is derived. God has called Israel but Israel has failed to fulfil that calling. The initial sequence, however, may precede plotted time and may therefore not be positioned chronologically and/or may not be a unified section of text (possibly may not even be complete). This is indeed the case in the Lukan writings, as the infancy narrative begins the topical sequence, relating the problem resolution. Authorial prerogative has left detection of the initial sequence to investigation. Fundamental morpho-syntactical components of the background story or metadiegetic narrative (Prince, 2003: 50) should be extracted and examined to identify this sequence.

#### 5.1.1.1 Extraction of the Metadiegetic Narrative’s Syntactical Components

Assembling the initial sequence in this case involves a basic reconstruction of the background story/fabula, the metadiegetic narrative, which should reveal a vignette of Israel’s moral condition and thereby, among other things, the situation of lack and initial mandate. Writing for the Interdisciplinary Center for Narratology, University of Hamburg, Didier Coste and John Pier summarise Gérard Genette’s observations that there are three basic relations by which metadiegetic level is bound to primary or diegetic narrative level: “(a) explanatory, when there is a link of direct causality between the events of the diegesis and those of the metadiegesis; (b) thematic, by way of contrast or analogy between levels … with a possible effect of the metadiegesis on the diegetic situation; (c) narrational, when the act of (secondary) narrating merges with
the present situation” (Coste and Pier, 2010; Genette, 1983: 227-234). This Genette later expanded to six relations (Genette, 1990: 92-94). Thus by examining the appropriate relations a background story should emerge.

The extraction itself, however, requires some guidance so that the initial sequence with the disruption of the original mandate may be elucidated. Tyson’s remark is helpful in this: “Structuralists and other literary critics claim that the theme of conflict lies at the heart of any dramatic narrative” (1978: 136); this suggests that divine-human opposition/conflict scenes may be symptomatic of the situation of lack and may be particular potential sources for diegetic/metadiegetic level relation. Additionally, explanatory relation may also occur in pronouncement stories, in which events may be given a promise-fulfilment interpretation, in which Israel’s history may be recapitulated or knowledge of a historical figure’s significance may be rehearsed. These may link to the metadiegetic level, providing insight into the original mandate. Relation may occur thematically in stories latent with typological allusions. For instance, the birth narratives or, more significantly, conflict stories, where the theme of persecution elucidates, or where the established moral conduct of Israel is juxtaposed in story recapitulation/recollection, may reveal the “lack”, or disrupted mandate. It should be noted that within Luke and Acts certain characteristics of Israel are presented as in solidarity with the conduct of past generations (Minear, 1976: 110); thereby the span of generations is culpable for the “lack”. This may be found by identifying evaluative statements of its leadership or generation contemporary with Jesus, which may be in solidarity with prior generations or group types (Minear, 1976: 110). This is not to say all of Israel is declined as such. The infancy narrative is careful to reverence a few individuals such that each “initial portrait shows the real Israel” (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 188). The portraits of these individuals seem to heighten rhetorically the sense of disorder, raising awareness of the existence of the situation of lack.

The following list is not intended to be an exhaustive rehearsal, but a representative extraction of the initial sequence from a lexie, securing the evidence of its presence as foundational to the background story.

Infancy Narrative, Gospel of Luke 1:5-2:52
The information on the initial sequence contract and Israel’s failure to fulfil it as reflected by evaluative revelation/pronouncement may be found in the infancy narrative.
Joel B. Green argues that the infancy narrative holds strong literary ties to the Abrahamic story of Genesis 11-21 such that Luke creates from it and other OT text references a subtext: “the birth narrative has become a kind of echo chamber for the interplay of ‘the old stories’ with Luke’s own story” (Green, 1994: 79). Hence, the beginning of Luke’s Gospel is not the birth of Christ but “is located only in God’s purpose” (1994: 83).

**Angelica Announcement to Zechariah, Gospel of Luke 1:16-17**

“16 kai pollous tôn huîôn Israêl epistrepsei epi kurion ton theon autôn. 17 kai autos proeleusetai enôpion autou en pneûmati kai dunamei Èliou, epistrepsei kardias paterôn epi tekna kai apeitheis en phronêsei dikaiôn, hetoimasai kuriô laon kateskeuasmenon.”

The angelic announcement to Zechariah gives explanatory and thematic relation of diegesis to metadiegesis. John the Baptist’s birth is linked to the background story. The angelic announcement reveals the contract that John the Baptist is called to fulfil. Hence this text gives Topical Sequence information. Implicitly, however, a divine evaluation of Israel’s pre-existing moral condition is discernible. They are away from their God as manifest by the existence of social degeneration; their lack of unity is a result of a deficiency of wisdom and righteousness. This condition points to a situation of lack regarding wisdom and both ethical and moral righteousness, that is plausibly (based on the Semitic conception of generations) long pre-existing. As such, they are considered unprepared to apprehend and respond to divine intervention of restoration. They need to be assisted in turning to their God, and John the Baptist does this by addressing their condition. Fitzmyer states that the turning of the fathers to their children, a reference to Malachi 3:34, addresses “the paternal neglect of the young in Israel”, for “Luke is hinting ... at the neglect shown by Israel of old toward those who are becoming Abraham’s children” (1970 [1]: 320). The reference is also found in Ben Sirah (‘Praise of the Fathers’ section, 48:10) where the context is similar. A failure of leadership seems to be related to the deficiency of upright, righteous, ethical living and thereby a unified people of God. The text suggests that leadership, particularly religious leadership, seems to be a good candidate for the actantial position of “opponent”, preventing the subject, Israel from carrying out its mandate. This seems to fulfil the canonical functions of PS1 and PS2. PS1, the confrontation statement, is that there is a conflict with Israel’s leadership; PS2, the domination/submission statement, is that the leadership subdues the people. The angelic evaluation, indicating the disruption of the
mandate, is further emphasised when read in contrast to the characterisation of Zechariah and Elizabeth: “ἐσαν δικαίοι αμφοτέροι εναντίον του θεού, πορευομενοί ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαίωμαίν του κυρίου αμεμπότι” (Luke 1:6).

_Benedictus, Gospel of Luke 1:71-75_

“72 ποйтеσαι ελεος μετά τῶν πατερῶν ἡμῶν καὶ μνήμεσίν αὐτοῦ διάθεκές ἡγιασάτας, 73 ἱρον ὑμὸν ὅμοσεν πρὸς Αβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, τὸ δοσὶν ἡμῖν 74 ἀποβοῦς εκ κηροῦ ἱεροῦ ἱστηντας λατρεύειν αὐτῷ. 75 ἐν ἁσιοτητὶ καὶ δικαίωσιν ἐνοπίον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν.”

The _Benedictus_ gives explanatory and thematic relation of diegesis to metadiegesis, why and how the ministry of Jesus will effect salvation. The accepted major manuscripts agree generally on the text. Zechariah under the Spirit’s inspiration, _eplésthē pneumatos hagiou_, is portrayed as a credible speaker, hence his believability is rescued and the effect of his initial unbelief is remedied. In Zechariah’s life circumstance, intertextual allusion to the Abraham cycle, the revered past, and covenant serves to validate the Zechariah story and prologue, yet also serves to establish the prologue as a continuation of the Abrahamic story (Litwak, 2005: 82-83). The relation of the Abrahamic cycle to Luke 1 and 2 is bound in the continuation of promised Abrahamic covenant blessings to the figures in the narrative (2005: 83)—not just, however, the covenant blessings in themselves, but a continuation of the covenant context. The importance the text places on the moral character of figures suggests that something is expected of Israel, as it was from Abraham.

The initial sequence contract, CS1 canonical function, is here given in succinct form. God will enable them to fulfil what they have been unable to. The births of John and Jesus herald God’s redemption, salvation and deliverance from impeding opposition and herald the enabling of God’s people to His service—appropriate service, which is characterised by lack of fear, security, holiness and righteousness. The use of the term, _latreuein_ (1:74) refers to “a way of life that is really a cultic service of him. Though it denotes acts of worship, it is used analogously of the entire way in which the chosen people was to conduct itself” (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 385). The designation of Israel as servant (_paidos_) in the _Magnificat_ (Luke 1:54) reinforces that this is what they have been called to. _The text suggests that appropriate prior service to God, the mandate of CS1, has been disrupted, prevented by opposition, but will be re-established_. This is
only possible because God has remembered His covenant and oath to Abraham (Luke 1:72-73). The sustained unilateral graciousness of God should be reflected in the operative aspect of the covenant, in service to him. The details of this service the *Benedictus* does not reveal. The Abrahamic story reference in verses 72 to 75 seem to allude not just to the Abrahamic covenant blessings, as mentioned, but also to God’s command to Abraham, “I am God Almighty; walk before me, and be blameless. And I will make my covenant between me and you, and will make you exceedingly numerous” (Genesis 17:1-2). Covenant establishment and its promise-blessings are accompanied by, though not contingent upon, a call to walk before God and to be blameless. This seems to garner support for the concept of service, the operative aspect of the covenant, as an Actant in the Initial Sequence. This understanding appears to be strengthened by the Targum Onkelos’ rendering of Genesis 17:1, “And Abram was son of ninety and nine years: and the Lord was revealed to Abram, and said to him, I am El-shadai; serve before Me, and be perfect; and I will set a covenant between My Word and thee, and I will multiply thee exceedingly much” (Etheridge, 1862). The Targum has changed *hitḥalēk*, to walk, for *p̄lā*, to labour, serve or worship. The redaction suggests an Early Judaic interpretation expressing a concern for “service” perhaps cultic or ethical in nature; *Anawim* influence may have some bearing on this (Fitzmyer, 1970 [1]: 385). However, as Chapter 3 has suggested, an Early Judaic understanding of service was most likely seen in terms of purity, primarily ritual purity.

The covenant concept as an oath to Abraham is referenced as the basis for God’s raising up a horn in the house of His servant David and visiting Israel with redemption. The text, Luke 1:72-75, also seems to suggest that the Abrahamic covenant is the basis for service to God—Israel is called to serve God, walk before Him blamelessly, in the Abrahamic covenant. R. Routledge identified a narrative substructure underlying the book of Isaiah (2004), and described the “helper” in the Initial Sequence according to the Greimasian Actantial Model as the Call/Election of Israel to be God’s Servant at the time of the Exodus (2004: 196). This provided a fulcrum of strength for Israel to fulfil their mandate from God. In Luke the Exodus event as a “helper” is replaced with the Abrahamic covenant, Luke 1:71-75, as a basis of election, redemption and strength for Israel to fulfil what God has called them to (CS1), that is, to serve Him boldly in righteousness and holiness. This fulfils the canonical function (CS2, communication/reception), in that Israel receives a helper: *the calling* in the Abrahamic covenant to
fulfil the mandate. Deliverance, therefore, is requested from Israel’s enemies (the opponent) who are preventing service to God (PS1 and PS2).

_Nunc Dimittis, Gospel of Luke 2:30-32_

\[30\] hoti eidon hoi ophthamoi mou to sôterion sou, \[31\] ho hêtoimasas kata prosôpon pantôn tôn laôn, \[32\] phôs eis apokalupsin ethnôn kai doxan laou sou Israêl’

Simeon’s metaphorical pronouncement of Jesus’ ministry gives explanatory relation of the background story to the Gospel. There is no significant textual variation among the manuscripts to note. Simeon refers to himself as _ton doulon sou, despota_. Simeon the Lord’s servant is devout, righteous, vigilant and lead by the Spirit. Not only does this characterise Simeon, making credible the explanatory relation of Jesus’ ministry to the Isaianic Servant Song of Isaiah 49:6, to Isaiah 42:6 and to 46:13, but it also attributes specific qualities to the Lukan conception of a servant proper. Lukan concern for the servant conception becomes increasingly evident in the focalisation event of the blessing scene. The “focalisor” Simeon’s pronouncement connects the plot-event to the background story using OT terminology in the blessing scene. The scene focuses the narrative portrayal of Jesus as not just the one who saves, rescues and delivers, as presented in the _Benedictus_, but as one who has the means to do so; Jesus saves as a light of revelation and of glory because he is the Isaianic Servant covenanted to his task. Simeon is a faithful servant yet the Servant epitome is now on the scene. Reference to the Isaianic Servant not only adumbrates Jesus’ mission but also suggests that the condition he is to address is _a perpetuation of the situation described in Isaiah_, a situation characterised by darkness. Zechariah, referring primarily to Israel, also affirms that the tender mercy of God will bring light to those in darkness (1:78-79). On this point, this Initial Sequence situation as it points to the contract mandate, prior to plotted time, is ultimately what is of prime concern.

The Isaianic quotation and allusion in the _Nunc Dimittis_ is a direct pronouncement over the life of Jesus. Yet this is an incomplete observation if it does not countenance additional evidence and intertextual allusions. The textual evidence of Lukan usage of Isaiah 42 and 49 at Acts 13:47, when supplemented by the commissioning of Jesus’ disciples at various stages, does not allow us to proceed without ascertaining the full import of the Isaianic quotation and allusion. A.J. Mattill’s concerns and observations undergird this argument (1975).
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Isaianic Servant Concept and Israel’s Mandate

Morna Hooker is essentially correct in saying that one’s understanding of the relation between individual and collective identity determines one’s conception of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Hooker, 1959: 41-45). The degree of oscillatory relation between individual and collective identity is, however, often not examined in view of the eschatological hope of the prophet’s message. The individual-collective relation should, however, be treated in tandem with the whole message of Isaianic deliverance, especially its eschatological dimension. This suggestion is confirmed by B. Scheuer’s affirmation of the spiritual usage of the term “deliverance” and by speculation regarding delivered Israel’s transformation as a people, whether they would exhibit the expected response; this arises from the observation that they stand in an interdependent cooperative relationship with YHWH, which is in answer to the question, Why does YHWH require repentance if deliverance had been carried out (2005: 1-3, 90-93, 97, 162)? The eschatological hope presented, which is tied to the transformed state of the servant witnesses, calls for deliverance beyond the political and religious; it calls for a spiritual inner transformation that is contingent on the addressing of moral impurity. If we entertain this possibility, the Isaianic Servant concept should be again re-evaluated. The Lukan considerations of this will be touched on in the topical sequence section and the Lukan mandating of Jesus.

Regardless of one’s conceptualisation of the Servant as an individual or collectively as many contemporary scholars do, (like Ulrich Berges, for whom the Isaianic Servant is understood as a personification of the post-exilic followers of the Prophet Isaiah [2010: 36, 38]), the significance remains that the Servant is a connecting element between historical Israel and the post-exilic devout group (2010: 35). Berges goes to the extent of saying, “On the one hand the servant stands for Israel transformed by God himself and on the other he symbolizes the prototype of those who in Trito-Isaiah are called servants of God” (2010: 35). Joseph Blenkinsopp’s article supports much of Berges’ argument, as the post-exilic group, YHWH’s servants, identified in Isaiah 56-66, Ezra 9-10 and Malachi 3, can be linked to the disciples of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah 40-55, so that “the literary growth of Isaiah 40-46 is related in important ways to the emergence and consolidation of a prophetic-eschatological group within post-exilic Judaism” (1995: 411). What is of interest to this thesis is that Blenkinsopp points to the
"redefinition of the office in terms of instrumentality and service" (1995: 406). As such, the Isaianic Servant is inherently central to God’s deliverance, defining the restorative event.

According to Isaiah 49:6, the Isaianic Servant is to restore the tribes of Jacob after which the Servant will also be a blessing to the Gentiles and the ends of the earth. Restoration is the crux of the Deutero-Isaianic agenda. According to Martin-Achard, in Deutero-Isaiah Israel’s divine mission is to be God’s servant to whom is given the task of revealing the greatness of YHWH as the true God, and this is why Israel was created (43:7ff) (1962: 9, 15). R. Routledge echoes this general observation (2004: 190). This is Israel’s articulated mandate. The Isaianic corpus, however, attests that Israel has transgressed the law committing not just legal offence but has deliberately rebelled, by implication “violated the covenant” (24:5), thereby failing to carry out God’s will for them, hence restoration is required in order for Israel to fulfil this given mandate (Routledge, 2004: 188, 190). Restoration according to Oswalt addresses the problem that “proud, arrogant, sinful Israel is anything but the servant of God. Nevertheless, Israel is declared as the means through whom God’s light and blessing will come to the world … How can this Israel be that Israel?” (1986 [1]: 54). Oswalt observes that Chapters 49 and following answer that question: God makes it possible by covenant-based unilateral action (1986 [1]: 54). YHWH because of His own faithfulness is coming to tend to Israel (Martin-Achard, 1962: 12, 15).

Proto-Isaiah begins with a descriptive assessment and rebuke of Israel. Chapter One establishes that they are a sinful nation, corrupt, unjust, oppressive and rebellious, forsaking the Lord. Isaiah 1:16c-17 LXX reveals the core of the rebuke: “pausasthe apo tòn ponèriôn humôn. 17 mathete kalon poiein ekzêtešate krisin hrusaste adikoumenon krinate orthanô kai dikaiósate khēran.” Israel is lacking in righteousness for the elders and leaders of the people have corrupted God’s vineyard (3:14), making it incapable of exercising justice especially for those that symbolise vulnerability, the orphans and widows (Oswalt, 1991: 88). The result is that Isaiah acknowledges he is of “unclean lips” (Isaiah 6:5); he states that he dwells among people of unclean lips, “implying that they [Israel], too, are unfit to proclaim God’s word” (Routledge, 2004: 189). Chapters 7 to 39 show that “instead of trusting in God and thus representing him to the nations, Israel becomes enamoured with the glory of the nations and turns her back on God” (Oswalt, 1991: 89). Israel trusts in foreign nations for deliverance, is
unwilling to trust in God and is thereby rebelling against Him, a misstep that reveals her “failure to fulfil her mandate” (Routledge, 2004: 193). The indictment of corruption echoes throughout Isaiah and forcefully reverberates in the light/darkness metaphor beginning with Chapter 5, where the Lord looks for justice and righteousness yet finds none (5:7); as Israel has rejected God’s precepts (5:24), it has exchanged light for darkness (5:20).

Trito-Isaiah, chapter 58, using the light/darkness metaphor, highlights God’s mandate for Israel: in living righteously according to God’s word they will channel God’s light for all to see. This mandate seems, in addition to that already identified, to be adopted by Luke and constituted as part of the canonical function CS1, mandating/acceptance, of the Initial Sequence. Israel, the “subject”, is mandated to communicate the “object”, the light of God’s greatness and mercy, to the nations, the “receiver”. Interestingly, Chapter 59 conveys a similar evaluation as Chapter 5, only now divine intervention is promised; God will redeem Zion, the repentant of Jacob (59:20), and He will enable their obedience to their mission/mandate.

Two thirds of Deutero-Isaiah is devoted to “persuading his [Isaiah’s] contemporaries that the hour of Israel’s liberation and its return to the Holy Land had come” (Martin-Achard, 1962: 14). A message of comfort based on God’s faithfulness motivates the Isaianic proclamation (1962: 12-14). God will have compassion on Israel as He will redeem, forgive, restore and glorify His people (1962: 13). Importantly, God “reveals His holiness in the sight of the nations and the distant peoples see the salvation that Yahweh accords to His Chosen” (1962: 16). The Servant is to reveal God’s restoration of Israel primarily and initially (1962: 18). He is covenanted to this task. God’s Spirit rests on him to show the whole world that Yahweh’s judgment is to forgive His people and restore them (1962: 29). The labour of the Servant in his task, his suffering, persecution and glorification serve this task, linking Isaiah 6 with 53, to help the people recognise God’s mercy and glory in his mission (Berges, 2010: 38). In this way is the Isaianic Servant the light of the world (1962: 18). Specifically, it is because he shines God’s justice (see also Isaiah 9, 11, 42, 49, and 60) or God’s favourable judgment to vindicate Israel (Martin-Achard, 1962: 25-26, 29) that he will effect restoration bringing those in darkness into the light (49:9).
Restored Israel’s identity is, however, tied up in that of the Isaianic Servant as witnesses (Berges, 2010: 35). They are his offspring represented in him (2010: 35, 38). As Martin-Achard states, “It is by granting life to His People that Yahweh makes it the light to the world” (1962: 31). Yet they are to be a consecrated and holy nation in order to function in mediation (1962: 75). Enabling them is God whose covenant is with them and whose Spirit rests on them as with the Servant and the prophet Moses (Oswalt, 1991: 91-92; Berges, 2010: 35). So the eschatological vision of Zion emerges in Isaiah 60:1, 3 LXX, “phasis phasis Ierousalêm ékei gar sou to phôs kai hè doxa kuriou epi se anatetalken... kai poreusontai basileis to phôti sou kai ethnê tê lamprotêti sou.” This recalls the similar vision for Israel of Chapter Two.

To summarise, then, “Deutero-Isaiah’s message is not a missionary message in the usual sense of the term; there is no question of proselytism in his preaching … The Chosen People’s business is to exist” (Martin-Achard, 1962: 31), and, “The mission of Israel consists in reflecting the glory of God by accepting His gifts and His judgment alike” (Martin-Achard, 1962: 31). Routledge qualifies, “Israel’s role in the winning of the nations is not merely passive, and in the closing verses of the book we see God’s people performing the somewhat unfamiliar task of going out to the nations in order to bring them back to worship God in Jerusalem (Isa. 66:18-19)” (2004: 193). Also, “to exist” such as to reflect God’s glory, however, should be understood in terms of Isaiah’s critical categories of justice and righteousness, which need to be integrated with the other Isaianic reflective function, witnessing (Martin-Achard does not specify as to what “existing” and “reflecting” means according to Deutero-Isaiah). In this way Israel shines God’s light of justice, greatness and mercy. This illuminates the situation of lack in which Israel was floundering disempowered, the societal deterioration of just, righteous and ethical living defined in covenant terms by Yahweh, a situation to which the Isaianic Servant is called to resolve (Routledge, 2004: 199-200).

**Lukan transformation of Isaiah**
The significance of the Lukan presentation of the Isaianic servant concept and the situation of lack rests upon the Lukan interpretation of Isaiah.

Scott McKnight observes that late Second Temple Judaism was characteristically passive, that is, it was quite guarded but kind toward Gentiles, positive and accepting toward proselytes, such that Judaism was as “a light among the Gentiles and were more
than willing to allow others to partake of that light” (1991: 48). Being a “light” was not understood in missionary terms as Judaism was never a missionary religion but remained passively confident that “truth was on its side” and so relied on its good deeds and on the hope of God’s apocalyptic intervention (1991: 48, 77, 116-117). Michael F. Bird, notably, fills out this initial description in his 2010 work on the subject. The book of Tobit, traditionally assigned to the second century BC, illustrates this position. When Tobit’s ordeal has ended, his canticle in Chapter 13 links the Isaianic light metaphor to part of the Abraham story, Genesis 12:

“6 In the land of my exile I acknowledge him, and show his power and majesty to a nation of sinners: ‘Turn back, you sinners, and do what is right before him; perhaps he may look with favor upon you and show you mercy.’ 7 As for me, I exalt my God, and my soul rejoices in the King of heaven. 8 Let all people speak of his majesty, and acknowledge him in Jerusalem. 9 O Jerusalem, the holy city, he afflicted you for the deeds of your hands, but will again have mercy on the children of the righteous. 10 Acknowledge the Lord, for he is good, and bless the King of the ages, so that his tent may be rebuilt in you in joy. May he cheer all those within you who are captives, and love all those within you who are distressed, to all generations forever. 11 A bright light will shine to all the ends of the earth; many nations will come to you from far away, the inhabitants of the remotest parts of the earth to your holy name, bearing gifts in their hands for the King of heaven. Generation after generation will give joyful praise in you, the name of the chosen city will endure forever. 12 Cursed are all who speak a harsh word against you; cursed are all who conquer you and pull down your walls, all who overthrow your towers and set your homes on fire. But blessed forever will be all who revere you.”

This extrabiblical evidence alludes to the call of Abraham with its blessings and curses, Genesis 12, which is ultimately based on a call to repentance and righteousness, for only in this way will they be a light for the nations but more importantly for the glory of Jerusalem.

This rendering, however, requires further qualification. Peter Mallen reports that Thomas Moore, in his unpublished 1995 doctoral dissertation on Luke’s Gospel entitled Luke’s Use of Isaiah for the Gentile Mission and Jewish Rejection Theme in the Third Gospel, identified that Isaiah writes chiefly of a centripetal movement of the nations to
Jerusalem (Mallen, 2008: 13). This Isaianic emphasis, according to Mallen’s findings in Early Jewish literature, is tailored such that the “characteristic use of Isaiah that emerges is strongly nationalistic with an emphasis on vindication and restoration for the elect within Israel and judgment for all others, whether rival Jewish groups or the nations” (Mallen, 2008: 53). Isaiah was utilised in Early Jewish literature without fail in a nationalistic manner, guided often by a hermeneutic of exclusion (Mallen, 2008: 57). From this the question arises, Did Luke and the Lukan Jesus operate with this Judaic self-understanding?

This query is addressed in C.A. Evans’ comparative analysis of Jesus’ criticism of the Temple establishment as recorded in the Synoptics with the MT, 1QIsaiahᵃ, 1QIsaiahᵇ, LXX and the Targums, in which he shows that Jesus’ reference to the Temple as a “house of prayer” (Isaiah 56:1-8; Luke 19:46) that has been made a “cave of robbers” (Jeremiah 11-15) reflects that “it is plausible to suppose that Jesus’ more inclusive stance was somewhat in tension with the Aramaic’s later more exclusive orientation” (Evans, 1997: 432). Jesus declares by quoting Isaiah 56 what the Temple establishment should be—its mandate, to maintain proper witness to the nations—and it reflects that he has assumed Isaiah’s understanding that the “gospel” and “light” of Israel are to extend to the Gentiles (Evans, 1997: 432, 440, 441). Evans concludes that Jesus’ reference to Isaiah 56 and Jeremiah 7 was moved in part by the failure of “the Temple establishment … to live up to its obligations toward, among others, the Gentiles” (Evans, 1997: 442). This difference is attributed, as Michael F. Bird avers, to the suggestion that “the Gentile mission did not arise from a Jewish particularism that evolved into a more inclusive brand of Judaism. Jesus did not universalise the Jewish world-view; rather, the Jewish world-view was universal to begin with. Jesus prosecuted this universal impulse through his eschatological conception of the restored Israel and the renewed temple” (2006: 176).

Recognising that a somewhat particularistic tendency governed the use of Isaiah in the literature of late Second Temple Judaism, the “subversive” intentions of Jesus become increasingly evident (Mallen, 2008: 53, 102-131, 133, 207). Particularly in the Gospel prologue, the transition between volumes and the conclusion of Acts, Luke dialogues with Isaiah causing transformations by specific selection of passages, developing particular themes and the inclusive salvation and christocentric application of select prophecies (2008: 99-100, 131-132). The two transformations that are the most radical
are the mission of the Servant and the inclusivity of salvation (2008: 99-100, 132-133, 207). To these two must be added also Luke’s reference to Isaiah, which foreshadows and explains Israel’s reaction to Jesus’ proclamation (2008: 133). Regarding the second, Lukan salvation is inclusive because Luke applies Isaianic passages on eschatological reversal to Jewish society, critiquing accepted norms and then extending the application to include the Gentiles (2008: 132). The Servant’s mission, Luke shows from Isaiah, is to proclaim this inclusive salvation, to fulfil obediently the mandate and vocation of Israel and to suffer and be exalted for the purpose of restoring Israel and facilitating further proclamation by his followers (2008: 129-130, 132-133). Peter Mallen’s work (2008) testifies to the substantial Luke-Isaiah connection and demonstrates that Luke imbibes much of the corporate and individual aspects of the Servant concept from Isaiah transforming them with regard to his own universalising purpose of inclusive salvation (2008: 102-133, 189-197). The Lukan corpus capitalises on the Isaianic oscillation between the individual and corporate identity of the Servant figure role. Thus, the Initial Sequence mandate of God’s people is serve Him without fear in righteousness and holiness in order that the light of God’s justice and mercy may extend to the nations. The mandate seems then to consist of two closely related parts, CS1a+b, the second contingent on the first. The evidence seems to suggest the CS1 canonical function, mandating/acceptance be understood as complete in this way.

The light of God’s justice and mercy, then, is the “object” to be communicated to the “receiver”, the nations. For this purpose is Israel called in the Abrahamic covenant (actant “helper” role) to serve God by walking blamelessly, in just and righteous behaviour, not passively, bound by particularism, but actively seeking to engage the nations that they may also enjoy covenant blessings of mercy. With this, however, they have failed to comply. The “object” then, what the sender wants to communicate to the receiver, in the actantial model, is “the light of God’s mercy in service” and the “receiver” is the nations.

The strength of intertextual evidence commends Simeon’s Isaiah quotation in the Nunc Dimittis as allusion to the mandated Isaianic Servant role of Israel. Any further Lukan Isaiah references and transformations throughout the Gospel and Acts should necessitate sustained consideration of the aforesaid observations.

John the Baptist’s preaching, Gospel of Luke 3:7-14

“8 poièsate oun karpous axious tês metanoias kai mē arxèsthe legein en heautois: patera ekhomen ton Abraam. legō gar humin hoti dunatai ho theos ek tôn lithôn toutôn egeirai tekna tō Abraam.”

John’s preaching gives thematic relation of diegesis to metadiegesis, tying the importance of ethical living to the Abraham story and to righteousness, thereby elucidating John’s commission to turn the recalcitrant to the wisdom of the righteous. Abrahamic descent pales in comparison to the righteous life for which John is calling his listeners to repentance; the comparison by implication imparts correct meaning to Abrahamic descent. The manuscripts agree on the text with no relevant variations. This section reinforces John’s commission as announced by Gabriel to Zechariah and demonstrating the moral condition of Israel with an exhortation to the opposite. The rebuke for misplaced trust in “genealogical and cultic correctness” seems to allude to Isaiah 56-66 according to Oswalt (1991: 91). Characteristic patriarchal narrowness is challenged by the prophet in 56:6 who remarks that an obedient foreigner enjoys God’s favour over a disobedient Israeliite (1991: 91). Hence, follows Oswalt, God says His temple is to be a house of prayer for all nations, which indicates Israel’s mission (CS1a+b, mandating/acceptance) is outward, that is by their righteous/ethical life they are to facilitate, shining God’s light so that the nations turn to Jerusalem and to the Lord (1991: 91-92).


“18 pneuma kuriou ep’ eme hou heineken ekhrisen me euaggelisasthai ptôkhois, apestalken me, këruxai aikhmalôtois aphesin kai tuphlois anablepsin, aposteilai tethrausmenous en aphesei, 19 këruxai eniauton kuriou dekton ... 21 érxato de legein pros autous hoti sêmeron peplérôtai hè graphê hautê en tois õsin humôn.”

At Nazareth Jesus announces the details of his commission, explaining it by relation to the metadiegetic narrative: Jesus’ work connects to and “fulfils” the restorative work of the Isaianic Servant. In keeping with the Isaianic Servant’s work Jesus will bring light and freedom to the oppressed and to those in darkness (Mallen, 2008: 75). This section
is part of the Topical Sequence, CS1 canonical function; however, its metaphorical description of Israel’s moral condition is telling. Jesus takes up an Isaianic description implying that their prior moral choices have resulted in their becoming captive, oppressed, poor, broken-hearted and blind. This applies to Israel as a whole. Israel has not succeeded in its mandate. This fits canonical function PS3, deprivation statement of the Initial Sequence.


“37 Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι ἐρώτα αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖον ὅπως αριστέση παρ’ αὐτῷ: εἰσέλθων δὲ ἀνεπέσεν ... 42 ἄλλα οὐαὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ... παρερκέσθη τὲν κρίσιν καὶ τὲν ἀγαπὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ... 48 ἀρα μαρτυρεῖς εστὶ καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς εργοῖς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἡτοὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν ἁπαξανοῦντες τοὺς παρερκόντας τὸν κυρίον, ἡμεῖς δὲ ὑοικοδομοῦντες τὸν κόσμον καὶ τοὺς γενεάς ταυτῶν, ... 50 ἵνα εξετῆθη τὸ ζῷον ἡμῶν τῶν προφήτων τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ τὴν καταβολὴν κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταυτῆς, ... 52 Οὐαὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς νομίκοις, ὡστε τὲν κρίσιν τὴν γενομένην ἑπεκρούσαν: αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχόμενους ἐκεῖσατε.”

Jesus relates thematically diegesis to metadiegesis by stating that his present generation is in solidarity with the past generations who persecuted the prophets. The assertion is that Israel shares in the guilt of past generations. Paul Minear states, “Luke sees death as the sign under which all prophets stand, their solidarity being matched by the solidarity of all generations of persecutors” (1976: 110). The situation of lack revealed is trans-generational. It is the clear rebellion of the religious leadership in the denial of justice, love of God, and obstruction of proper leadership to the benefit of the people. Pre-existing rebellion and negligence by the leaders would fit the actantial role of “opponent” in the Greimas construction and fit PS1 and PS2 canonical functions.


“35 Ἑστῶσαν ἡμῶν ἵνα ὁσφυες περεῖζοσμεναὶ καί ὧν λυκῆκαι καιομενοὶ ... 37 μακαριοὶ οἱ δουλοὶ εἰκεῖνοι, ὡστε εἰλθῶν ὁ κύριος ἑπεξέσθη γρηγορούντας· αμέν λεγῶ ἡμῖν ὧν περιζῷ ... 43 μακαρίους δούλους εἰκεῖνοι, ὡστε εἰλθῶν ὁ κύριος αὐτοὺς ἑφεξέσθη ποιοῦντα hūτῶσ.”

Jesus, by warning his hearers of those that oppose him and by exhorting his hearers to service, to which they have been already called as servants, makes thematic relation of
diegesis to metadiegesis. The texts show little variation; P⁴⁵ has extensive lacunae although this does not weaken the textual witness. Jesus addresses his disciples and then the multitude following opposition from the scribes and Pharisees in Chapter 11; in view of this opposition he says, “prosekhete heautois apo tês zumês, hêtis estin hupokrisi, tôn Pharisaiôn” (Luke 12:1). The effect of this encounter is seen in the Lukan content and its arrangement in Chapter 12. A distinct emphasis is laid on accountability. As all shall be revealed, Jesus instructs on how one should live: not materialistically but seeking kingdom interests in vigilant faithfulness to Jesus, and all this like a servant in faithful service to the master. Jesus closes his call to service with, “…panti de hô edothê polu, polu zêtêthêsetai par’ autou, kai hô parethento polu, perissoteron aitêsousi n auton” (12:48), an allusion to his encounter with the scribes and Pharisees who have been entrusted with leadership of God’s people.

The eschatological day of reckoning for those in leadership seems to suggest Isaianic undercurrents and the story of Israel. Proto-Isaianic indictments (1:26; 3:12, 14-15) reveal clearly that the leaders of Israel will be held accountable. Israel is called to serve the Lord (Isaiah 43:10), and its leaders have impeded this, for Israel’s lack of knowledge is a reason for their exile (Isaiah 5:13). The Isaianic condemnation finds a parallel in Jesus words: the religious leaders, like their forefathers in Isaiah’s time, have taken away the key to knowledge (Luke 11:52). Israel’s leaders again appear to fit the function of “opponents” in the Actantial Model. As leadership is lacking, Jesus himself teaches on the exercise of serving the Lord, which includes seeking the Kingdom. God’s people are called to service, the operative aspect of the Abrahamic covenant and “helper” in the Actantial Model, and the specifics of it clearly govern this chapter.


“Jerousalêm Jerousalêm, hè apokteinousa tous prophêtas kai lithbolousa tous apestalmenous pros autên, posakis ethelêsa episunaxai ta tekna sou hon tropon ornis tên heautês nossian hupo tas pterugas, kai ouk ethelêsate.”

H.O. Steck argues the logic that “weil darin Israel gerichtet wird, ist Jerusalem als Mutter aller Israeliten angesprochen” (1967: 229). Jerusalem’s resistance to God, as representative of Israel, precedes plotted time, as reference to the prophets suggests. The time reference evidently extends back into the OT story. Thus, Jesus relates diegesis to metadiegesis thematically. Jerusalem’s resistance to God has not abated, as
the use of present tense participles *apokteinousa* and *lithobolousa* suggest. Regarding this Fitzmyer states that they are “expressive of Jerusalem’s ever-present attitude toward heaven-sent messengers” (1985[2]: 1036). Jesus states, “*posakis ἑθελέσα επισυναξάι τα τεκνά σου ...*” The word *posakis*, “how often”, occurs only once in Luke’s Gospel and two times in Matthew (18:21; 23:37) and intimates God’s merciful intention repeatedly acted upon within the course of redemptive history.

God’s intention is to gather His people, to restore them. Israel is unwilling and has failed in her mandate and continues in this state, thus fitting the canonical function PS3, deprivation statement.

**Persecution and Expansion of the Church, Acts 6:1-9:31**


> “51 *Sklérotakhêloí kai aperímtōi kardiais kai tois ὀσίν, humeis aei τὸ pneumatī τὸ ήγιὸν ἀντιπιπτεῖ ἕως hoi pateres humōn kai humeis. 52 tina tōn prophētōn ouk edióxan hoi pateres humōn? kai apektēnan tous prokataggeiλantas peri tēs eleuseōs tou dikaiou, hou nun humeis prodotai kai phoneis egenesthe, 53 hoitines elabete ton nomon eis diatagas aggelōn kai ouk ephulaxate.*”

There is extensive explanatory and thematic relation of the diegetic and metadiegetic narratives. The Stephen speech contains a fundamental metadiegetic narrative. The Abraham and Moses story are linked in narration forming a continuous unit. The call of Abraham contains anterior narration of God’s call of Israel echoing that of Abraham, (Acts 7:7), that is, a mandate to worship (*latreusousin moi*)—canonical function CS1a. This OT concept’s meaning appears to be sustained by the notion of cultic service. Here also follows the canonical statement DS, describing the move from Egypt to the Promised Land in order to fulfil the mandate among the nations. The Moses story is the development of the anterior narrative in the Abrahamic story (7:17). The deliverance of God (7:34) through Moses (7:35) reveals the nature and extent of God’s unilateral activity but also the conflict situation and precise behaviour of Israel that disrupted the original mandate. The prophecy of Amos (Acts 7:42-43) serves as an epilogue to the narrative unit providing divine evaluation in the post-exilic voice on the
unfortunate result (Richard, 1982). Israel in Abraham had been called to worship but was given over to worship the “host of heaven”, to idolatry since they rejected God’s word. Hence, the function of the Temple in worship is compromised by their disobedience; that is, communion with God, the essence of the covenant, is dependent on righteousness. Hence, the semantic fullness of the term latreuō integrating worship and obedience into the conception of service. This suggests an inseparable tie between worship and service/rightness. In this consists canonical function PS1, PS2 and PS3. The Stephen speech metadiegesis illuminates how the original mandate was disrupted and identifies the cause of Israel’s “spiritual” state, as disobedience and rejection (7:39), but also resistance to the Holy Spirit (7:51). The Holy Spirit appears to fill the place of “helper” in Greimas’ Actantial Model (the prophets are indirect agents of the Spirit), alongside God’s promise in the Abrahamic covenant (7:5-6). The two render canonical function CS2. The Stephen speech achieves relation between the diegesis and the metadiegesis by placing Stephen’s audience, whose character is representative of Israel, in solidarity with past generations (7:51-53). Just as Israel resisted Moses and God (7:39) and His Spirit (7:51) by disobedience and sacrilege, so also Stephen’s generation has resisted Jesus, a prophet like Moses (7:37) by crucifying him (7:52) and resisting the Holy Spirit (7:51). The current “spiritual” state and behaviour of Israel is thus explained and is the result of a disrupted mandate to worship God (understood semantically as related to service) according to His living words. The Stephen speech reveals the canonical functions CS1a, CS2, DS, PS1, PS2 and PS3.


Jerusalem Council, Acts 15:15-18

“16 meta tauta anastrepsō kai anoikodomēsō tēn skēnēn Dauid tēn peptōkuiian kai ta kateskammena autēs anoikodomēsō kai anorthōsō autēn, ἐκζέτεσοσιν ὁι kataloipoi tōn anthropōn ton kurion kai panta ta ethnē eph’ hous epikeklētai to onoma mou ep’ autous, legei kpios poiōn tauta 18 gnōsta ap’aiōnos.”

James justifies Paul’s activities by answering the question of Gentile conversion in quotation of Amos 9:11-12, and so relates diegesis to metadiegesis by explanation. There is opposition to the missionary work of Paul, and the net result is that the basis of salvation is in question, namely, certain men from Judea are teaching that circumcision is also required for salvation. The faith standard set through Peter is reiterated, behind which James sets the background story. David’s tent is fallen down and his house is in
ruins, which is symbolic of God’s people, and the restorative work of God also makes room for the Gentiles. Textual variations are minor. The logic of James’ argument is, however, based on a redaction of the Amos source. The quotation is based on the LXX and requires consideration because it is “apparently based on misreading of the original Hebrew” (Jackson & Lake, 1933[4]: 176). The Hebrew text translated reads, “On that day I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen, and repair its breaches, and raise up its ruins, and rebuild it as in the days of old; in order that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations who are called by my name, says the LORD who does this.” The LXX redacts the Hebrew, reading the verb “to possess” as “to seek” and “Edom” as “man”; the latter the redactors took as the subject of the verb instead of the object and thereby as foretelling the conversion of the Gentiles rather than as a prophecy about inheriting land (1933[4]: 176). This is rather awkward. The LXX Amos undergoes additional Lukan modification in the James quote (Richard, 1982). In verse 17 the words an and ton kurion are added (Richard, 1982: 44). The former is a stylistic feature and the second is the addition of an object (1982: 46). Notably in verse 16 the verb anastrephō/epistrephō is added with the possible explanation that “God returns to his people (the Jews) so that the Gentiles may turn to him” (1982: 48). The verb anorthōsō replaces the LXX verb anoikodomêsō emphasising the straightening up of something fallen (1982: 48). The import of these redactions is the clear message that God is now returning to His people according to plan, to those whom he gave over to the worship of pagan gods, as the Acts 7:42b-43 quotation of Amos 5:25-27 states, and in addition He has “promised that through Israel he would call all men to his name” (1982: 49). The pre-existing “spiritual” state of God’s people is one that is “fallen”, that is in “ruin”. Their own blessing, as well as the prophesied blessing of the Gentiles, is unavailable, hence God’s restoration is essential to remove the impediment. Not only has Lukan redaction articulated the state of lack, but Israel’s mandate is also asserted with certainty: they are to be a conduit for the Gentiles’ blessing. This fulfils canonical function CS1 as well as deprivation canonical function PS3.

As was stated, this analysis is not an exhaustive one but a pellucid cross representation of the metadiegesis or background story which precipitates the clear formation of the Initial Sequence.
5.1.1.2 Synthesis of the Metadiegetic Narrative and the Initial Sequence

The preceding analysis supports the validity of diegesis/metadiegesis relation and postures structuralist methodology such that in its application a panorama of the Lukan background story becomes comprehensible.

Investigation into Luke’s Gospel and Acts yields very similar results. The Initial Sequence Contract appears to consist of God calling Israel into covenant to worship Him (*latreusousin moi*, Acts 7:7) and to serve Him (Luke 1:74-75). The operative aspect of the covenant, service, immediately receives a place of primacy. The concept of worship takes on an ethical semantic, as God’s expectation for Israel is to live according to His word righteously and ethically. This can be inferred from John’s call to a righteous life if they are Abraham’s descendants and heirs of the covenant (Luke 3:7-14) and from Stephen’s speech which reminds of the obedience Moses called Israel to (Acts 7:38). Indeed, Jesus’ teachings on discipleship undergird this obedience (Nelson, 1994). As the infancy narrative seems to be the continuation of the Abrahamic story, which includes the call of Abraham to a blameless walk, the Abrahamic covenant with its promises seems to be the basis for the call to service. This is reflected in Jesus’ exhortation to proper service in Luke 12:35. Thus the call in Abraham is given as a “helper” along with the Holy Spirit (Acts 7:51). This understanding seems to echo the classical prophetic concept imbibed primarily from Isaiah that righteous behaviour is a witness to the nations, as a light drawing them to God (Luke 1:78-79; 2:32). The Contract/ Mandate was broken by disobedience, resistance to God and rejection of His word, thus characterising Israel as wicked and as in darkness, lacking righteousness and wisdom and degenerating socially. The result is that Israel is described metaphorically as David’s fallen tent, as poor, captive, oppressed and blind. Present and past are in solidarity with one another. Therefore cross-generationally the leadership is foremost responsible for this failing. They deny justice, the love of God, take away the key to knowledge and in this way offer no leadership to Israel. They are among the opposition to Israel. For this reason God needs to intervene in deliverance. This fits with what Marshall avers is the central theme of Luke, “For the Son of Man came to seek out and to save the lost” (19:10) (Marshall, 1971: 117).
5.1.1.2.1 Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance Statement
In the contract syntagm “the protagonist is charged with a task to perform” (Hayes, 2002: 85). Based on Zechariah’s revelation Israel requires intervention so that they can once again serve God without fear in holiness and righteousness. God mandates Israel to worship Him by obeying His word. God’s people are to serve Him without fear in righteousness and holiness in order that the light of God’s justice and mercy may extend to the nations.

5.1.1.2.2 Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement
Israel is given God’s Spirit as helper (Acts 7:51) and the calling in the Abrahamic covenant to walk before God blamelessly, to serve Him. The Isaiah quotation confirms this by allusion to Israel’s call to be a beacon to the nations.

5.1.1.2.3 Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement
In the disjunction/conjunction syntagm “the protagonist sets out on the quest to carry out the ‘contract’” (Hayes, 2002: 85). Israel is sent (figuratively) to the nations.

5.1.1.2.4 Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement
“In the Lucan setting of the canticle [Benedictus] the ‘enemies’ would include all those who resist or refuse to accept the new form of God’s salvation-history” (Fitzmyer, 1970 [1]: 384). The chief opponents are the religious leaders who deny justice and knowledge, resist God and His Spirit and effect moral degeneration.

5.1.1.2.5 Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement
The religious leaders prevail and the mandate is broken; Israel is characterised by darkness, wickedness and oppression.

5.1.1.2.6 Performance Syntagm, PS3 Deprivation Statement
In the performance syntagm “the protagonist carries out or fails to carry out the task” (Hays, 2002: 85). The mandate is unfulfilled. Prophetic rebuke witnesses to failure.

The following Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions can be discerned.

CS1a+b (mandating/acceptance): The mandate is that God’s people are to serve righteously and so be a light to the nations, shining God’s greatness and mercy so as to draw them to Him.
CS2 (communication/reception): God has given a “helper”, He has called Israel in the Abrahamic covenant to serve Him boldly in righteousness and holiness. God also lends His Spirit.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): Israel has left Egypt for the Promised Land to fulfil its mandate among the nations.

PS1 (confrontation): Israel is in conflict with its leaders who are rebellious and negligent.

PS2 (domination/submission): The leadership subdues the people preventing service to God and the fulfilment of the mandate.

PS3 (deprivation): Israel fails in its mandate and is in darkness.

Based on this synthesis and analysis the Actantial Model for the Initial Sequence can be constructed.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{God} & \rightarrow \text{The Light of God’s Mercy in Service} \rightarrow \text{The Nations} \\
\uparrow & \\
\text{Called to Serve } \text{via} & \rightarrow \text{Israel} \leftarrow \text{Leaders/} \\
\text{Abrahamic Covenant/} & \text{Rebellion/} \\
\text{Holy Spirit’s activity/} & \text{Negligence} \\
\text{Isaianic Servant} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

5.1.2 Topical Sequence

Since the Subject failed to fulfil the mandate in the Initial Sequence a new Helper is provided who will help Israel overcome the Opponent in the Final Sequence. This new Helper becomes the Subject in the Topical Sequence. As stated previously, the Topical Sequence, which may consist of more than one part, is the body of the narrative (Hays, 2002: 84) wherein “the central character tries to solve the problem” (Wright, 1992: 71).

The Topical Sequence is assembled based on the reading unit, the *lexie* that identifies Jesus, the new Helper, as the protagonist/Subject mandated and sent by God for the action of delivering Israel by ways enumerated in the text. The *lexie* extends beyond the ending of the Gospel into the second volume for the reason that the process of deliverance elemental to the reading unit, in light of the Initial Sequence, must be completed. As the passion is the backdrop and the culmination of Jesus’ ministry
(McComiskey, 2004) his evaluation at this narrative point is significant. In the context of the Last Supper and the New Covenant establishment Jesus states, “But I am among you as one who serves [diakonōn]” (Luke 22:27). The lexicmatic process, the action of deliverance, is focalised in the crucifixion and by virtue of the narrative context is defined in terms of the operative aspect of the covenant concept as service rendered by Jesus. The picture of table service cannot be literal, as Lukan redaction proves, but interpretive of Jesus’ death as the anointed one who has ministered in righteousness but is numbered with the transgressors and killed (Luke 22:37; Isaiah 53:12) but subsequently justified in exaltation. Jesus innocence and righteousness is well documented (Scaer, 2005: 103-105, 109-112, 118). The saying in Luke 22:27c (“I am among you as one who serves”) is not found in Mark, and I.H. Marshall explains that this saying and Mark 10:45 most probably constitute a double saying: “Mark 10:45 could also be regarded as a comment on Luke 22:27, grounding the behaviour of Jesus in the role” (1978: 813-814). A synoptic reading of this Lukan pericope reveals the significance of this determinative utterance. The fact that Luke annexed the Passover Supper in the context of new covenant establishment with the dispute about greatness, removing also the atoning language from the instruction on service, suggests that the placement is interpretive and illustrative not just of Jesus’ death (Larkin, 1977) but of his entire ministry. This Lukan interpretation of Jesus’ reference to his entire ministry as service is supported by the research of R.F. O’Toole (2000). He states that Jesus after his resurrection is considered the Servant of YHWH as Acts 3:13, 4:30, 13:47 and 26:23 evidence (2000: 343-344). O’Toole states in reference to Acts 4:30 that “the persecuted Christians would be praying that God work signs, wonders and marvels through Jesus who is likewise the Servant of YHWH. However, the miracles spoken about in this verse must now clearly occur after Jesus’ resurrection, so the Christians’ petition must look to a post-resurrectional activity on the risen Jesus’ part” (2000: 343). The ministry Jesus performs then is as servant in service to God. Buttressing this case further is the parallel and development Luke seems be making with the previous pattern at Luke 9:43b-48. At that previous point Jesus predicts his passion followed by a dispute over greatness, after which he offers teaching on service.

The term “service” then seems to encompass not only the unjust death of the righteous servant who is innocent but also Jesus’ pre-crucifixion ministry. As noted, this terminology is not limited to the above pericope, for similar discourses that are exclusive to Luke occur at Luke 12:37 and 17:8, further suggesting that the
concept is significant for Luke. The term would also seem to include the concept of Jesus’ exaltation, for the term “service” in this context evokes the programmatically-quoted Isaianic Servant passages and its allusions, which Jesus obediently fulfils, passages that speak of the exaltation of the Servant for the blessing of the Gentiles and Israel (Luke 2:32). The Servant’s mission, Luke shows from Isaiah, is to bring deliverance and inclusive salvation, to fulfil obediently the mandate and vocation of Israel, to suffer and be exalted for the purpose of restoring Israel and facilitating further proclamation by his followers (Mallen, 2008: 129-130, 132-133). Thus, the deliverance effected by Jesus as characterised by service addresses the failed mandate of Israel established in the Initial Sequence (Jesus fulfils it for them) but provides the means, the Holy Spirit, for them also to do so, to serve (Acts 4:29-30, 24-33); the term also prepares for the final sequence in which the concept of service is a model exemplified by Paul in a representative way (Acts 13:47). Moessner emphasises the importance of the Servant pattern: “As in the second (Isa. 49:1-6), (third) and fourth (52:13-53:12) servant songs, so it is clear also in Luke’s portrayal that Israel/Jacob/“tribes of Israel” are being restored by the servant’s mission of bringing eschatological salvation to an Israel that for the most part violently rejects this mission” (1988: 47). Thomas S. Moore aver, “Luke not only presented Jesus as the fulfilment of the Isaianic Servant, but also worded his version of the commission to depict the disciples as those who were to take up the Servant’s mission after Jesus’ departure” (1997: 47).

Based on the lexie, the Topical Sequence for Luke’s Gospel’s and Acts’ conjoined narratives seems to extend from the beginning of plotted time (Luke 1:5) to Acts 12:25, that is, from the conveyance of the mandate(s) to the nascent “reconstituted Israel” (Fitzmyer, 1970[1]: 191) symbolised by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon Cornelius and his household, thus uniting them to the Pentecost event and enabling them for obedient witness (Treier, 1997: 13-26). This, then, with Peter’s accompanying justificatory explanation at Jerusalem, and the transitional section of Barnabas locating Paul and Peter’s deliverance but Herod’s death, constitutes the fulfilling of the final element of the Topical Sequence principle mandate.

The mandate that the Subject carries out in the Topical Sequence is revealed in two prefacing stages or sub-sequences. Thus the Topical Sequence in this case is non-monolithic. The mandate, however, maintains the connection and continuity of the sub-
sequences. The mandate constitutes them as a single Topical Sequence. Hence, the Topical Sequence is comprised of three discernable complete parts, sub-sequences ABC. The sub-sequence C consists of three further hypo-sequences. In the “A” part (Luke 1:5-2:520 the births of and mandates for John the Baptist and Jesus are communicated by divine agents to their respective parents, to Zechariah and Mary “servants of the Lord” (1:8, 38), and this is followed by John’s and Jesus’ births and events/announcements confirming the divine communications. The “B” part (Luke 3:1-21a; 7:18-35) consists of John the Baptist’s ministry of preparation and transition to Jesus’ ministry. The “C” part (Luke 3:15-17, 21b through to Acts 12:25) is Jesus’ ministry of deliverance or restoration. This ministry, sub-sequence C, divides further into three hypo-sequences, C^1, C^2, C^3. Hypo-sequence C^1 (Luke 3:15-17, 21b through to 24:53) relates Jesus’ ministry, his suffering and glorification in resurrection. In Hypo-sequence C^2 (Luke 24:36 through to Acts 2:13) the ascended and glorified Jesus baptises his disciples with the Holy Spirit, sending his Spirit, the Promise of the Father, upon them. Hypo-sequence C^3 (Acts 2:14-12:25) presents them empowered in service, addressing the situation of lack by preaching repentance and forgiveness to the nations who are baptised by the Holy Spirit, completing Jesus’ mandate by proxy.

5.1.2.1 Topical Sequence, Sub-Sequence A: Angelic Communication of the Mandate(s), the Birth Events and Confirmation. Gospel of Luke 1:5-2:52

In this first part of the Topical Sequence Gabriel is given by God the mandate to communicate the message of John the Baptist’s and Jesus’ birth and, importantly, the mandate to their parents, Zechariah and Mary respectively. The CS1 canonical function, mandating/acceptance, is based on Gabriel’s revelations: “καὶ ἀποκρίθης ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῷ: εἶ μόνον ἀγγελὶς ὁ Παρθένος 

The prophetic nature of these announcements conveys a defining significance not only for the events in context but also for the plot and the story. The numinous announcements immediately identify God as the Sender not just for this part A of the
Topical Sequence but according to the mandate(s) for the entire Sequence. God is the Sender not just of Gabriel but also of John the Baptist and of Jesus. The divine agent and the narrator attest to God being the Sender in Part A, as made clear in 1:19: “ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Γαβριὴλ ὁ παρέστηκός εν οἴπον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπεστάλησεν λαλῆσει πρὸς σε καὶ εὐαγγελισθαί σοι ταύτα”, and 26, “ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἀγγέλος Γαβριὴλ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ”. In Part A Gabriel fulfils the actantial role of Subject, being sent from heaven to earth. Zechariah and Mary, being the ones to whom Gabriel is sent, are the Receivers in the model.

5.1.2.1.1 Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance Statement
According to the text, Gabriel is mandated by God to announce the birth of John and Jesus and their respective mandates to their parents. Luke 1:19 and 1:26-28 describe the contract Gabriel takes up.

5.1.2.1.2 Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement
When challenged by Zechariah’s unbelief, Gabriel makes known to him his authority as God’s emissary. Gabriel’s helper is the authority and word he bears.

5.1.2.1.3 Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement
Gabriel is sent to the Temple in Jerusalem and to Nazareth in Galilee.

5.1.2.1.4 Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement
Clear opposition to Gabriel is unbelief. Zechariah’s unbelief (οὐκ εἰπεσθασ) causes Gabriel to resort to the helper, his authority as God’s emissary. Mary’s initial turmoil and wonder (διεταρακθῆ καὶ διελογίζετο) the sense of disbelief, does pose some opposition to Gabriel’s announcement. The sense of wonder (εθαυμασαν) or fear (φοβοῦ/φοβον) expressed by figures in the infancy narrative, Part A, cannot be said to qualify as opposition.

5.1.2.1.5 Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement
Mary believes Gabriel’s words whilst Zechariah for his unbelief becomes mute until he capitulates in an act reflecting belief (1:63-64). Mary’s words of allegiance express her belief (genceito moi kato to hrêma sou, 1:38). Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Spirit, testifies to Mary’s belief (kai makaria hê pisteusasa hoti estai teleiosis tois lelalêmenois autê para kuriou. 1:45).
5.1.2.1.6 Performance Syntagm, PS3 Attribution/Deprivation Statement

Gabriel successfully fulfills his mandate to deliver God’s message to John and Jesus’ parents. In the Performance Syntagm the Sender’s object is either attributed to or deprived from the Receiver. The success of Gabriel’s mission is indicated by Zechariah’s and Mary’s belief in the divine communication. Zechariah’s Benedictus and Mary’s Magnificat relay their faith in God’s announcement and the mandate for their children. Outsiders serve to confirm their belief. Relatives confirm the belief of Zechariah (1:65-66), and that of Mary is confirmed by Elizabeth (1:45). The success of Gabriel’s mission is also measured by the response afforded after the birth of John and Jesus. There is a response of hopeful expectation after John’s birth and Zechariah’s healing. After his birth, to Jesus are sent shepherds who praise God and impart wonder in those they encounter. Mary is recorded as pondering all that transpired. Simeon and Anna speak words confirming the numinous communication of Gabriel and by implication justify Mary’s belief.

The following Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions are observed.

CS1 (mandating/acceptance): God mandates Gabriel to announce the birth of John and Jesus and their respective mandates to their parents.

CS2 (communication/reception): Gabriel’s helper is the commissioning of God.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): Gabriel is sent from heaven to earth.

PS1 (confrontation): Gabriel is confronted by the disbelief of Mary and the unbelief of Zechariah.

PS2 (domination/submission): Mary believes in Gabriel’s announcement whilst Zechariah is mute until he too capitulates in an act of belief.

PS3 (attribution/deprivation): Both Zechariah and Mary believe in the divine communication, which belief is confirmed by outsiders.

Assembling the information according to the Actantial Model for this part of the Topical Sequence, A, yields the following.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{God} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Birth Announcements and} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Zechariah/ Mary} \\
\text{Mandates} & \quad \uparrow \\
\text{Commission} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Gabriel} \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{Unbelief}
\end{align*}
\]
5.1.2.2  **Topical Sequence, Sub-Sequence B: John the Baptist’s ministry of preparation and transition to Jesus’ ministry, Gospel of Luke 3:1-21a, 7:18-35**

God is sending John, the Subject, to the people of Israel, the Receivers. His mandate is not self-contained but stands in dependent relation to that of Jesus’. John the Baptist’s birth and initial ministry not only in diachronic relation but also in purpose precedes that of Jesus, as the text states “proporeusê gar enôpion kuriou hetoimasai hodous autou” (1:76). The implication is that John’s ministry stands in a particular continuity with the ministry of Jesus (Allison, 2003). John speaks this relation when he announces there is one coming after him who is mightier than him (3:16). This relation is also supported by the significant parallels in the angelic announcements (Fitzmyer, 1970 [1]: 314-315). The successful communication of the mandates concerning both John and Jesus to their parents and by assumed implication to them is followed by, as the text suggests, a single mission that addresses the situation of lack in a concerted and uninterrupted manner. It can be said that “Jesus’ ministry continued John’s mission, and on this fundamental point there is no hint that Jesus ever departed from the Baptist” (Allison, 2003: 19). Based on textual support Allison argues the position that sees the missions of John and Jesus as predominant; dissimilarity is speculative at best and any differences do not impinge on similarities (2003). The evidence, therefore, favours the designation of this sequence as preparatory and transitional.


5.1.2.2.1  **Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance Statement**

The angelic announcement, Luke 1:16-17, reveals the Contract John the Baptist is charged to perform. God is the Sender as observed in Topical Sequence A. God communicates John’s mandate to his father Zechariah to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, ready in righteousness. The text applies to John Isaiah 40:3-5: “As it is written in the book of the works of Isaiah the prophet, ‘The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord!’” (Luke 3:4). Not only is John’s ministry tied to the angelic communication to Zechariah in Sub-Sequence A, but it is given an
Isaianic context “to explain the nature of John’s preaching and baptism” (Fitzmyer, 1970 [1]: 460), that is, that John is addressing the situation of lack as extracted in the Initial Sequence, specifically the lack of righteousness resulting from social deterioration. Fitzmyer also states that the angelic announcement alludes to Malachi 3:24 and Ben Sirah 48:10, suggesting John’s mandate is to continue the reform of the prophet Elijah (1970 [1]: 327). The text is silent about John’s explicit acceptance of the mandate; however, it is implied by John’s response to divine unction (3:2-3). Thus, God mandates John, he receives God’s word, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, prepared ethically in righteousness. John’s statement that true Abrahamic descent is based on ethical living evokes the Abrahamic covenant and God’s requirement that Abraham walk blamelessly before Him. This involves preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins and creating awareness of his preparatory role in light of the salvific work of God in Jesus.

5.1.2.2.2 Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement
The Baptist is given a helper to facilitate. The angelic announcement to Zechariah is pellucid: “pneumatos hagiou plêsthêsetai.” (1:15) and “kai autos proeleusetai enôpion autou en pneumati kai dunamei Êliou” (1:17). Helpers are the Holy Spirit and/or the spirit of Elijah. In addition, the justification for John’s mandate is equally necessary for the effectiveness of his ministry, as 3:4-6 and 7:27 relate. The Baptist is fulfilling Isaiah 40:3-5, in the goal covenant restoration and justice: John is God-sent in the fulfillment of Isaiah 40:3-5. As helper in this sense the Subject is assisted in addressing the situation of lack.

5.1.2.2.3 Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement
The disjunction/conjunction syntagm describes movement whereby “the protagonist sets out on the quest to carry out the ‘contract’” (Hayes, 2002: 85). This is recorded in Luke’s Gospel 3:2-3: “egeneto hêma theou epi Iôannên ton Zakhariou huion en té erêmô. 3 kai êlthen eis pasan [tên] perikhôpon tou Iordanou kérussôn baptismâ metanoias eis aphesin hamartiôn”.

5.1.2.2.4 Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement
John is opposed in his charge, at first, by the people, the Pharisees and Herod. John refers to the people (okhlois) whom he calls to repentance for the forgiveness of sins, as gennêmata ekhidnôn (3:7). Matthew has John refer instead directly to the Pharisees and
Sadducees (Mt 3:7). For Luke there is an initial brief diametric opposition. Lasting opposition is Pharisaic. Narrator comments ensuing Jesus’ address in Luke 7 suggest ongoing Pharisaic opposition: “hoi de Pharisaioi kai hoi nomikoi tén boulén tou theou éthetēsan eis heautous mê baptisthentes hup’ autou” (7:30). Luke 7:30 though fragmented corroborates the accepted reading. Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by John, puts him in prison (3:19) and later to death (9:9). John’s imprisonment is the result of Herod’s opposition; the effect on John is apparent in Luke 7:18-23.

5.1.2.2.5 Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement
The text reveals that John the Baptist did indeed overcome opposition in the crowd, though not specifically in the Pharisees or Herod. In order for the Baptist to succeed in his charge he will have had to overcome the people by convincing them not only to repent and be baptised, in the goal of ethical reform, but as well to recognise his role in light of Jesus’ mission. In this way are the people prepared.

Luke 3:7-10 indicates that John has representative success in calling people to repentance. John’s exhortation to repentance proper is followed by “Kai epērōtōn auton hoi okhloi legontes: ti oun poiēsōmen?” (3:10) similar to the phrase at Acts 2:37. The crowd has taken seriously the Baptist’s exhortation. With regard to baptism one reads in Luke 3:21a, “Egeneto de en tō baptisthēnai hapanta ton laon”. Marshall reads this correctly as “all the people whom John did baptise” rather than “all the people of Israel” (1978: 152). The infinitive phrases and genitive absolute construction impart the sense of accomplishment prior to the revelatory event, suggesting a general capitulation of the people to John.

5.1.2.2.6 Performance Syntagm, PS3 Attribution/Deprivation Statement
In the performance syntagm “the protagonist carries out or fails to carry out the task” (Hays, 2002: 85). John’s mandate was to prepare a people. They repented and were baptised and were told, “One is coming who will baptise with the Holy Spirit and fire.” The people regarded John as a prophet (Luke 20:6). That the people understood John’s mission as preparatory is evidenced by Luke 7:29, which confirms that John indeed fulfilled his task and that the object was successfully attributed to the receiver Israel: “hoi telōnai edikaiōsan ton theon baptisthentes to baptisma Iōannou”. The people are agreeing with Jesus’ assessment of John’s ministry (7:24) because they have submitted
to it, with Jesus’ relation to John the Baptist. It can be said that John completed his mandate and addressed the situation of lack in the Initial Sequence.

The following Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions are observed.

CS1 (mandating/acceptance): God mandates John, he receives God’s word, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. This involves preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins and creating awareness of his preparatory role in light of the salvific work of God in Jesus.

CS2 (communication/reception): John is filled with the Holy Spirit and given the spirit and power of Elijah. He is also charged according to Isaianic prophecy for covenant restoration.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): John goes into all the country around the Jordan.

PS1 (confrontation): John is opposed, at first, by the people, the Pharisees and Herod.

PS2 (domination/submission): The people are baptised, they repent and are instructed in the ethical life and on the role of John in light of Jesus’ mission.

PS3 (attribution/deprivation): The people who received John’s baptism receive Jesus’ words also.

Assembling the information according to the Actantial Model for this part of the Topical Sequence, B, the following can be constructed.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{God} & \rightarrow & \text{Preparation for the Lord} & \rightarrow & \text{People of Israel} \\
\uparrow \\
\text{Holy Spirit/} & \rightarrow & \text{John the Baptist} & \leftarrow & \text{crowds/ Pharisees/ Herod} \\
\text{Isaianic agenda for} & \text{covenant restoration/} & \text{Abrahamic covenant.} \\
\end{array}
\]

This model corresponds basically to that constructed by Matthias Wenk (2000: 160-162), yet differs as it attempts to account for its narrative elements as a part of the Topical Sequence.

As articulated above, the textual evidence suggests the missions of the Baptist and Jesus stand in continuity. The very first recognisable point of continuity is Jesus’ submission to John’s baptism (Luke 3:21). In effect this a theological endorsement (Allison, 2003: 27). Jesus is not replacing but building on John’s mandate. Jesus’ later words in Luke 7:18-35 substantiate this link. Jesus’ answer to the Baptist’s question meets John’s eschatological expectations (2003: 23). He affirms that John indeed fulfilled his mandate, as the earlier textual witnesses read: “alla ti ekêlthate idein; prophêtên; nai legô humin, kai perissoteron prophêtou. houtos estin peri hou gegraptaî: idou apostellô ton aggelon mou pro prosôpou sou, hos kataskeusei tên hodon sou emprosthen sou” (7:26-27). Dale C. Allison seeks a text-based non-speculative position on the John-Jesus continuity. Interestingly, he observes, “Jesus is fundamentally indebted to John throughout his ministry” (2003: 16), the continuity being in three areas: Abrahamic descent and judgement, shared images (primarily eschatological), and John’s “coming one” (2003: 16-27). Jesus’ preaching of repentance (Luke 5, 13, 24) reveals also that “Abrahamic descent guaranteed nothing. In this respect at least Jesus’ ministry continued John’s mission” (2003: 19). Jesus’ mandate was restorative in an Isaianic sense, as was the Baptist’s. Jesus shared the images of fruit and righteousness (Luke 6:43-45; 13:6-9), baptism of fire (12:49-50) and judgment as a harvest (10:2), in common with John the Baptist (2003: 19-20). Not only so, but also regarding the Baptist’s statement that one is coming who is mightier than he is, “Jesus himself believed that he was the fulfilment of John’s expectation, that he was the stronger one who would baptise with fire” (2003: 22). Thus, Jesus is mandated, as the Baptist was, to call the people back to God in repentance and righteousness, addressing the situation of lack. How Jesus accomplished this is revealed in three consecutive stages, hypo-sequences C¹, C² and C³. C¹: Jesus as Servant fulfils his Isaianic ministry, suffers and is exalted and glorified in resurrection, thus is endowed with the role and authority spoken of to Mary. C²: the ascended and glorified Jesus baptises his disciples with the Holy Spirit and power effecting the covenant restoration unto service as per Abrahamic covenant concept terminology (Peter confirms the latter). C³: Disciples preach repentance and forgiveness, resulting in the baptism of the “nations” with the Holy Spirit as per Jesus’ mandate, as proxy for Jesus.
In its reduction, Jesus’ mandate is to show mercy to Israel (Luke 1:54) and to deliver them (Luke 1:74). According to Marshall, the central theme in Luke’s two volume work is summarised in Luke 19:10, “For the Son of Man came to seek out and to save the lost” (1971: 117). Therefore, salvation can also be added as a descriptor. By accomplishing these aims Jesus as the New Helper enables Israel to serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness (Luke 1:74-75). The Jesus mandate, however, is to be completed in successive stages even though some parts are expressed prior to Jesus beginning his ministry. The contract with Jesus is constituted by revelations to and/or corresponding announcements by basically five individuals.

1.) Jesus: a.) He will serve; b.) He will fulfil the Isaianic commission; c.) He will preach the Good News of the Kingdom; d.) He will accomplish his exodos at Jerusalem; e.) He will suffer, be crucified and will rise; f.) He will enter his glory; g.) He will send the Promise of the Father.

2.) Mary: Jesus will be exalted as Lord, given David’s throne.

3.) Zechariah: Jesus will save/rescue Israel from its enemies.

4.) Simeon: Jesus will be a light to the Gentiles and glory to Israel.

5.) John the Baptist: Jesus will baptise with the Holy Spirit and fire.

There is logical development to the mandate. Generally, Jesus must serve, fulfil the Isaianic commission and be a light to the Gentiles and glory to Israel. These activities span Jesus’ ministry. Specifically, though, Jesus is to preach the Good News of the Kingdom, perform mercy, must suffer, be crucified, rise again and be glorified, and be given David’s throne, thereby completing C1; after this he will baptise with the Holy Spirit, completing C2 and C3.

The first part has already received attention. In Luke 22:27 Jesus reveals he has come to serve. The leximatic process, the action of deliverance, is focalised in the crucifixion and by virtue of the narrative context is defined in terms of the operative aspect of the covenant concept as service rendered by Jesus. This part of the mandate carries through the ministry of Jesus in parts C1, C2 and C3. It is common knowledge that Jesus announced his mission in Nazareth (Luke 4). This enumeration is primarily a metaphorical and representative characterisation of Jesus’ activity of deliverance as Isaianic Servant (Isaiah 61:2-3; 58:6). This part of the mandate applies to the entirety of Jesus’ ministry. Beyond this Jesus announces, “hoti kai tais heterais poleisin evaggelisasthai me dei tén basiletan tou theou, hoti epi touto apestalén” (4:43). He will accomplish his exodos at Jerusalem (9:31). Jesus also reveals the elements of rejection
and suffering basic to his service of deliverance (Luke 9:21-22; 9:44; 17:25; 18:31-33) in his coming passion, which is necessary for him to enter his glory (24:26). Jesus also states that he will send the Holy Spirit upon his disciples with whom they shall be baptised and from whom they shall receive power (Luke 24:48; Acts 1:4, 8).

The Jesus mandate is also made clear to Mary, to Simeon and also to John the Baptist. To Mary the numinous announcement reveals that Jesus must be exalted to David’s throne in authority for the purpose of ruling. This part of the mandate is fulfilled in Jesus’ resurrection and ascension. It addresses that part of the situation of lack which is a result of Israel’s lack of leadership.

Through Simeon is announced that Jesus’ ministry will give light to the Gentiles and glory to Israel in the restoration and development of covenant relationship; Jesus will be fulfilling what Israel was originally charged with. Jesus fulfil s the Isaiah text quoted by Simeon throughout his career. (In the final sequence Jesus will be the enabling source of Paul’s ministry as light to the Gentiles.)

The announcement of John, however, is also of particular significance, for he unifies and distinguishes his and Jesus’ ministries on the basis of one ministry activity functioning as a focalisor indicating mandate fulfilment and success. John will baptise with water but Jesus with the Holy Spirit and fire. Jesus’ ministry begins with this pronouncement at Luke 3:16-17, its necessity is reaffirmed at 24:49 and Acts 1:4-5, and it is implemented at Acts 2:1-13, at Acts 8:16, 10:47 and at Acts 11:15-16. Jesus’ ministry to impart Abraham’s covenant blessings to the nations (addressing the situation of lack) is declared symbolically completed by the proxy activity of Peter (Acts 19:3-6 fulfils a slightly different narrative function and belongs to the Final Sequence). This part of Jesus’ mandate, although announced prior, is not fulfilled till Hypo-sequence C² when Jesus baptises his disciples with the Holy Spirit and power, effecting the covenant restoration unto service as per Abrahamic covenant concept terminology as Peter confirms (Acts 4:29) and also Hypo-sequence C³ which sees the representative baptism of the nations.
5.1.2.3.1 Hypo-Sequence C₁: Jesus’ Ministry, Suffering and Glorification in Resurrection, Luke 3:15-17; 3:21b-24:53.

Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance Statement
The following items of the dissected mandate are relevant to C₁.

1.) Jesus: a.) He will serve; b.) He will fulfil the Isaianic commission; c.) He will preach the Good News of the Kingdom; d.) He will accomplish his exodos at Jerusalem; e.) He will suffer, be crucified and will rise.

Regarding the last point, Jesus, justifying explains the Jerusalem occurrences were according to plan, abstracts the specific details of his passion as discussed on the road to Emmaus into the theme of suffering. He then pairs this with the resurrection events abstracted in the theme of glorification. Jesus has subsumed his passion under the rubric of suffering and his resurrection under the rubric of glorification. This development is also evidenced by the change in terminology Jesus uses to describe the culminating events of his ministry in Jerusalem, that is, instead of egerthēnai / anastēnai (9:22) and anastēsetai (18:33), Jesus substitutes doxan (24:26). This terminological development is overtly illuminated in Peter’s Pentecost sermon. For Peter the resurrection (2:24-32) is glorification because it fulfils God’s promise to David in the interest of the continuance of his rule. This logic points back to the angelic revelation of Jesus’ mandate to Mary: Jesus will be given David’s throne to rule and govern the people. Thus Jesus by his suffering and resurrection has initiated completion of this mandate. Full completion of it awaits his ascension and session in the Hypo-sequence C₂. Thus, this is in effect a direct fulfilment of the angelic pronouncement to Mary, that Jesus shall rule with authority.

2.) Mary: Jesus will be exalted as Lord.

3.) Zechariah: Jesus will save/rescue Israel from its enemies.

4.) Simeon: Jesus will be a light to the Gentiles and glory to Israel.

Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement
Jesus is given several helpers by which he is assisted in fulfilling his mandate. The Holy Spirit is given as a Helper. Luke 3:22 records that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus. In his Nazareth speech Jesus refers to his anointing. Accompanying the descent of the Holy Spirit is an audible divine proclamation that Jesus is God’s beloved pleasing Son. This echoes Gabriel’s declaration to Mary that Jesus will be Son of the Most High (1:32). This appellative is repeated at 9:35 with the assumption that God is the speaker,
promoting Jesus’ mission and calling for obedience to him. Prior to their exorcism demons confess Jesus is the Son of God (4:41; 8:28). This designation serves as a Helper in the overcoming of opposition. In his Nazareth sermon Jesus quotes Isaiah 61:1-2 as the basis, a Helper, for performing the mercy of God. According to the intertextual context of Simeon’s quotation, Jesus will be a light to the Gentiles and glory for Israel by becoming, according to textual allusions, a covenant. Jesus is also given Helpers in the justifying promises of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants. For example, the former is implied after the Nazareth sermon and referred to in the Zacchaeus story, and at 18:33 the blind beggar invokes Jesus’ authority as David’s son for his healing.

**Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement**

Luke 3:23 announces the beginning of Jesus’ ministry. Jesus goes through Galilee and Judea (4:14, 44; 8:1; 13:22; 17:11-12; 19:1, 29, 45). People, however, come from many regions to hear and see him (4:25).

**Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement**

Sources of opposition are Satan, the crowds, religious leaders, Pilate and Herod. Jesus encounters conflict with Satan in his temptation, indirectly in demonic encounters and has sporadic conflict with the crowds but escalating conflict with the religious leaders. Fitzmyer explains that Zechariah’s reference to “enemies” in his Benedictus includes “all those who resist or refuse to accept the new form of God’s salvation-history” (1970 [1]: 384). This definition helps not to over-generalise about any particular group. In this sense, the express animosity of the religious leaders would have them considered plausible “enemies” of Jesus. This becomes all the more likely when they are held in solidarity with past persecutors of the prophets. Kingsbury condenses his analysis of social opposition thus: “Jesus’ conflict with the people is to win their allegiance. Jesus’ conflict with the authorities is over ‘authority’ and who will rule God’s (re-constituted) people” (1991: 71). For this reason the people’s opposition to Jesus is inconsistent. Brawley maintains that opposition from the people exists as they are influenced by the high priestly or dominant religious party (1987: 156). Opposition from Pilate and Herod is resultant from that of the religious leaders.
Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement

Jesus does not succumb to Satan’s temptations but demonstrates he is indeed the Son of God. Instead his authority breaks demonic oppression. Satan enters Judas Iscariot (Luke 22:3) and succeeds inbetraying Jesus into the hands of his opponents, the religious leaders who have been “seeking how to put him to death” (22:2). Although they are successful in killing Jesus the resurrection sounds their ultimate defeat and the domination of Satan. Jesus is Lord in resurrection. There are of course exceptions to the religious leaders’ opposition. The portrayal of the people’s position is variegated and incalculable. Their view of Jesus is definitely not that of the religious leaders, who, as per their own admission, “ephobounto gar ton laon” (22:2b). Jesus’ disciples report that the people believe Jesus is John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the prophets (Luke 9:27-28; 7:16-17). The people’s reactions to Jesus range from benign to acrimonious, even wicked, although certain individuals (such as the centurion) are singled out as examples of faith, convinced that Jesus is sent by God and shares in the restorative ministry of the prophets. Israel’s recognition of Jesus’ role is perhaps restricted by their own preconceptions (Luke 7:31-35). Max Turner points out that the later Targum translation of the Isaiah 61:1-2 and 58:6 quotations in Jesus’ programmatic Nazareth sermon suggests the hearers may have already understood the speaker to be primarily a prophetic figure (2000: 232). Kingsbury states that “although the people do not believe in him, they are nonetheless well-disposed toward him and hold him to be a prophet (9:7-8)” (1991: 72). Thus, as opposition, the people are overcome, yet reservedly. Herod and Pilate remain only instrumental in the religious leaders’ opposition. Though Jesus’ enemies crucify him, he is resurrected, triumphing ultimately over his opponents, heralding deliverance from Israel’s “enemies”, those hindering Israel from fulfilling her mandate (addressing Zechariah’s prophecy).

Performance Syntagm, PS3 Attribution/Deprivation Statement

The following evidences that Jesus served Israel during this Hypo-sequence. (He will continue to serve in the next Hypo-sequence, C²).

Jesus fulfilled his Isaianic commission by healing, exorcising, restoring and forgiving. He preached the Good News of the Kingdom of God throughout Israel. He suffered unjustly, was crucified, completing his exodos, and he rose again. In his resurrection Jesus is glorified. Peter makes known that the value of the resurrection is glorification according to God’s promise to David (Acts 2:22-32). Jesus resurrected is established as
Lord as Acts 2:36 suggests, thus partly fulfilling what Gabriel spoke of to Mary and as a result addressing the oppression of the “enemies” of Israel referred to by Zechariah. Jesus referred to this oppression of the people primarily as the burden imposed by the religious leaders (Luke 11:46). Jesus’ death and resurrection is not just the sign of Jonah fulfilled, which as Simeon announced is a light to the Gentiles and glory for Israel, but Jesus has become a covenant to the people in the Passover supper, the New Covenant in his body and blood (Luke 22:17-20). Being killed as an innocent transgressor, he has been raised according to the Davidic covenant.

Jesus states, however, that on account of Jerusalem’s unwillingness he is not able to gather God's people as he has desired, indicating that although Israel has recognised him as a prophet they have not responded as required.

The following Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions are observed.

CS1 (mandating/acceptance): God mandates Jesus to serve, that is to preach the Good News of the Kingdom, to perform God’s mercy and to present himself as risen Lord.

CS2 (communication/reception): Jesus is anointed by the Holy Spirit, and carries the appellation of Son of God. He is called according to the Isaianic Servant’s mandate of covenant renewal, according to the Abrahamic and Davidic covenant.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): Jesus goes throughout Galilee and Judea.

PS1 (confrontation): Jesus is opposed by Satan, the people, the religious and political leaders.

PS2 (domination/submission): Jesus fulfilling his mandate with his helpers convinces the people that he is God-sent, in line with the prophetic mandate. Though his enemies crucify him, Jesus is resurrected, triumphing ultimately over his opponents, heralding deliverance from Israel's “enemies”, those hindering Israel from fulfilling her mandate (addressing Zechariah’s prophecy).

PS3 (attribution/deprivation): Jesus fulfils his mandate as servant.

Assembling the information according to the Actantial Model for part C1 of the Topical Sequence, C, the following is rendered.
God → Good News of Kingdom/ → People of Israel
Perform God’s Mercy/
Risen/ Exalted Lord

↑
Holy Spirit/ → Jesus ← Satan/ crowds/
Son of God/
Isaianic Servant/
Covenant for People (New Covenant)/
Light and Glory/
Davdidic Covenant/
Abrahamic Covenant


Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance
Jesus continues to serve Israel’s welfare by virtue of his resurrection. He states specifically he must “eiselthein eis tên doxan autou” (24:26) after which he will “apostellô tên epaggelian tou patros mou eph’humas” (24:49). Peter reiterates this at Acts 2:33. Again Peter corrals the semantic of doxa in his Pentecost speech. Jesus is exalted to the right hand of God; he has ascended, fulfilling conditions for the Davidic covenant (2:33-36). Once again Jesus’ mandate revealed to Mary receives attention. Jesus is glorified in ascension and session in that Jesus is given David’s throne to rule according to God’s oath to David.

Jesus associates the sending of the Promise of the Father with a revival of John the Baptist’s revelatory words at Acts 1:4-5. The Promise of the Father and the Holy Spirit appear to be used interchangeably in Jesus’ final instructions such that it is intimated that in sending the Holy Spirit upon the disciples they are baptised with the Holy Spirit. In this Jesus fulfils that portion of his mandate initially revealed by John the Baptist.

Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement
Jesus is given the Davidic covenant as helper. Perhaps also a fulfilling of the Isaianic task (44:3) is envisioned as a helper.
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Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement

Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement
Jesus is confronted with the possibility that his disciples will not be united in expectation.

Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement
The disciples are obedient to Jesus’ instructions and remain in Jerusalem. It is also recorded that they choose Matthias (1:26) to replace Judas the betrayer. The disciples are gathered together in the upper room awaiting in prayer the Spirit’s arrival.

Performance Syntagm, PS3 Attribution/Deprivation Statement
Jesus having ascended sends the Spirit and the disciples are baptised with him on Pentecost. The manifestations attest to the presence of the promised Spirit.

Here follows the Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions.

CS1 (mandating/acceptance): Jesus’ mandate to serve is manifested in the charge Jesus has to ascend in glory according to the Davidic covenant and to send the Promise of the Father upon the disciples, as John the Baptist revealed, the one coming after him would baptise with the Holy Spirit.

CS2 (communication/reception): Jesus has the Davidic covenant as a helper in this, perhaps also the Isaianic task described in Isaiah 44:3.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): Jesus ascends.

PS1 (confrontation): The potential for disunity threatens the disciples’ experience of the arrival of the Spirit upon them.

PS2 (domination/submission): The disciples heed Jesus’ words and secure unity.

PS3 (attribution/deprivation): Jesus continues to fulfil his mandate as servant, sending the Promise of the Father and thereby baptising his disciples.

Assembling the information according to the Actantial Model for part C² yields the following.
5.1.2.3.3 Hypo-Sequence C³: Disciples preach, by proxy baptise with Holy Spirit, Acts 2:14-12:25.

Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance
The plot reveals that the Promise of the Father was not only intended for the disciples. The Abrahamic covenant promise apparently holds sway on the Holy Spirit’s distribution. Jesus sends the Holy Spirit upon not just the disciples but upon the nations representatively. Peter makes it known that the Holy Spirit coming upon Cornelius and his household was identical in experience to his own at Pentecost (Acts 11:15-17) which prompts Peter to remember the Lord’s words which interpret the event, “ἐμνῄσθην de tou hrêmatos tou kuriou hōs elegen: Iōannês men ebaptisen hudati, humeis de baptisthêsesthe en pneumati hagió” (11:16). The implication is clear: as Jesus sent the Spirit upon and baptised his disciples, so also has the Spirit been sent upon and baptised Cornelius and his household upon hearing Jesus’ witnesses. The disciples are mandated as instrumental witnesses (1:8) and also as servants as Jesus himself served (4:27-29). Jesus being ascended works by proxy through his disciples so that the Spirit can be sent upon the nations representatively. As noted, Thomas S. Moore states, “Luke not only presented Jesus as the fulfilment of the Isaianic Servant, but also worded his version of the commission to depict the disciples as those who were to take up the Servant’s mission after Jesus’ departure” (1997: 47). The charge to be witnesses provides the opportunity for Jesus’ mission to continue.

Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement
Helpers provided for the disciples are: the calling to witnesses as servants like Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. Clearly, the Holy Spirit empowers them to the task of witnessing (1:8; 2:1-4; 4:8, 31).

Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement
The disciples are to remain in Jerusalem until the Promise of the Father comes upon them, after which they are charged to go into Judea, Samaria and to the ends of the earth

**Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement**

Opposition arises from the people, beginning at Acts 2:13; opposition from the crowd is sporadic and follows the same pattern as in Luke’s Gospel, in that the crowd may become hostile upon the religious leaders incitement (Acts 6:12; 17:13). The political leaders are hostile under the influence of the religious leaders.

**Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement**

Generally the people are overcome in the narrative; as Acts 5:13 states, the people hold the apostles in high honour. The growth of the church attests to the disciples’ successful domination. The opposition of the religious leaders does not abate, as is evidenced in Acts chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12, yet they are restrained, as for instance by the address of Gamaliel (5:33-40). The opposition of the political figure King Herod Agrippa I, grandson of Herod the Great and son of Aristobulus, is significant (Acts 12:1-19). His intention for harm is direct (Acts 12:1), however, the story reveals a divine response to Herod’s *hubris* in the form of his death. With him being dominated the “point that unrighteous rulers cannot stop the progress of the gospel” (Talbert, 1997: 118) is made and the Sequence draws to a close. This is supported also by O.W. Allen’s dissertation that deals with the apologetic and transitioning function of Herod’s death scene and divine retribution (1996).

**Performance Syntagm, PS3 Attribution/Deprivation Statement**

The disciples have fulfilled the mandate with which they were contracted in representative fashion, for the Holy Spirit has come upon the nations representatively, those in Judea, Samaria and Caesarea, upon Israelites, Samaritans and Gentiles. Abrahamic covenant blessing (and Isaianic mercies) have been distributed representatively to the nations. With this the Topical Sequence of Isaianic restoration/renewal is complete in a qualified sense. Reconstituted Israel is now in a position to serve God according to the original mandate.

The following Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions are observed.
CS1 (mandating/acceptance): God/Jesus mandates the disciples as witnesses to serve him for the distribution of the Holy Spirit, the Promise of the Father to the nations.

CS2 (communication/reception): The disciples are given the Helpers: the calling as witnesses and the Holy Spirit.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): The disciples go into Judea, Samaria and Syria.

PS1 (confrontation): The disciples are opposed, at first though not consistently, by the people, the religious leaders who influence the political leaders.

PS2 (domination/submission): The people are overcome and hold the disciples in high regard and many are baptised and converted. The religious leaders’ opposition does not abate.

PS3 (attribution/deprivation): The disciples successfully witness in representative manner to those in Judea, Samaria and Syria, to Israelites, Samaritans and Gentiles. These are baptised with the Holy Spirit as Jesus baptised the disciples on Pentecost.

Assembling the information according to the Actantial Model for part C³ of the Topical Sequence, C, yields the following.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{God} & \rightarrow \text{Holy Spirit} & \rightarrow & \text{Nations} \\
\uparrow & & & \\
\text{Holy Spirit/} & \rightarrow & \text{As Witnesses the Disciples} & \leftarrow & \text{people/ Religious} \\
\text{Joel’s prophesy/} & & & & \text{Leaders/ Herod} \\
\text{Abrahamic covenant} & & & &
\end{align*}
\]

5.1.3 Final Sequence

A plot communicates the transformation of an initial situation of lack to a final situation where the lack is satisfied (Patte, 1990: 55). In this respect the final sequence must correlate with the initial. The emulative ministry of Paul in Acts 9:1-28:31 seems to fulfil this correlation.

The Final Sequence is assembled based on the reading unit; the *lexie* in this case is singular and demonstrates that Paul fulfils the original mandate as an exemplary figure representative of reconstituted Israel. It seems the service of Paul as Jesus’ appointed
witness maintains the integrity of the lexie. The lexie officially begins with the setting apart of Paul (and Barnabas) by the Syrian Antiochean church, the prophets and teachers in the context of worship in the Holy Spirit, Acts 13:1. The conversion of Paul at Acts 9:1-22 should be included as part of the lexie as prefatory. The lexie’s delimitation and determination is aided by the developed characterisation of Paul, that is, it aids in reducing the unit into its normative fundamentals of actors and processes. This then facilitates the identification of actants, syntagms and canonical statements.

5.1.3.1 Characterisation of Paul
Paul is quickly established as the protagonist from Chapter 13. J.C. Lentz in his 1988 PhD dissertation entitled Luke’s Portrayal of St. Paul as a Man of High Social Status and Moral Virtue in the Concluding Chapters of Acts, avers that Luke, according to the standards of the Greco-Roman world which focused on good pedigree, citizenship, education, wealth, and moral virtue, emphasises Paul’s virtuous character after his conversion and indicates by his access to Roman rights and privileges Paul’s high social status (1988). Lentz’s study underscores the importance of characterisation as a means to building story meaning.

Among the rhetorical methods ancient writers used to portray their characters, C.H. Talbert reports that in antiquity legitimisation was an accepted practice of religious groups seeking to justify their religion to its adherents (2004: 4). In Acts legitimisation seems to figure importantly, as Luke is intent on rehabilitating Paul for the assurance of the nascent church. Robert Brawley identifies at least six categories of techniques in Acts: “(1) divine approval, (2) access to divine power, (3) high motivation, (4) benefiting others, (5) possessing a high level of culture, and (6) adhering to an ancient tradition” (1987: 55). Examining the Lukan Paul through the lens of legitimisation reveals, states Brawley, that Luke is authenticating Paul as a genuine Jew (1987: 52). This observation requires supplementation, as there is a greater breadth to the Lukan Paul’s character. The accumulation of Paul’s character testifies to this (Darr, 1992: 38-43).

The importance of the Lukan Paul as the central character is suggested during Chapter 13, which records the first reversal of name order from “Barnabas, Paul” (11:30; 13:2,7) to “Now Paul and his company” (13:13) and “Paul and Barnabas” (13:43, 46, 50). It is noteworthy that within the context of these occurrences (13:47) not only is divine
approval given Paul and Barnabas but their charge, particularly Paul’s, is further defined by Jesus: Paul is commanded according to Isaiah 49:6 to be a light unto the Gentiles. As Jesus fulfilled the figure of the Isaianic Servant so also Paul is to do so. Along with the Peter-Paul parallelism, the Jesus-Paul parallelism is also strategic for Luke, perhaps even more so (Mattill, 1975; Wenham, 2002), for it cements Paul’s character as witnessing servant. The Holy Spirit figures correspondingly in the ministries of both Jesus and Paul (Mattill, 1975: 27-28). Both are God’s servants ministering His salvation according to divine necessity and attested by signs and wonders (1975: 25-29). Both recognise that God’s salvation is also for the Gentiles (1975: 29-30). “Jesus travels through Samaria, prefiguring Paul’s Gentile mission” (1975: 30). Both of them suffer persecution (1975: 31-37, 41; Moessner, 1986: 253-255).

Paul is granted access to divine power confirming (marturounti) that he is fulfilling as Jesus did the Isaianic Servant’s charge (Acts 14:3). Despite the fact that Paul does not take credit for the miraculous healing of the cripple in Lystra he suffers stoning at the hands of Jews. Miraculous confirmation and opposition are paired in Paul’s missionary activities for the purpose of his characterisation as well to demonstrate the progress of gospel proclamation. Paul’s activities become increasingly portrayed against the theme of persecution and unjust suffering, reflecting what Jesus foretold about him, how much he would suffer for his name. Narrative progression moves the task of witnessing through the gauntlet of opposition and trials. This process, completed successfully, meets divine approval in the cumulative characterisation of Paul not just as faithful witness to Christ but as proven servant, even as the epitome of a servant. Paul’s service is to bear witness to Jesus albeit enduring the facilitating process of suffering.

In Corinth the Lord speaks to Paul in a vision communicating divine approval (Acts 18:9-10), thus amid steady opposition Paul’s charge as fulfilled is legitimised. Paul’s farewell to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20) is only a type of the true farewell speech, since it is partly apologetic and “involves … the rhetoric of advice and consent, of what is useful and imitable” (Witherington, 1998: 612). In this Paul reveals a self-assessment of his character, which by implication he views as the foundation for his successful ministry to date and for the future. Paul defines his ministry by the rubric of “servant”, “douleuōn tō kuriō” (20:19). Here he parallels not only Peter but also Jesus (4:29-30). Importantly, Paul understands “serving the Lord” according to the self-evaluation of how he lived and not just consisting of proclamation. In addition to his declared
innocence amid opposition (20:26), Paul adds humility, longsuffering (20:19), unrestrained helpfulness (20:20), receptiveness to the Spirit’s direction (20:22-23), ethical attitudes (20:33), industriousness (20:34), integrity (20:33-34), charity (20:35), and witness (20:21, 24, 25, 27). All these qualities, according to Paul, were integral to his service for the purpose of emulation.

Paul announces he is to go to Jerusalem, possibly paralleling Jesus as Suffering Servant (Mattill, 1985: 19, 30-37). Arriving there, he debriefs James on the progress of the ministry to the Gentiles (21:19). James, however, enlightens Paul as to the believing Jews’ negative perception of his Gentile ministry (21:20-21) and then instructs him in what to do. Paul’s reaction shows his obedience to the law (21:22-24). The apposition of the zeal and perception of the Jews is used to portray Paul as obedient to the law, and also his humility again becomes apparent in his submission to the plans of James. These both indicate Paul’s character traits (Darr, 1992: 44).

Paul’s speech to the riotous crowd contains the second account of Paul’s conversion which Marion Soards calls “judicial rhetoric, which simply narrates Paul’s past, seeking through metastasis to transfer the responsibility for Paul’s activities to God” (1994: 111). Accordingly, the technique of this defence speech appears to be legitimation. The speech at 22:1, 3-21 suggests that the Lukan Paul adheres to ancient Jewish tradition, that he observes the law of the fathers (vs 3), and also that he claims a high level of culture, that is Paul was instructed by Gamaliel (vs 3), he was from no ordinary city, Tarsus (21:30), and Paul spoke Aramaic (vs 1,2). The speech appears to redefine the role of these Judaic merits through Paul’s divine encounter and Ananias’ function, creating a dichotomy, setting one against the other. Paul’s auspicious background is fundamentally rehabilitated by the God of the fathers for divine reasons of the first order (22:7, 14-15). The Lukan Paul is portrayed as a law-abiding Jew, a Roman citizen, and through the legitimating technique of high motivation he is called to receive the Righteous One’s instruction and to be the Lord’s witness sent to his own and to the Gentiles, a clear allusion not just to Acts 13:47 and Isaiah 49:6 (the Isaianic Servant) but to Jesus’ Nazareth sermon and the Abrahamic covenant promises. With Paul’s arrest begins his trial ordeal. H.W. Tajra (1989), L.C.A. Alexander (1993), A. Neagoe (2002) and S. Schwartz (2003) among others have pointed out the poetic usefulness of trial narratives in Greco-Roman literature. As Schwartz states, “The courtroom scene is a particularly apt formula for the dramatization of ideology” (2003: 110). It would seem
though that Luke not only “defends the Gospel precisely by defending Paul” (Neagoe, 2002: 217) but that Luke employs the opposition of the trial narratives for Paul’s characterisation. Alexander posits that the life of Socrates was used as a template for the description of the lives of heroes, and quite possibly for Paul’s life (Alexander, 1993: 63). More particularly, “Socrates is cited as a moral paradigm” (1993: 57-58). One only has to compare Paul’s trials to Plato’s *Apology* in order to understand Alexander’s point. The trial scene, then, is also conducive as a device for character building. Paul is increasingly portrayed as the innocent suffering witness (servant) parallel ling Jesus as Suffering Servant.

Paul receives divine approval by a Jesus theophany (23:11), which is inclusive of his witnessing activity in Jerusalem. Direct divine approval independent of Paul’s words adds reliability to the characterisation of Paul. Thus far, the Lukan Paul’s character is legitimated as a servant witnessing faithfully and as a servant addressing the Isaianic agenda, with the expansion of his mission field being foreshadowed.

Paul is re-located to Caesarea in Acts 23:31-26:32. This section contains three speeches by Paul: before Felix (24:10b-21), before Festus (25:8b, 10b-11) and before Agrippa (26:2-23, 25-27, 29) (Soards, 1994: 118-126). The first speech (24:10b-21) is in the style of judicial rhetoric (Soards, 1994: 118). The Lukan Paul argues that the charges are unsubstantiated (24:12-13, 18) and inadmissible (24:19). He claims a clear conscience (24:16), admits to being a follower of the Way (24:14), and moreover states that his beliefs stand in agreement with ancient tradition (24:14-15, 21). Since Tertullus does not substantiate the charges against Paul the case against him does not advance. Felix’s decision remains pending (24:22). Paul is left in prison for two years. Paul’s second speech follows at 25:8b, 10b-11. With Paul securely in Roman custody and Porcius Festus becoming governor, the Jerusalem Jews seek to manage the situation via the reciprocity conventions of the social network with Roman officials (Witherington, 1998: 719-720). As part of the plan, again, an ambush threatening the life of Paul is plotted. Paul in his speech asserts the innocence of his character, desires justice and continues to assert his right to a Roman court, thereby asserting his charge as just. The plot is driven forward by his appeal to Caesar (25:10-12). Paul delivers his third speech at 26:2-23, 25-27, 29, before Agrippa. Again, “The speech … ultimately seeks through metastasis to transfer the responsibility for Paul’s manner of living to God” (Soards, 1994: 122). Four parts are discernable: Address (26:2-3), Paul’s background and
convictions (4-8), Paul’s experience and testimony (9-23), and Epilogue through Dialogue (25-27) (Soards, 1994: 123). The Lukan Paul is portrayed as a faithful Jew by his claim to adhere to ancient tradition in his education and theology of resurrection. To this is added high motivation claimed in his zeal for persecuting the name of Jesus. Again, the technique of divine approval in his calling and commission rehabilitates his genuine Jewishness. Jesus is reported as appearing to Paul, supplementing what was declared in 22:10, 14-15 (chosen to know God’s will, see and hear the Righteous One, and to be his witness) by appointing him (prokheirisasthai) as a witness (martura) and a servant (hupēretên). Hupēretên elicits Luke’s Gospel 1:2, the Lukan “sources”, the eyewitnesses and servants of the word, creating a link between the apostles and Paul. In the conversion speech of Acts 22, Jesus is reported as saying he has chosen Paul as witness and is sending him from Jerusalem far away to testify to the Gentiles. Here in Chapter 26 the appointment of witness and sending is repeated; however, the intentional additional pairing of servant and deliverance from opposition is included (servant/witness; deliverance/sending) to emphasise that Paul’s character is being accumulated.

The expressed metastasis of 26:19, Paul’s obedience to the divine vision in the third account, encompasses all his prior activity. Paul’s Jewishness continues to be sculpted at this point by the direct function of “servant” in Paul’s characterisation.

Acts 27:1-28:31 records Paul’s travel to Rome. On four occasions (27:10b, 21b-26, 31b, 33b-34) the account reports Paul’s speeches during the sea voyage to Rome. During the voyage it is Paul alone who speaks, thus keeping him at the focal point. The first speech warns against bad judgment. “But the centurion paid more attention to the pilot and to the owner of the ship than to what Paul said” (27:11). Paul must now submit to and endure the consequences of the decision. The second speech is placed at the height of the storm. “When neither sun nor stars appeared for many days, and no small tempest raged, all hope of our being saved was at last abandoned” (27:20). S.M. Praeder states that the storm speech follows the conventions of storm scenes: “The usual place for such speeches is at a high point in the storm and a low point in the fortunes of the sea travellers” (1984: 696). Paul reminds them of his initial warning but encourages them with a promise of divine physical deliverance (27:21-22). The promised salvation is based on the portrayal of Paul as divinely called with access to divine power, with high motivation and as the rehabilitated genuine Jew, God’s servant. The deliverance of Paul (and others) is a function of his defence before Caesar. The Lukan Paul states,
“parestê gar moi tautê tê nukti tou theou, hou eimi [egô] hô kai latreuô” (27:23). Paul describes himself in terms of latreuô. Under semiotic examination, particularly syntagmatic evaluation of the word, latreuô may generally mean to worship or to serve, however the context of the announcement “you must stand before the emperor” emphasises the commission of Paul. Thus the text in syntagmatic relation may read, “The God to whom he belongs and whom he worships declares he must serve him by standing before Caesar”. A dramatic reversal takes place after this mid-point: the centurion and the soldiers are open to Paul’s words of direction. They begin to listen and respond to that which will bring them deliverance. By the end the centurion desires to spare Paul’s life and orders a stay on the killing of the prisoners. Through the ordeal Paul has gained respect and is portrayed as faithful and again importantly servant of God. The remaining two speeches concentrate on sustaining life till the ordeal reaches a conclusion. Like the trial scene, the type-scene of sea storm and shipwreck also provides the medium for character building, one that Luke employs. Miles and Trompf argue that Luke is seeking to prove Paul innocent and therefore avers that “Paul was put to the last test by forces and exigencies far more dreaded than the requirements of a human law court, and since he had been found guiltless, what need was there to recount the outcome of his appeal?” (1976: 265). D. Ladouceur (1980) affirms Miles and Trompf’s observations. S.M. Praeder questions these previous results and methodology. She states, “Divine favour is demonstrated by calm seas, not by a storm and shipwreck” (1984: 704). Talbert and Hayes have complied an exhaustive list of comparative material (1999: 268-270). They state that Luke used the type-scene not to communicate divine retribution but the storm scene is due to natural causes (Acts 27:9) and importantly portrays Paul as innocent and righteous and vindicated by God to fulfil his mandate (1999: 272, 275, 283).

The Maltese treat Paul and the others with unusual kindness perhaps attributable to Publius (28:2, 7). Paul’s survival of the snake-bite in addition to the storm leads the Maltese to think Paul is a God. The pagan laws of divine retribution do not seem to apply to Paul. It is not so much a case for Paul’s innocence as it is a demonstration of the prevailing plan of God in the dynamics of universal salvation. The text and logic tell us that they have survived the storm although they have lost the ship; Paul has not died from the snake-bite because he must stand before the emperor. Divine approval and access to divine power in preservation legitimates Paul as His emissary or because Paul has endured faithfully as His servant despite duress. The healing of sick on the
island also confirms this. The sign of the ship, the Twin Brothers Castor and Pollux, on which Paul embarks, is used by Luke to signify divine approval, to affirm Paul as God’s genuine instrument in the eyes of Greek readership.

Paul arrives in Rome and is again among his own people. In dialogue with the Jewish leaders the Lukan Paul claims adherence to ancient tradition, the hope of Israel. His good conscience is confirmed by the absence of any bad report against him. Paul holds to the determination of the Romans that they found him not guilty and intended on releasing him. The sect, the Way, however, is being spoken against. In the end Paul awaits trial. Yet he is active; his work now is unhindered, to which he boldly applies himself.

Simon Bar-Efrat remarks, “the limits of the literary unit cannot be fixed a priori, but ... they are dynamic and vary according to the kind of questions the literary critic desires to pose, provided of course that the delimiting of the unit has its justification in the text” (1980: 155). Bar-Efrat’s comment points to the significance of the above observations: Luke’s characterisation of Paul is precisely what delimits the literary unity in question, that is the Final sequence. This is because, for Luke the portrayal of Paul is important, as testified by Luke’s continual reference to Paul as faithful witness and by his dilation on Paul as servant similar to Jesus, the righteous Isaianic Suffering Servant. Luke also uses opposition for a positive portrayal of Paul’s character. Paul is proved a genuine Jew who is not just a faithful witness to Christ but a proven servant, even the epitome of a servant. Paul’s service is to bear witness to Jesus, albeit enduring the facilitating process of suffering. Moessner states, “it is precisely through this christological-historical pattern of the Deuteronomistic rejection of the prophet like Moses and his prophet-apostles that the Exodus salvation, the ‘glory of Israel’, is extended as ‘light to the Gentiles’ in ‘the presence of all peoples’ (Luke 2:31-32)” (1986: 255).

The lexic is governed by the characterisation of Paul as a faithful Jew rehabilitated by his conversion to be a servant of the Lord and a light to the Gentiles, one who serves the Righteous One by righteous conduct and faithful consistent proclamation and witness even as innocent amid formidable opposition. Based on the lexic, the Final Sequence for Luke’s Gospel’s and Acts’ conjoined narratives seems to extend from Acts 13:1 to Acts 28:31, but is prefaced by Acts 9:1-22. Paul’s conversion and revelation to Ananias of his charge (9:1-22) extends back into the Topical Sequence overlapping it. This text
is a necessary component of Paul’s mandate. Squires’ study on the preparatory function of Acts 8:4-12:25 regarding “the role of gentiles and the place of Jerusalem and Jewish elements” supports the above beginning text demarcation (1998: 611).

5.1.3.2 Contract Syntagm, CS1 Mandating/Acceptance
Paul’s mandate differs slightly from that of the other apostles as he received it separately. Paul is also to bear witness to Jesus (with emphasis on his witness for Gentiles) but upon Paul awaits the heavy task of suffering. Jesus purposefully says that Paul will suffer for the sake of his name (Acts 9:16). The original mandate as revealed by the Lord to Ananias is, “eipen de pros auton ho kurios: poreuou, hoti skeuos eklogês estin moi houtos tou bastasai to onoma mou enôpion ethnôn te kai basileôn huôn te Israël; egô gar hupodeixô autô hosa dei auton huper tou onomatos mou pathein” (9:15-16). In addition to being a witness who suffers, Jesus adds the distinctive that Paul is commanded to be a light to the Gentiles (13:47), according to the covenantent servant of Isaiah 49:6. Moessner points out that the parallels between Jesus and Peter/Stephen/Paul are united by the continuing disobedience of Israel (1986: 227). They become one with the “prophet like Moses” in suffering and rejection (1986: 226). Importantly, Moessner notes, however, that Luke, having once established this fundamental feature, becomes intent on chronicling not Peter’s “later career of suffering” (1986: 247) but the prophetic career of Paul (1986: 247). Thus “the prophet like Moses and his rejected prophets” pattern is three-staged: Jesus (Luke 9:29-35), (Peter)/Moses/Stephen (Acts 7:30-32), and Paul (Acts 9:3-15; 22:6-15; 26:13-18). Paul, for Luke, is the final character in the mission of Israel’s restoration.

Paul’s reiteration of his conversion dilates on the call to service as part of his mandate, the operative aspect of the covenant, an allusion to preceding references. Paul is a chosen instrument of witness (Acts 9:15) to which is added, by Ananias, that he is chosen to know God’s will and receive instruction from the Righteous One (Acts 22:14) to which is added now directly by Jesus that Paul is appointed as servant and as a light to the Gentiles for the forgiveness of their sins and sanctification by faith (Acts 26:15-18).

The contract is between God/Jesus, the Sender, and Paul, the Subject, although it would seem that Paul is portrayed as a witnessing servant type to be emulated. Paul’s words to Agrippa seem to indicate this Lukan motive: “I would to God that not only you but also
all who hear me this day might become such as I am, except for these chains” (Acts 26:29). Thus Paul is the Subject, but in a representative/exemplary role.

5.1.3.3 Contract Syntagm, CS2 Communication/Reception Statement

Paul appeals to the Lord’s command that he is, like Jesus, to be a light to the Gentiles (Acts 13:47). Paul shares in the calling of the Isaianic Servant (Isaiah 49:6) and proclaims the Abrahamic promised blessings to the nations. Paul also appeals to his calling and anointing by Jesus at his conversion to know God’s will, be directed by the Righteous One, be a witness and a servant, reflecting the Abrahamic covenant’s operative aspect.

5.1.3.4 Disjunction/Conjunction Syntagm, DS Statement
Paul is sent from Antioch, completes his missionary journeys, returns to Jerusalem and is transported to Rome.

5.1.3.5 Performance Syntagm, PS1 Confrontation Statement
Jews, Gentiles, the circumcision group, and political figures confront Paul. The Jews that are formidable opponents are those that bring accusations against Paul and influence other Jews, Gentiles and political leaders. Paul has minor opposition from evils spirits.

5.1.3.6 Performance Syntagm, PS2 Domination/Submission Statement
Paul overcomes his opponents, both believing and non-believing Jews, Gentiles, and political figures primarily on an individual basis. Thus his success is marked but limited. There is a tendency that the groups who hear Paul may become divided (Acts 13:43; 17:4, 12, 32-34; 19:9; 28:25). Corporately understood, his own people will not listen (13:46; 22:18,22; 28:26-27). However, it is declared that the Gentiles will listen (13:48; 28:29). Evil spirits are reported to recognise and submit to Paul (19:15).
5.1.3.7 Performance Syntagm, PS3 Attribution/Deprivation Statement

The fulfilment of Paul’s mandate which correlates to the original mandate revealed in the Initial Sequence is aptly summarised by Acts 28:30-31, “And he lived there two whole years at his own expense, and welcomed all who came to him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ quite openly and unhindered.” Paul has been enabled and is fulfilling representatively Israel’s original mandate. To serve God without fear, established in righteousness and justice, vindicated by God in innocence, shining God’s light of salvation in Jesus and his kingdom. He welcomes all to himself as a beacon preaching and teaching. The accumulation of Paul’s character gives the necessary weight to this final statement. Zechariah’s prophecy in Luke 1:74-75 has reached a fulfilment in the person and activity of Paul.

Partway through the Final Sequence narrative Paul summarises the success of his ministry (Acts 20:18-35). In its entirety it is evident Paul fulfilled his mandate by teaching and preaching extensively to Israel and to Gentiles. Paul bore all suffering, maintained ethical behaviour, and witnessed faithfully, and so confirmed his anointed role as servant. Paul’s appearance before the dignitaries Felix, Festus and Agrippa, and appeal to Caesar, demonstrate he has taken Jesus’ name to kings. Acts 19:17 relates this effect of Paul’s preaching and activities: “kai emegaluneto to onoma tou kuriou Iêsou.”

The following Narrative Syntagms and Canonical functions are observed.

CS1 (mandating/acceptance): Jesus mandates Paul as witness and servant to carry his name to the Gentiles, kings and Israel and as a light bringing salvation.

CS2 (communication/reception): Paul is given the Holy Spirit, the Isaianic Servant’s calling to be a light, the Abrahamic covenant in its promissory and operative aspect, and power to perform miracles and divine revelations as Helpers.

DS (disjunction/conjunction): Paul travels, fulfilling his mandate.

PS1 (confrontation): Jews, Gentiles, and political leaders oppose Paul. Formidable opposition arises upon the instigation of the Jews.

PS2 (domination/submission): Paul overcomes his opponents, both believing and non-believing Jews, Gentiles, and political figures on an individual basis. Corporate success with Israel is elusive; corporate Gentile receptiveness is promising. Thus his success is marked but limited.
PS3 (attribution/deprivation): Paul fulfils travels, as preaching and activities suggest. The text of Acts 28:30-31, carried by the accumulated character of Paul, evidences not only the successful fulfilling of Paul’s mandate but that of Israel in the Initial Sequence.

Assembling the information according to the Actantial Model for the Final Correlated Sequence yields the following.

God/ Jesus → Carry Jesus’ Name/ → Gentiles/ kings/
Bring Salvation and own People
Mercy
↑
Holy Spirit/ → Paul ← Jews/ Gentiles/
Isaianic Servant- (representatively/ Leaders
Light to Gentiles/ exemplary/
Abrahamic covenant epitomic)

5.2 OCCURRENCES OF THE COVENANT CONCEPT AND ITS FUNCTION IN THE NARRATIVE OF LUKE’S GOSPEL ACCOUNT AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

It has previously been demonstrated that the covenant concept figures prominently in the double work of Luke (Kovács, 2006). The foregoing analysis suggests that the covenant concept as presented in its operative aspect as service occurs at ten defining points in the conjoined narrative of Luke and Acts and are listed as follows.

Luke 1:32-33, Davidic Covenant
Luke 1:72-75, Abrahamic Covenant
Luke 3:4-6, Isaiah 40:3-5 and Covenant Restoration
Luke 22:27 (7-38), New Covenant
Acts 2:25-36, Davidic Covenant
Acts 7:1-53, Abrahamic Covenant

5.2.1 Angelic Announcement to Mary, Gospel of Luke 1:32-33

“32 houtos estai megas kai huios hupsistou klêthêsetai kai dôsei autô kurios ho theos ton thronon Davud tou patros autou, 33 kai basileusei epi ton oikon Iakôb eis tous aiônas kai têss basiletas autou ouk estai telos.”

The angel announces that Jesus will be given his father David’s throne to rule from eternally. This is a clear reference to the Davidic covenant and to the service Jesus will offer based on it, to rule God’s people.

5.2.2 Benedictus, Gospel of Luke 1:72-75

“72 ... poiêsai eleos meta tôn paterôn hêmôn kai mnêsthênaí diathékês hagias autou, 73 horkôn hon ômosen pros Abraam ton patera hêmôn, tou dounai hémin 74 aphobôs ek kheiros ekhthênas hrusthenas latreuein autô 75 en hoiotêti kai dikaiosunê enôpion autou pasais tais hêmerais hêmôn.”

Zechariah declares that the births of John and Jesus are the result of God’s salvific activity, more specifically that God has raised up a horn in the house of David, Jesus, because He has remembered His oath to Abraham. The reason for this is so that they might serve God in holiness and righteousness. This service to God is reminiscent of the “requirement” that Abraham walk before Him blamelessly as one in covenant with Him.

5.2.3 Nunc Dimittis, Gospel of Luke 2:30-32

“32 phôs eis apokalupsin ethnôn kai doxan laou sou Israël.”

Simeon quotes Isaiah 42:6/49:6 by which he announces Jesus’ mandate and by implication the Gentile mission. According to Isaiah the Servant will be a covenant for the people, that is, in him God’s restorative light and mercy will extend to the Gentiles and His people. This reference to the Isaianic Servant Covenant expresses the nature of Jesus’ service but by implication, as Isaiah reveals, the original intent of God for Israel was that they were called by God to serve Him as a light for the nations.
5.2.4  *John the Baptist’s Preaching, Gospel of Luke 3:3-9*
“poiēsate oun karpous axious tēs metanoias kai mé arxēste legein in heautois: patera ekhomen ton Abraam.”

God mandates John according to Isaiah 40:3-5, for restoration ministry, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, prepared ethically in righteousness. John’s statement that true Abrahamic descent is based on ethical living evokes the Abrahamic covenant and God’s requirement that Abraham walk blamelessly before Him, to serve Him in righteousness.

5.2.5  *Jesus’ Nazareth Sermon, Gospel of Luke 4:18-19*
“pneuma kuriou ep eme hou heineken ekhrisen me euaggelisasthai ptôkhois apestalken me kēruxai aikhmalōtōis aphesin kai tuphlois anaplepsin aposteilai tethrausmenous en aphesi 19 kēruxai eniauton kuriou kurioi dekton.”

Jesus, quoting Isaiah 61:1-2, announces his programmatic mission. It is the Isaianic Servant’s mission who is a covenant for the restoration of God’s people.

5.2.6  *Jesus’ Nazareth Sermon, Gospel of Luke 4:24-27*
Jesus speaks this passage as an allusion to God’s disposition to the Gentiles as expressed primarily in the Abrahamic covenant (Kovács, 2006: 70-73). As the fulfillment of the Isaianic Servant Jesus has come to “serve” them in deliverance also.

5.2.7  *Dispute About Greatness, Gospel of Luke 22:24, 27*
“Egeneto de kai philoneikia en autois, to tis autôn dokei einaî meizôn. ... egō de en mesō humôn eimi hōs ho diakonōn.”

Jesus defines his ministry, as focalised in the New Covenant, in terms of the operative aspect of the covenant concept; he is come to seek and save the lost under the rubric of service.

5.2.8  *Peter’s Pentecost Sermon, Acts 2:25-36*
“prophētês oun huparkhôn kai eidōs hoti horkōi Ómosen autōi ho theos ek karpou tēs osphuos autou kathisai epi ton thronon autou ...”
The exaltation of Jesus is clearly a product of Davidic Covenant promises. Jesus’ exaltation is a fulfilment of the angelic announcement to Mary: Jesus is given David’s throne to rule forever.

5.2.9 Stephen’s Sermon, Acts 7:1-53

“... kai meta tauta exelevontai kai latreusousin moi en to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to to
activity of His recipients. The operative aspect is a consequence of God’s unparalleled mercy and salvation. Israel in covenant with God is called to serve in ethical living. Jesus is covenanted to serve as Isaianic Servant. Paul is anointed, under the identity of the Isaianic Servant, as servant and witness, to proclaim Jesus and God’s mercy and forgiveness in him. Each occurrence of ministry activity is based upon a covenant conception.

5.3 THE COVENANT CONCEPT AND ITS FUNCTION WITHIN THE STRUCTURE OF LUKE-ACTS AS A NARRATIVE WHOLE

Narrative structure, according to Greimas, lies at the deep structure level (Greimas, 1971: 794). The deep structure level may also be termed the fabula or story. The Greimasian Actantial Model functions on this level. The foregoing analysis has identified the relevance of the Model in Luke-Acts and its applicability in the deep structural level of the conjoined narratives of Luke and Acts. This structure is verified by the correlation of actors and actions on the surface structure level or level of the plot. The foregoing structuralist analysis reveals, in addition to its standard features, that the covenant concept presented in its operative aspect figures determinatively at the Gospel’s beginning (Luke 1-4), at its ending (Luke 22), at the beginning of Acts (Acts 2), in the middle of Acts (Acts 7 and 13), and in its dénouement (Acts 26).

Structuralist analysis shows that the covenant concept in its operative aspect occurs in mandating or evaluative contexts and thus provides a basis for sequencing the plot and structuring the narrative. It can be maintained that Zechariah’s prophecy announces the covenant concept’s operative aspect, service, as fundamental to the Subject’s, Israel’s mandate in the Initial Sequence. Zechariah’s prophecy also shows that this mandate is unfulfilled. This condition is supported by further texts such as Acts 7. Jesus, in his ministry as the new Helper-become-Subject, addresses the impediments of Israel’s failure: faulty leadership, unrighteousness and powerlessness. Jesus, after his last supper and in lieu of the New Covenant, interprets his ministry in its entirety (including his death, resurrection, ascension and sending of the Spirit, the Promise of the Father) as the greatest service. Jesus’ deliverance ministry as new Helper spans the Topical Sequence, resolving issues causing the Situation of Lack. Paul is anointed and empowered as exemplary witness and servant and so defines the Final Sequence, which
correlates with the Initial Sequence: Paul is enabled to fulfil what Israel could not. The infancy narrative presents the problem, and the end of Acts yields the resolution. Israel cannot serve without fear in holiness and righteousness (Luke 1:74-75). Paul being vindicated in righteousness is unhindered in his service, boldly preaching and teaching (Acts 28:31).

The full narrative seems to hang on these identified ten occurrences of the covenant concept in its operative aspect, service, as the flesh hangs on a skeletal frame. The narrative progresses, according to the logic of the Greimasian morpho-syntactical system, from one occurrence to the next occurrence. Israel is mandated but has failed, so Jesus is provided to resolve the problem, which he does by teaching true discipleship, in his glorification replacing the leadership and sending the Spirit. After this, Israel, identified representatively in the person of Paul, is, according to the resolution, anointed and enabled to fulfil the original mandate. The results of McComiskey (2004) fit well within Hypo-Sequence C1 supporting the logic. The narrative in its complexity seems to support this arrangement and progression; if it did not then the system would ultimately break down. The evidence suggests that the covenant concept functions as an organisational principle for the structuring of the conjoined narratives. The simplified chart below exhibits the sequences according to the Greimasian Actantial Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial sequence</th>
<th>Topical sequence</th>
<th>Final sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God → Light of → Nations</td>
<td>God → Deliverance/ → Israel/ Holy Spirit → Nations</td>
<td>God/ → Jesus Name/ → Israel/ God’s Mercy → Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrahamic → Israel ← Leaders</td>
<td>Abrahamic Covenant/ Leaders/ Isaianic Servant/ Call to serve</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The covenant concept appears in the role of Helper in each sequence. Yet it is closely associated by justification to the Sender and Object in each sequence: it empowers the Subject with necessary guidance to overcome the Opponent and deliver the Object to the Receiver. The covenant concept is basic to the mandate as it guides the Subject in service.
It is quite interesting that the results of this morpho-syntactic analysis coincide with what Talbert observes about the architectonic structure of Hellenistic writings. He states that the need for balance in Hellenistic writings is expressed in the cyclic pattern with a middle climatic point (1974: 5-8). This structure may even be termed pedimental (1974: 5-8). Similarities in Luke are perceptible only if the two-volume work is viewed as a literary whole constituted by conceptual unity and analysed structurally. Service to God frames the two ends, while the mid-point is the passion narrative and Jesus’ exaltation. It is in this that we see Jesus identify his suffering, crucifixion and ascension as the climax of his mission of service.

5.4 THE COVENANT CONCEPT’S RESULTANT FUNCTION IN THEOLOGICAL INTERRELATION AND ORGANISATION IN LUKE-ACTS

The idea of Lukan theology is in essence an exercise that includes the generating of theological themes. It is the relation of themes, not mere notions, that is of interest in this thesis. A theme, then, is “a semantic macrostructural category … extractable from (or allowing for the unification of) distinct (and discontinuous) textual elements which (are taken to) illustrate it and expressing the more general and abstract entities (ideas, thoughts, etc.) that a text or part thereof is (or may be considered to be) about” (Prince, 2003: 99). In order to write meaningfully about thematic interrelation one must first consider theme construction. Writing on theme extraction, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan suggests the possibility that a theme as a “unifying, integrating principle” (1995: 15) may be constructed from macrostructures, underlying structures of the text (such as time, focalisation, narration) which can be integrated by a principle of correspondence or recurrent feature (1995: 15-16). In addition to the identification of recurrences, Lubomír Doležel proposes that actions on the basis of motivational factors can be thematised (Doležel 1995b: 62). Just as themes can be constructed in this way, via a principle of correspondence, the potential for thematic interrelation exists based on the similar dynamics if the themes are re-conceptualised.

Theme construction is a singular event. Thematic relation is a non-singular event because it involves a thematic field (Doležel, 1995a: 93). Relational difficulty is
perceivable since themes are constructed in “different ways, depending on the purpose of its representation” (Doležel, 1995b: 59). Different perspectives will identify different themes even though they are based on the same event (1995b: 59). Successful relation of themes depends on their re-conceptualisation around a “commonality”, whether there are any correspondence/recurrent features between the macrostructures of each re-conceptualised theme. The covenant concept obviates the uncertainty involved in relating deconstructed themes, because the covenant concept offers a “relevant template” as the basis for the re-conceptualising of a theme. The plausibility of this lies in the fact that there are fundamental constants and representative identities in the covenant concept, which may be expressed in macrostructural features and actions. Hence, the covenant concept appears to function as a correspondence facilitator, as by definition it contains macrostructural elements. The covenant concept seems to exhibit a catalytic ability of mediation.

As discussed in my previous work (Kovács, 2006), “Luke consistently uses diathēkē to refer primarily to the covenant established between Yahweh and His people via the patriarchs. Gottfried Quell’s and Johannes Behm’s treatment of diatithēmi and diathēkē in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament has disseminated the understanding that Luke ‘follows the conventional Jewish view established by the LXX, though he sees prophecy and its fulfilment from a Christian standpoint’ (Behm, 1968:133)” (2006: 38). Luke has adopted a Jewish understanding of the covenant idea, the fluid and comprehensive usage of which results from its definition as a relationship intended to be inviolable, yet one which could be broken but could be renewed (2006: 26-27). This portrayal seeks to account for how the covenant concept can be relevant to various themes. What are the fundamental constants and representative identities? How are they expressed in macrostructural features?

Fundamental constants are actants, motivation and time. The actant Sender is always God and/or Jesus. The Receiver is always Israel or the nations. The covenant formula, “I will be God for you” and “You shall be a people for me”, is a constant that expresses the Object, mercy, which God desires to communicate. Intention is based on motivation to bless people, to show mercy to those who have been designated for blessing yet have disqualified themselves from it or whom blessing has eluded. Time is constant, a recurring feature, for any reference to the time frame of a covenant is marked by consistent association to a patriarch. The Davidic covenant is consistently associated
with the point in the story depicting David in relation. From this is derived focalisation as a constant, that is, the details and meaning of a covenant event are focalised in a person. Representative identities are multiple actors subsumed under the same actantial role. The function of Jesus and Israel, Jesus and the apostles elides.

As noted in the previous section, the covenant idea in its operative aspect of service occurs in the context of mandating and/or evaluation. These contexts are ripe with themata, a congealing point for themes, making interrelation possible. The covenant concept’s organisational ability is manifest in this also.

An example is afforded in the Benedictus, wherein the themes of salvation and fulfilment are prominent. How are they related? The covenant concept referred to in Luke 1:74 and 75 provides the map for the re-conceptualisation of the two themes. Salvation as defined in the prophecy is, according to the covenant concept, a result of the fundamental constant of God’s unchanging intention/motivation. The salvation theme becomes the concept of God showing mercy to Israel that they may serve Him (exhibiting the covenant formula). The basis of God’s salvation is focalised in Abraham. Fulfilment is re-conceptualised according to the covenant concept in the action of what God out of His constant motivation promised—mercy promised and delivered. Focalisation in Abraham re-conceptualises the fulfilment theme. God completes that which He promised to Abraham. In this manner the themes of salvation and fulfilment are related meaningfully.

The above example can be repeated and seems to always show that the covenant idea in its operative aspect facilitates the re-conceptualisation of themes for meaningful theological dialogue and interrelation. It appears to be an organisational principle.

5.5 SUMMARY

Assuming conceptual unity, the narratives of Luke’s Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles were analysed as a conjoined narrative in order to ascertain whether the covenant concept functioned as an organising principle. Structural Critical Methodology according to the method of Greimas and as represented by Hayes has returned positive results. The covenant concept in its operative aspect of service was identified to occur at ten key places in the conjoined narrative: the beginning, middle
and broadly the end, that is, in the Initial, Topical and Final Sequences. The covenant concept in its operative aspect seemed to occur in mandating or evaluative contexts and fulfilled the actantial role of Helper. This placement of the covenant concept influences the structure of the narrative, suggesting organisational efficacy as a principle. In addition to the suggested structuring, the covenant idea in its operative aspect was also observed to provide a means of theological, specifically thematic, interrelation. This is due to the concept’s ability to function as a “template” for re-conceptualisation of themes, providing correspondences for meaningful comparison and contrast. Taking into account this breadth of dynamics it seems that the covenant concept ultimately facilitates the relation between history and theology in the Lukan corpus.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study substantiate the central theoretical argument that the covenant concept in Luke-Acts provides a means of correlation between history and theology, making possible the interrelation of themes, concepts and subject matter, and also assisting the development of the narrative as a structured whole. Specifically, the evidence suggests that the covenant concept in its operative aspect appears to function as an organising principle in Luke-Acts, lending form to the conjoined narratives of Luke’s Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, and also enabling re-conceptualisation of themes catalytically as a template and thereby posturing themes for interrelation.

The central question, which is a response to the challenge of B.R. Gaventa (1988) to investigate the possibility and manner of thematic interrelation, asked “How may one determine the extent to which the concept of covenant functions as an organising principle in the design of Luke-Acts as a unified theological historical narrative?”

The question, which ultimately expresses the aim, precipitated four objectives, which were investigated in four corresponding chapters. Chapter Two, the first investigative angle, examined the different approaches to previous research on the organisation of concepts in Luke-Acts. Chapter Three identified the principles of organisation of concepts in Judaic and Hellenistic literature. The fourth investigative chapter evaluated the principles of organisation under the terms and conditions of the Old Covenant. The final part of the investigation, Chapter Five, assessed the relationship of the covenant concept to the narrative structure, theological interrelation and organisation as found in Luke-Acts.

Representative scholarship was surveyed following five different approaches: historico-theological, socio-rhetorical/literary, apologetic, literary-narrative and socio-critical. Analysis revealed that certain concepts exhibited organisational ability. Foremost was the plan of God as a concept, which was treated in various ways by scholars but was usually joined with other themes or concepts in order to explain plot development, such as promise-fulfilment, Jesus’ passion, prophet/Moses typology, the church, the Holy Spirit’s activity and gender. These results imply that structure and organisation are grounded quite plausibly at the level of the story/fabula; which in turn means that at this level “history” and theology seem to be connected. The survey determined that
thematic arrangement was acknowledged in varying degrees but investigative results, if any, were not entirely clear.

Chapter Three examined Early Judaic and Ancient Greek literature for concept(s) of organisation. It was discovered that primarily the concept of piety featured in an organisational capacity in the texts. The concept of piety was, however, nuanced variously by its respective contexts, and was at times aligned with other equally important concepts such as holiness, justice, honour and divine expectations. Analysis of Early Judaic literature and Ancient Greek literature strongly attests to a common trans-cultural interest. The concern for piety and justness together with a notion of divine order and expectation, expressed in the written manuscripts in different ways, appears formidable and merits serious consideration as a possible source of literary influence. Whether Lukan composition was shaped by an apparent common concern cannot be entirely discounted for the possibility seems plausible in light of the results of Chapter Five.

Investigation into the principles of organisation under the terms and conditions of the Old Covenant was the subject of Chapter Four. Particularly three perceptible concepts were noted: typology, the covenant concept, and the eschaton idea. Among typologies contained in the OT canon, foremost is Exodus typology that seems to assist the development of Israel and humanity’s story. Specifically, Exodus typology using both narrative and thematic elements ties together Israel’s story. Judgment, restoration and preservation are the common purposes elicited by the covenant idea; the covenant concept also uses degrees of parallelism and integrative concept centralisation to structure the OT narrative. The covenant idea, understood synchronically and diachronically, seems to effect judgment, restoration and preservation as a governing idea; specifically, the covenant concept provides the story framework and promise of future restoration after situations of decline. The covenant idea, therefore, not only frames stories but also ties together consecutive stories, creating a progression. It may be said, the covenant idea seems to operate as an organising principle in OT writings. The eschaton idea puts forward the Day of YHWH as a thematically organising principle in the exilic and post-exilic material, that is in the Book of the Twelve Prophets. Restoration after judgment seems to be arranged differently in each book of the Twelve yet their relation to the Day of YHWH has full bearing on logical thematic
development. According to research the covenant idea appears to be the most adaptive and as a result the most prevalent.

Chapter Five addressed the fourth objective, by assessing the role of the covenant concept in narrative structure, its potential for theological interrelation and organisation as found in Luke-Acts. Conceptual unity of the narratives of Luke’s Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles was assumed. The narratives conjoined in the reading act were analysed according to the structural critical methodology of Greimas as represented by Hayes. It was observed that the covenant concept in its operative aspect denominated as service was identified to occur at ten key places in the conjoined narrative: the beginning, middle and broadly the end, that is, according to the Greimassian Actantial Model, in the Initial, Topical and Final Sequences. These ten occurrences are:

Luke 1:32-33, Davidic Covenant
Luke 1:72-75, Abrahamic Covenant
Luke 3:4-6, Isaiah 40:3-5 and Covenant Restoration
Luke 22:27 (7-38), New Covenant
Acts 2:25-36, Davidic Covenant
Acts 7:1-53, Abrahamic Covenant

Its operative aspect, service, accompanies each of the above references or allusions to the covenant idea. The unilateral beneficent activity of God is yoked with the expected activity of His people. The operative aspect is a result of God’s unparalleled mercy and salvation. Israel is called to serve God in ethical living as a covenant member. Jesus is covenanted to serve as Isaianic Servant. Paul shares in the anointing of the Isaianic Servant, as servant and witness in order to announce Jesus and God’s mercy and forgiveness. Each occurrence of ministry activity is based upon a covenant conception.

The covenant concept in its operative aspect seemed to occur in mandating or evaluative contexts and fulfilled the actantial role of Helper. This placement of covenant concept as a Helper in the tasks of the Subjects has developmental bearing on the narrative and
thereby its structure, thus suggesting organisational efficacy as a principle. The
evidence suggests that the covenant idea figures significantly in each sequence not only
facilitating the work of subjects but also connecting the significance of their work to
each other.

The evidence suggests that Zechariah’s prophecy in all clarity announces the covenant
concept’s operative aspect, service, as fundamental to the Subject’s, Israel’s mandate in
the Initial Sequence. Zechariah’s prophecy announces that Israel’s mandate is
unfulfilled. Predominantly Acts 7 supports these assertions. Jesus is sent to rectify
Israel’s failed mandate and deteriorated situation. He in his ministry as the new Helper-
become- Subject addresses the impediments of Israel’s failure—faulty leadership,
unrighteousness and powerlessness. Jesus, after his last supper and in lieu of the New
Covenant, interprets his ministry in its entirety (including foremost though not only his
death, but also his resurrection, ascension and sending of the Spirit, the Promise of the
Father) as the greatest service. Jesus’ deliverance ministry as new Helper spans the
Topical Sequence resolving issues causing the Situation of Lack. Importantly, part of
Jesus’ mandate is to baptise with the Holy Spirit. He ascends to the Father to initiate
this, first sending the promised Spirit upon his disciples and then enabling his disciples
so that by proxy the Holy Spirit can come upon those in Samaria and upon Gentile
Cornelius as it did upon the disciples. With this Jesus completes his mandate in the
Topical Sequence, having replaced Israel’s leadership by his ministry and exaltation,
and having reconstituted Israel by teaching and empowering his disciples to proper
worship and service. Paul is anointed and empowered as epitomic witness and servant
and so defines the Final Sequence, which correlates with the Initial Sequence—Paul is
enabled to fulfil what Israel was not able. In the context of the infancy narrative the
problem is presented, correspondingly the end of Acts yields the resolution. Israel
cannot serve without fear in holiness and righteousness (Luke 1:74-75). Paul in the
Final Sequence is vindicated in righteousness and as the text directly notes is
unhindered in his service, boldly preaching and teaching ( Acts 28:31). This is the story
structure rendered by a Structural Critical reading.

In addition, however, to the suggested structuring of narrative, the covenant idea in its
operative aspect was also observed as providing a means of theological, specifically
thematic, interrelation. This is accorded to the concept’s ability to operate as a
“template” for re-conceptualization of themes, precipitating correspondences for meaningful comparison and contrast.

In the results of Chapter Five’s analysis reverberate the comparative critical findings of Chapter Three. The Lukan corpus attests to a common trans-cultural interest in the meaningful relation between the divine and the human in the context of history. However, this concern in Luke-Acts follows a Judaic trajectory as represented by basic Old Testament conceptualisations. From this background, then, emerges the Lukan story of Israel and God’s restorative salvation. Lukan design interpreted in a structural-critical way in this work substantiates the central theoretical argument that the Lukan writings relate history to theology by the covenant concept; this is evidenced by the facilitation of narrative structuring by the covenant concept in the conjoined narratives together with the covenant concept’s catalytic capacity to interrelate themes as a “template” concept.
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