PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURAL STUDIES
REVISITED/HISTORISCH-GENETISCHE STUDIEN
ZUR PHILOSOPHIE UND KULTURGESCHICHTE

Edited by/herausgegeben von
Seweryn Blandzi

Advisory Board/Wissenschaftlicher Beirat
Manfred Frank (University of Tübingen)
Kamila Najdek (University of Warsaw)
Marek Otisk (University of Ostrava, Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague)
Wojciech Starzyński (Polish Academy of Sciences)

VOL. 1

PETER LANG

Dorota Muszytowska / Janusz Kręcidło /
Anna Szczepan-Wojnarska (eds.)

Jerusalem as the Text of Culture

PETER LANG

Dorota Hartman

"A Fulfillment of All That Is Written" (Lk 21:22): The Fall of Jerusalem in the Gospel of Luke

Abstract: The paper analyzes the image of Jerusalem stemming from the Gospel of Luke.

Keywords: destruction of Jerusalem, Temple, Gospel of Luke, travel narrative, eschatological expectations

It can be easily observed that Jerusalem is mentioned frequently and has a position of relevance in Luke's Gospel and in Acts.[1] Following the motif of Jerusalem in the Third Gospel shows how meticulously Luke constructed his account

1 All the English translations of the scriptural quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version. I refer to the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts as Luke, and assume the narrative unity of the Gospel of Luke and Acts: Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, for the contrary view see: Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007). Luke mentions Jerusalem 30 times in his Gospel: 28 times he uses the Hebrew name of the city transliterated as Ἰερυσαλήμ, from which ten times in Jesus' discourses. The Hellenistic Ἱεροσόλυμα appears three times. In Acts, Jerusalem is mentioned 57 times but Ἱεροσόλυμα is used 25 times and Ἰερυσαλήμ 39 times. In Mark and Matthew instead only the Hellenistic name appears (Matthew uses Ἰερυσαλήμ once). The reason for the use of two respective names of the city in Luke-Acts was broadly discussed, however without a satisfactory explanation: Ignace de la Potterie, "Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans l'évangile de Luc," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 69 (1981): 57–80 and "Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans les Actes des Apôtres," *Biblica* 62 (1982): 153–87; Dennis D. Sylva, "Ierousalēm and Hierosolyma in Luke-Acts," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 74 (1983): 207–29; James R. Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition* (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009), 136–38. The simplest explanation of the preference of Luke for the Hebrew name of the city, is that this form is used in the LXX, on which language Luke heavily relies. A broad discussion of the argument is in Krzysztof Mielcarek, *Ierousalēm, Ierosolyma. Starotestamentowe i hellenistyczne korzenie Łukaszowego obrazu świętego miasta w świetle onomastyki greckiej* (Studia Biblica Lublinensia 2; Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2008). The author, after having examined the use of the two names in the LXX books where they both appear (Tobit, 1 Macc., 1 Esdr.), implies that the use of the Hebrew name in Luke has theological connotations and forms a connection to the Temple.

(διήγησις),[2] as he declared in his prologue, not only compiling his sources with attention (ἀκριβῶς),[3] but also following a clear narrative project.[4]

At the beginning of the Gospel, the focus is not on the city as a whole, but on the Jerusalem Temple. The infancy narrative, which is widely considered to be Luke's own composition, begins in the Jerusalem Temple with the vision of Zechariah (Lk 1:8–23).[5] The Temple appears in the early life of Jesus as his dedication takes place there (Lk 2:25–35).[6] The city of Jerusalem itself appears for the first time as the destination of the pilgrimage for Passover (Lk 2:41; 43; 45). A twelve-year-old Jesus remains in the Temple, when his parents leave. It is emphasised that his parents returned to Jerusalem (ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, Lk 2:45) to find him. The central section of Luke contains only one reference to the Temple (Lk 18:10), but it is referred to again at the end of the Gospel.[7]

Jerusalem is mentioned only a few times in the section (Lk 3:1–9:50), which contains the account of the ministry of Jesus in the Galilee. In Luke (4:9), the episode describing the temptation of Jesus in the desert, the final scene of temptation takes place in Jerusalem. The parallel passage in Matthew does not contain the name of Jerusalem, which was presumably in the Q source from which the verse originates, and has only a reference to the holy city (τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, Mt

2 Luke 1:1.

3 Luke 1:3.

4 On Jerusalem and the Jerusalem Temple in the Third Gospel: Michael Bachmann, *Jerusalem und der Tempel. Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 6/9; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980; reprinted as BWANT 109 (2012); J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988).

5 For the meaning of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke, see: Klaus Baltzer, "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lucan Writings," *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965): 263–77; Nicholas H. Taylor, "The Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts," *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 60 (2004): 459–85; Peter Head, "The Temple in Luke's Gospel," in *Heaven on Earth. The Temple in Biblical Theology*, eds. Desmond Alexander and Simon J. Gathercole (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004), 101–19.

6 Andrés García Serrano, *The Presentation in the Temple. The Narrative Function of Lk 2:22–39 in Luke-Acts* (Roma: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2012).

7 Mikeal C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus. The Ascension Narratives in Context* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 75.

4:5). It is clear that Luke instead wishes to emphasize that the final temptation is connected with Jerusalem.[8]

In 5:17 Luke mentions the Pharisees and teachers of the law who came from Galilee, Judaea, and Jerusalem, and again in 6:17 people from Jerusalem appear among the multitude that came to hear Jesus.[9] This last passage is based on Mark 3:8, who has ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων, but Luke changes the name of the city to his preferred Ἰερουσαλήμ.

The first reference to Jesus' destiny which is predicted by Moses and Elijah to be completed in Jerusalem appears in the pericope of the Transfiguration: ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 9:31).[10] This verse is unique to Luke and serves to build up the expectation of the climax to be held in the holy city. The verb πληρόω here for the first time specifies that the accomplishment of the mission is linked to the city of Jerusalem, thus preceding the intent to go to Jerusalem that Jesus himself will show in Luke 9:51. Both in the Gospel and in Acts, Luke gives great consideration to fulfillment, especially the fulfillment of the scriptural prophecy.[11] The noun ἔξοδος, which is a *hapax*

8 I accept as a premise the two source hypothesis, as the best available solution to the synoptic problem at the moment, although not without some issues. For the reconstruction of Q 4:9, see: *The Critical Edition of Q. Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*, eds. James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 28. Even if the story of the temptations comes from Q, it is not easy to explain the reason for the different order of the temptations in Luke and in Matthew (Luke has the scene of the world kingdoms first, and the Temple as a final scene; Matthew has the Temple as a second scene and the temptation on the high mountain as a third. The Lucan order seems to ruin the climax in the temptations, unless Luke put the temple scene as a final one because he wanted to emphasise the importance of Jerusalem as the final destination of Jesus, cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2 vols (I–IX and X–XXIV; The Anchor Yale Bible 28 and 28A; New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1985), vol. I, 507; *contra* Michael D. Goulder, *Luke. A New Paradigm* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 294.

9 In both instances, Jerusalem is treated as if it were somehow separate from Judaea, but Luke's knowledge of geography of Palestine was very scant.

10 The noun ἔξοδος is used in Greek literature to denote death.

11 The verbs of fulfilment used by Luke are πλερόω 1:20; 4:21; 9:31; 21:24; συμπλερόω 9:51; τελέω 12:50; 18:31. Yet Cadbury saw that the central issue in Luke's work is the fulfilment of the Scriptural prophecy: Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 303–5; the similar conclusions about the importance of the fulfilment of the OT in the theology of Luke are expanded in the classical works of

in Luke, is often understood as a reference to Jesus' death. But the mention of Jerusalem as the place of this fulfillment would suggest rather that ἔξοδος is connected to the ascension, ἀνάλημψις which will appear in 9:51.[12] The mention of Jerusalem as the city of destiny, which is not present in Matthew, in the same way as the changes in the pericope of the Temptations 4:9, is a proof that Luke shows no hesitation in modifying his sources taking into consideration the narrative design of his work as a whole.[13]

Jerusalem is viewed by Luke first and foremost as the location of Jesus' death and ascension. The arrest of Jesus and his passion as well as the events after the resurrection take place near to the city.[14] The disciples return to Jerusalem: καὶ ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 24:33), just as his parents returned there in 2:45. The same verb ὑποστρέφω is used, which will reappear in the last phrase of the Gospel yet again in connection with Jerusalem: ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης (Lk 24:52).[15] With this device of circularity the narrative function of Jerusalem is emphasized: the Third Gospel begins in Jerusalem with the visitation of Zechariah, and ends in the holy city.[16]

Jerusalem also becomes a link between the first volume of Lucan work and the second: the words inspired by Isaiah 2:3 a statement that repentance and the forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. These words inspired by Isaiah 2:3: καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ "and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Lk 24:47), prepare the ground for the proclamation of the mission in Acts (1:8,22; 10:37).

Lohse (Eduard Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," *Evangelische Theologie* 14 (1954): 256–75 and Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortess Press, 1982 originally published as *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1954).

12 Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 800.

13 Riccardo Maisano, "Traduzione nella lingua greca e latina della pericope della Trasfigurazione," in *Studi sull'Europa Orientale. Omaggio a A. Bongo, G. Carageani, C. Nicas, A. Wilkoń*, eds. I. C. Fortino and E. Çali (Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale": Dipartimento di Studi dell'Europa Orientale, 2007), 261–72; 266–67.

14 Emaus in Luke 24:13.

15 Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus*, 75.

16 Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1591.

1 The travel narrative: Jerusalem as a final destination

Leaving aside the prologue and the infancy narrative, it is possible to discern three main sections in the Gospel of Luke: first, the ministry in Galilee (Lk 3:1–9:50), then a long journey narrative which Luke expands on in comparison to Mark and Matthew (Lk 9:51– 19:27 or 19:44) and, finally, the ministry and passion of Jesus in Jerusalem (Lk 19:28–24:53). The reason for the threefold structure is that Luke follows the Gospel of Mark as a main source, except for the so-called central section, where he departs from the Marcan order. In this central portion of the Gospel, Luke put the most of the material which he derived from his other sources: the Q source, or, on the Farrer theory, from Matthew, and from his special material (called also L).[17] The particularity of the travel narrative is that Jesus is mainly teaching, he does not perform miracles, perhaps for narrative reasons; and tension is built up as he approaches his destiny in Jerusalem.[18] The so-called travel notices consist in the mentions of Jesus' being on his way towards the city.[19] From the beginning of the travel narrative Jesus predicts his own fate and his death in Jerusalem is the fulfillment of what has been written.

The traditional delineation of the travel narrative considers 19:27 as a final verse, and 19:28 as a beginning of a pericope of the Jerusalem entry (19:28–19:40). However, few scholars sustain that Luke 19:28–29 and the lament over

17 On Lucan special material: Burton Scott Easton, "Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 29 (1910): 139–80; id. "The Special Source of the Third Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 30 (1911): 78–103; Friedrich Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 5; Tübingen: Mohr, 1959); Kim Paffenroth, *The Story of Jesus According to L* (Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series 147, Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997); for the Proto-Luke hypothesis: Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

18 The discussion on the travel narrative: Frank J. Matera, "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51–19:46): A Conflict with Israel," *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 51 (1993): 57–77. The Old Testament model for the travel narrative: David Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 14–44.

19 διεπορεύετο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας (Lk 13:22); πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι (Lk 13:33); Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί (Luk 14:25) Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας. (Lk 17:11); ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 18:31); ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχώ (Lk 18:35); διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλὴμ αὐτόν (Lk 19:11); ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα (Lk 19:28).

Jerusalem in 19:41–44 are the climax of the travel narrative, which concludes at 19:44.[20] Opting for this division it can be observed clearly that, while during his Galilean ministry Jesus showed no interest for the city, Jerusalem becomes his main goal from 9:51 to 19:44. In this manner, the narrative concept of the author becomes evident: the travel narrative begins with the rejection in Samaria 9:51–56 and concludes with the final rejection in Jerusalem. Jerusalem not only remains a central motif for Luke from 9:51 to the final of his gospel but serves also as a starting place for Acts 2:1.

2 The narrative shift in 9:51: Jesus sets his face to Jerusalem

Verse 9:51 is an important narrative point in the Gospel of Luke. Here for the first time Jesus reveals that his Galilean ministry is finished and announces his intention to go to Jerusalem.[21] The section 9:51–56 is considered by some scholars, due to many Semitic elements,[22] as originating in the pre-Lucan source L.[23]

20 Denaux proposes to divide the Third Gospel not in three, but in two main parts, the second part being 9:51–24:53 and to treat the travel narrative from 9:51 to 19:44 as a one of subsections of this second major part, Denaux, "The Delineation of the Lukan Travel Narrative within the Overall Structure of the Gospel of Luke," in Adelbert Denaux, *Studies in the Gospel of Luke. Structure, Language and Theology* (Tilburg Theological Series 4; Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2010), 4, 21, previously published in *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, ed. Camille Focant (Bibliotheca Ephemeridium Theologicarum Lovaniensium 110; Leuven: University Press – Peeters, 1993), 359–92.

21 Craig Evans, "'He Set His Face': On the Meaning of Luke 9:51," in *Luke and Scripture. The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001), 94–5, originally published as Craig A. Evans, "'He set his face': A Note on Luke 9:51," *Biblica* 63 (1982): 545–48 and "'He Set His Face': Luke 9:51 Once Again," *Biblica* 68 (1987): 80–84. For some reflections on the narrative force of 9:51 and the debate over a possible parallel to Acts 19: 21, see: Armand Puig i Tàrreich, "Les voyages à Jérusalem (Lc 9,51; Ac 19,21)," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden (Bibliotheca Ephemeridium Theologicarum Lovaniensium 142; Leuven: University Press, 1999), 493–505.

22 Listed by Evans, "He Set His Face": 94–95. On Septuagintalisms in Luke: Hedley Frederick Davis Sparks, "The Semitisms of St Luke's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1943): 129–38.

23 Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Translated by John Marsh; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), 25–6; 385–86; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 826.

Flusser argued that verses 51–53 are copied from a Hebrew source.[24] But 9:51 is in all probability a verse of Lucan composition:[25]

> Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 9:51).
> "When the days drew near for him to be taken up, he set his face to go to Jerusalem."

This verse precedes the rejection in Samaria on the way to Jerusalem. According to Luke, Jesus went to Jerusalem through Samaria, as was custom of the Galileans (Josephus, *Ant.* 20.118).[26] Luke explains that the villagers in Samaria rejected Jesus (οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν) "because his face was set toward Jerusalem" (ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, Lk 9:53), literally "his face was proceeding to Jerusalem.[27] Josephus mentions the opposition of the Samaritans to the pilgrims travelling in the direction of Jerusalem for the festivals (*Bell.* 2.232, on a violent conflict between Samaritans from the village called Geman and Jews who were going to Jerusalem for the feast of Tabernacles; see also *Ant.* 20.118–123), so it is probable that the hostility of Samaritans was simply directed towards any Jew who was travelling to the holy city through their territory.

The focus on Jerusalem begins from this point (from Mk 10:1–32). Craig Evans saw a hint of the coming judgment to the city in the expression "he set his

24 David Flusser, "Lukas 9:51–56 - Ein hebräisches Fragment," in *The New Testament Age. Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, ed. William C. Weinrich (2 vols.; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1984), vol. 1, 165–79.

25 I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Text Commentary; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 403; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 826. The Old Testament model of Elijah departing for Jordan was proposed by Thomas L. Brodie, "The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51–56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1,1–2,6)," *Biblica* 70/1 (1989): 96–109.

26 In Gospels of Mark and Matthew, Jesus went to Jerusalem through Perea. Luke's knowledge of geography of the region was vague: cf. Chester Charlton McCown, "The Geography of Luke's Central Section," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (1938): 51–66.

27 The rejection of Samaritans according to Giblin is an argument for the lack of the idea of judgment in 9:51: if Samaritans knew that Jesus intended to go against the city, they would have been more favourable, Charles Homer Giblin, *The Destruction of Jerusalem According to Luke's Gospel* (Analecta Biblica 107; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1985), 32. To this Evans ("He Set His Face": Luke 9:51), 52, replies that the Samaritans were hostile to Jesus considering him as a Jewish prophet who is to fulfil his destiny in Jerusalem.

face to go to Jerusalem."[28] The verb στηρίζω in the LXX denotes a firmness and purpose.[29] In the Old Testament, God sets his face against rebellious people: καὶ στηριῶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκεῖνον (Ezek 14:8). The expression στηρίζειν τό πρόσωπον has a hostile meaning: υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη Ισραηλ καὶ προφήτευσον ἐπ᾽ αὐτά (Ezek 6:2), and is connected with judgment.[30] The expression is frequently used in Ezekiel and since Luke makes recourse to major prophets in all his predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem, it provides the best context to understand it.[31] In Ezekiel, στηρίζειν τό πρόσωπον ἐπί is used in particular with the prophecy against Israel an Jerusalem: υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη Ισραηλ καὶ προφήτευσον ἐπ᾽ αὐτά (Ezek 6:2), and υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ Θαιμαν καὶ ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ Δαρωμ καὶ προφήτευσον ἐπὶ δρυμὸν ἡγούμενον Ναγεβ (Ezek 21:2); and the most poignant διὰ τοῦτο προφήτευσον υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου καὶ στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ Ιερουσαλημ καὶ ἐπίβλεψον ἐπὶ τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ προφητεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ισραηλ (Ezek 21:7).

In 9:51, the noun ἀνάλημψις occurs, which is a *hapax* in the New Testament. The meaning of ἀνάλημψις in ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ (Lk 9:51) can be twofold. In Jewish-Greek literature ἀνάλημψις can mean "death" (Ps. Sol 4:18).[32] But since the verb ἀναλαμβάνω is used with the meaning "to be taken to heaven" in the LXX (for Elijah in 2 Kgs 2:11), and also by Luke in the Acts (1:2, 11, 22) the meaning "ascension" is preferable.[33] According to Denaux, ἀνάλημψις means more properly a bodily ascension.[34] Therefore, all the mentions of approaching Jerusalem, are clearly connected with the perspective of ascension, preannounced by the verb of fulfillment συμπλερόω (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ).

28 Evans, "He Set His Face," but Giblin does not agree with Evans and does not see the hint of judgment, *Destruction*, 32.

29 Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003): 570. Also, Giblin, *Destruction,* 32; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 823; Marshall, *Luke*, 405.

30 Isa 50:7, ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν, where the expression denotes determination.

31 Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 828.

32 ἐν μονώσει ἀτεκνίας τὸ γῆρας αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀνάλημψιν (Ps. Sol. 4:18); Evans, "He Set His Face," 97, note 16.

33 Evans adduces other examples, "He Set His Face," 97. It is worth to note the interesting suggestion of Flusser, "Lukas 9:51–56," 167, that the noun ἀνάλημψις is a result of a mistranslation of a Hebrew verb *ʿlyh* that had the meaning of "to go with a pilgrimage."

34 Denaux, "Travel Narrative," 17–21.

3 The destruction of Jerusalem

Another peculiarity of the Luke's Gospel is the repeated mention of the impending destruction in store for Jerusalem.[35] Luke has four passages that speak of the fall of Jerusalem: 13:34–35, 19:41–44, 21:20–24; 23:27–31, one of which comes probably from the Q source, while the other three are unique to Luke and have no correspondence in other Gospels. The singularity of Luke's Gospel is the prediction of the fall of the entire city. Mark and Matthew are concerned rather with the profanation of the Temple and the cult. Indeed, Conzelmann stressed the fact that for Luke the city and the Temple are separate.[36] The destruction of Jerusalem is seen in terms similar to God's retribution for the unfaithfulness of Israel. The judgment is due to the city's failure to recognize the moment of visitation (οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, Lk 19:44), which means that Jerusalem will not accept the coming Jesus as a Messiah. The oracles against Jerusalem are strikingly similar to the Jewish prophetic oracles of judgment, and follow the basic outline of the so-called prophetic lawsuits or *rîb* patterns, where the prophet states the offence of the guilty and announces their punishment.[37] Luke, due to his profound knowledge of the Scriptures, describes the punishment of Jerusalem using Old Testament allusions and in particular he makes recourse to prophetic books in the LXX version.

There is a broad consensus in scholarship that Luke wrote his Gospel after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus' forces.[38] It is, however, a matter of discussion whether those events influenced the Lucan redaction of the passages concerned

35 On the destruction of Jerusalem in Synoptic Gospels: Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), the analysis of the passages of Luke in this book are, however, influenced by the adherence of the author to the proto-Luke theory; Charles Homer Giblin, *The Destruction of Jerusalem According to Luke's Gospel* (Analecta Biblica 107; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1985).

36 Conzelmann, *Theology*, 75. This opinion was however heavily criticised: I. Howard Marshall, *Luke Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Zondervan, 1970), 154–55.

37 The formal analysis of Jerome Neyrey shows the basic outline of the *rib* in all the sayings about the destruction of Jerusalem: Jerome Neyrey, "Jesus' Address to the Women of Jerusalem (Lk 23.27–31) - A Prophetic Judgment Oracle," *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983): 74–86. The OT prophetic lawsuit was broadly studied: Kirsten Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge. An Investigation of the Prophetic Lawsuit (Rib-Pattern)*; (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 9; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978).

38 Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 56–57.

with the Temple and Jerusalem.[39] The analysis of the passages pertinent to the doom of Jerusalem, three of which are unique to the Gospel of Luke, shows that Luke took into account events that occurred after the completion of both the Gospel of Mark and the Q source. Moreover, a certain similarity with the descriptions of the destruction of Jerusalem in the works of Josephus can be noted in Lucan predictions. Even if the use of Josephus by Luke is denied by most scholars, there are strong arguments to support his indebtedness at least on the Jewish War, and some arguments that lead to suspicion of his knowledge of the Jewish Antiquities too.[40]

4 The first prophecy on the destruction of Jerusalem, Lk 13:33–35

As seen above, Jesus in Luke 9:51 demonstrated his determination to go to Jerusalem to meet his fate, and it is possible to see even in this passage the prevision of the judgment for the city. The first explicit warning to Jerusalem comes, however, with verses 13:34–35. This pericope can also be seen as a prophetic judgment against the city,[41] even if not all scholars accept this view.[42] However, to introduce this pericope it must be considered together with the preceding passage that contains a warning to Jesus by the Pharisees that Herod wants to kill him and Jesus' statement about his destiny (13:31–33).[43] These verses are specific

39 Conzelman, *Theology*, 134–35; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1255.

40 The first treatment of the argument was in Max Kraenkel, *Josephus und Lukas: der schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtsreibers auf den christlichen nachgewiesen* (Lepizig: H. Haessel, 1894). Whereas the use of the Jewish War as a source does not involve the redating of Luke, the knowledge of Antiquities by Luke implies that his writings must have been composed after 93–94 CE, which contradicts the traditional dating of Luke between 80–85 CE. To my opinion, there is much evidence to reconsider the use of Antiquities by Luke, cf. the discussion in Barbara Shellard, *New Light on Luke. Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 215; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004), 31–34; also Steve Mason, *Josephus and New Testament* (2nd ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003).

41 Bultmann (*History*, 114) considered the saying an original Jewish prophecy.

42 Giblin, *Destruction*, 4.

43 For the recent overview of the interpretations of the verses 13:31–32 and in particular the meaning of the temporal expressions "today, tomorrow and the next day" (cf. Exo 19:11; Hos 6:2), see: Riccardo Maisano, *Vangelo secondo Luca*. Introduzione, traduzione e commento (Roma: Carocci, 2017), 252–53; for the possible Aramaic background: Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Four Gospels: A New Translation* (New York–London: Harper & Brothers, 1933), 310.

to the Gospel of Luke, and are often considered as coming from his *Sondergut*.[44] A closer analysis of verses 13:31–33 shows Lucan characteristics and since they fit into the narrative motif of the fulfilment in Jerusalem, it seems more probable that they do not come from the L source but are for the most part Luke's composition.[45] Jesus replies to the Pharisees in an enigmatic way that, after having finished his activity of exorcism and healing, he has to complete his work on the third day (καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι, Lk 13:32). Here, as the verb πληρόω in 9:31, which means completion of the destiny, appear another two verbs linked with fulfilment, ἀποτελέω and τελειόω.[46]

Jesus continues:

> πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 13:33).
>
> Yet today, tomorrow, and the next day I must be on my way, because it is impossible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem.

He clearly states what was only preannounced in 9:51, the necessity to fulfil his destiny in the holy city. Because of this necessity Jesus must keep going: δεῖ με … πορεύεσθαι. The verb πορεύομαι belongs to Luke's preferred vocabulary.[47]

44 Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1933), 158.

45 The typical Lucan traits are ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, πορέυομαι. Fitzmyer assigns the verses to the L source, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1028. Denaux sustains that even if there is a core of another tradition, the verses as a literary unity are a product of Lucan editorial activity: "L'hypocrisie des Pharisees et le dessein de Dieu: Analyse de Lc., XIII, 31–33," in A. Denaux, *Studies*: 181–222, previously published in *L'Evanglie de Luc: The Gospel of Luke*, ed. F. Neirynck (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 32; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 155–95. Paffenroth excludes the pericope, apart from verse 13:13b–32, from the material he assigns to the L source, Paffenroth, *The Story of Jesus*, 58; 95.

46 According to Goulder, the two verbs have been modelled on Matthew 26:2 and 26:1, Goulder, *Luke*, 576. It is a matter of discussion if τελειοῦμαι here has a temporal meaning (like in τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας Lk 2:32, interestingly also in Jerusalem context), or means "to be perfected" or "to be brought to an end." For the discussion: Giuseppe Ferraro, "Oggi e domani e il terzo giorno" (osservazioni su Luca 13,32.33), *Rivista Biblica* 16 (1968): 397–407; J. Duncan M. Derrett, "The Lucan Christ and Jerusalem: τελειοῦμαι (Lk 13,32)," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75 (1984): 36–43.

47 Adelbert Denaux and Rita Corstjens, *The Vocabulary of Luke. An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel* (Leuven–Paris–Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009), 522–24.

The saying recalls other words of Jesus in Lk 9:22, εἰπὼν ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι, "The Son of Man must undergo great suffering, and be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised."

Verse 13:33 finishes with the mention of Jerusalem and the next pericope begins with the address to the city herself: Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε (Lk 13:34), "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those who are sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing."

The apostrophe, with the double vocative, recalls the lament of David for his son Absalom in 2 Sam 18:33.[48] It is not frequent that Jesus shows emotions in the Gospel of Luke, who in general downplays the emotions of Jesus from his sources, but he retains the compassion of Jesus here. The verses belong to the Double Tradition (parallel in Mt 23:37–39) and there are only minimal differences in wording between Matthew and Luke.[49] From the form critical point of view Bultmann considers the oracle to be a minatory saying, Neyrey instead a judgment oracle.[50] The saying in fact resembles typical Jewish oracles of judgment in structure, and with its double vocative "Jerusalem, Jerusalem" is strikingly similar to the oracle against Galilee uttered by Joḥanan ben Zakkai, who accused the Galileans of the rejection of the sage one.[51] Oracles of judgment

48 LXX: "υἱέ μου Αβεσσαλωμ υἱέ μου υἱέ μου Αβεσσαλωμ" (2Sam 19:1).

49 Luke has aorist infinitive ἐπισυνάξαι (Lk 13:34), meanwhile Matthew ἐπισυναγαγεῖν (Mt 23:37), Luke τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν (Lk 13:34), Matthew τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς (Mt 23:37), it seems that Matthew retains the Q version: cf. *The Critical Edition of Q*, 420–23. On the arguments for Luke using Matthew here, see: Goulder, *Luke*, 579. On the other hand, for Matthew having used Luke in this passage, see: Edwards, *The Hebrew Gospel*, 136–37.

50 Bultmann, *History*, 114–15.

51 David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 144–45; Maisano, *Vangelo di Luca*, 253; François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Evangelisch-Katolischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament III/2; Zürich und Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1991), 446–47; Neyrey, "Jesus' adress": 79–80; Giblin (*Destruction*, 38–43) does consider the pericope as an oracle of judgment.

are often employed in the Q source, which shows in particular much concern towards the final judgment.[52]

The spelling of Jerusalem is Ἰερουσαλήμ, which is typical of Luke, not Ἰεροσόλυμα as Matthew prefers.[53] This is only the second – and last – time, where Jerusalem is mentioned in Q.[54] The Q community was, unlike Luke, not particularly concerned with Jerusalem. It seems that the attitude of the Q community was hostile to cities in general, as the Q source presents all the towns negatively because of their lack of faith, contrasting their corruption with simple rural life.[55]

The saying introduces the theme of a persecuted prophet, which was quite widespread in Judaism and Early Christianity.[56] The Q source displays a special interest in this motif, which appears in 6:22–23 (Mt 5:11–12), Q 11:47–48 (Mt 23:29–31); Q 11:49–51 (Mt 23:34–36). The Q community considered John the Baptist and Jesus to be followers of the prophets of the Scripture, encountering persecution because of their message. However, whereby Matthew does not particularly elaborate this motif, Luke gives it a special relevance and connects it to the final rejection of Jesus and his death.[57] The necessity of Jesus' death in

52 Cf. the woes for the Galilean villages in Q. Brian Han Gregg analyses the final judgment oracles in Q, and the authenticity of those sayings, he mentions briefly also other judgment oracles which not necessarily refer to the final judgment: Brian Han Gregg, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

53 Matthew retains the spelling Ἰερουσαλήμ here and it is the only instance when he uses this form. So the arguments of Goulder that Luke copied this passage from Matthew are weak. The Lament over Jerusalem is problematic in the case of Farrer/Goulder theory, because there are no words typical to Matthew, and two words typical to Luke.

54 In Luke 4:9, as mentioned before, it was probably Luke who introduced the name of Jerusalem, which lacked in Q. The double vocative in Luke 13:34/Mt 23:37 is considered by Goulder a characteristic of Matthew (Goulder, *Luke*, 579), but it is also used not infrequently by Luke (10:41; 8:24) and, more importantly, also in the context of admonition – Luke 22:31, cf. Jer 22:29 for the Old Testament use of double vocative for emphasis.

55 John Kloppenborg, *Synoptic Problem. Collected Essays*, Chapter 9: "City and Wasteland," 232, originally published as "City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q)," in *How Gospels Begin*, ed. Dennis E. Smith (Semeia 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 145–60. Kloppenborg explains the hostile attitude of Q towards the urban centres as also a result of the natural opposition of the rural community to the economic exploitation of the villages, ibid., 233.

56 1 Thess 2:15; Acts 7:52; Aune, *Prophecy*, 157–59.

57 Aune, *Prophecy*, 159. The important passage in which Jesus identifies himself with the destiny of the prophets who are not recognized, is the pericope of the rejection at the synagogue of Nazareth, where Jesus says οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ (Lk 4:24).

Jerusalem was alluded previously to in Luke 6:22–23, 11:47 and in the pericope of the Transfiguration.

It is probable that in the Q source the saying was a final part of a longer section focused on the polemic with traditional Judaism, and that Luke decided to extrapolate it from its original context, and inserted it in the travel narrative to fit the ending of the verse 13:33 where Jerusalem is mentioned.[58] In fact, Matthew employs the saying as a climax of judgment sayings against Pharisees, scribes, and against "this generation" (Mt 23:13–36) which took place at the Jerusalem Temple (Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπορεύετο (Mt 24:1). In the opinion of Giblin, in the case of Matthew, the words of Jesus against Jerusalem are the consequence of the hostility he faced from the leaders of the city, who opposed him.[59] In Luke, on the other hand, the lament for Jerusalem is not connected to the actual rejection, which had not yet occurred, but is grounded in the OT typology of Jerusalem as the city which rejects the prophets. These observations by Giblin on the narrative setting of the pericope are very important. It is also noteworthy that the present participles ἀποκτείνουσα and λιθοβολοῦσα could indeed refer to the general attitude of Jerusalem towards the prophets, as something that repeats itself in history. In fact, the saying recalls the OT tradition and is not connected with the Roman destruction of the city, because the Q source presumably does not know of the Jewish War.[60] However the problem arises with the syntax of the phrase; Jesus first directs his words to the city which is referred to singular ἀποκτείνουσα and λιθοβολοῦσα,[61] then he describes the negative reaction to his attempts to protect the city using the plural καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε (13:34). It is also interesting to note that he seems to describe the rejection as an action that had repeated itself ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου. Since the Synoptic Gospels, differently to John's,[62] mention that Jesus visited Jerusalem once, it could be a trace of a tradition, which knows other journeys by Jesus to Jerusalem.

58 Bultmann, *History*, 114; Conzelmann, *Theology* 132–33; Maisano, *Il Vangelo di Luca*, 253.

59 Giblin, *Destruction*, 40.

60 The logical assumption is that Q precedes Luke and Matthew, but there are some doubts as to whether Q is necessarily prior to 70 CE – see: discussion in Christopher Tuckett, *From the Sayings to the Gospel* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 328; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 450.

61 The city can be considered as collective. For Luke λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους anticipates the stoning of Stephen (Acts 7:58–59) and Paul (14:19).

62 John mentions other Jesus' visits to Jerusalem: 2:13; 7:10; 12:12.

ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. λέγω [δὲ] ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [ἥξει ὅτε] εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (Lk 13:35).

See, your house is left to you. And I tell you, you will not see me until the time comes when you say, 'Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.'

There is no consensus on the meaning of οἶκος in 13:35a. In LXX, οἶκος can mean the Temple (Isa 56:7), but as a collective noun, it can also refer to the nation or descendants (Jer 38:33). Some scholars argue that since Luke rarely uses οἶκος with reference to the Temple, in the oracle he intends the whole city.[63] This interpretation seems rather forced, given that Matthew 27:38 also uses ὁ οἶκος, which comes from Q, and it is an allusion to Jeremiah 22:5 ὅτι εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος (Jer 22:5).[64] The house, ὁ οἶκος, refers to the Temple which is to be abandoned by God as a result of the tribulation.[65] The reference to the Temple after the address to the city in the previous verse seems to form a climax: the warning of destruction comes first to Jerusalem, and second – to its most important place, the centre of the Jewish cult, which will not be spared either. John Kloppenborg makes an important observation that the abandoned house recalls the motif of the God who leaves the holy place after the capture by enemies (*evocatio deorum*), also known from the Old Testament and Jewish literature (ἐγκαταλέλοιπα τὸν οἶκόν μου, Jer 12:7).[66]

5 The rejection of the Gospel

After the first oracle Luke continues his narrative pursuing the theme of fulfilment in Jerusalem, and as a reminder that Jesus is always in movement he uses the travel notices.[67] The passion prediction in 18:31–32 underlines that "the

63 Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 244; Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse* (Analecta Biblica 28, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), 76, Weinert. However, Luke uses οἶκος meaning 'temple' in his Gospel three times: εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk 6:4); μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου (Lk 11:51); γέγραπται· καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἰκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς (Lk 19:46).

64 The manuscripts D, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ and others after ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν add ἔρημος, an attempt of harmonisation with Matthew.

65 John Kloppenborg notes the similarity of Q 13:35a to Mark 13:2 (the verb ἀφίημι which leads to the suspicion of contact between Mark and Q 13:35, cf. discussion of John Kloppenborg, in "Evocatio Deorum and the Date of Mark," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/3 (2005): 419–50, 447–48.

66 On the motif of *evocatio deorum* known from the Roman praxis, and its possible reminiscence in Mark 13:2, see: John Kloppenborg, "Evocatio Deorum."

67 The study of the section is in Jan Lambrecht, "Reading and Rereading Lk 18:31–22,6," in *À cause de l'Évangile. Mélanges offerts à Dom Jacques Dupont* (Lectio Divina 123;

going up to Jerusalem" (ἀναβαίνω) is necessary to fulfill the destiny predicted by the prophets.

> Παραλαβὼν δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· (Lk 18:31) παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται (Lk 18:32).
>
> Jesus took the Twelve aside and told them, "Look, we are going up to Jerusalem, and everything that is written by the prophets about the Son of Man will be accomplished. For he will be handed over to the Gentiles; and he will be mocked and insulted and spat upon.

Jan Lambrecht noted that the passion prediction in 18:31 opens a new Gospel section which is concerned with approaching to Jerusalem, and in which Luke consciously limits geographical notions, because he wants to concentrate the narrative on the activity of Jesus in the holy city.[68]

6 The Parable of the Pounds

Near the end of his journey Jesus recounts the Parable of the Pounds, which is also known as the Kingship Parable.[69] The parable is connected implicitly to the motif of the destruction of Jerusalem because its focus is the lack of recognition of the kingship claims and the punishment of the opponents. The parable is assigned to the Double Tradition, though Matthew places his Parable of the Talents in the context of the Eschatological Discourse.[70] The Parable of the Pounds in Luke has an important

Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985), 585–612, also Jan Lambrecht, "The Parable of the Throne Claimant," in *Understanding What One Reads: New Testament Essays*, ed. Jan Lambrecht and Veronica Koperski (Leuven–Paris–Dudley: Peeters, 2003), 112–22.

68 Jan Lambrecht, "The Parable of the Throne Claimant," 114.

69 It is impossible here to give more space to the Parable, see: Jean Nöel Aletti, "Parabole des mines et/ou parabole du roi: Remarques sur l'écriture parabolique de Luc," in *Les Paraboles évangeliques. Perspectives nouvelles. XIIe congrès de l'ACEF*, ed. J. Delorme (Lectio Divina 135; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 309–32; for the narrative setting and the connection to the Jerusalem entry: Adelbert Denaux, "The Parable of the King-Judge (Lk 19,12–27) and its Relation to the Entry Story (Lk 19,29–44)," in Denaux, *Studies*, 253–73, originally published in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93 (2002): 35–57.

70 Very little verbal agreement between Luke's and Matthew versions lead some scholars to consider the two versions as belonging to two different parables told by Jesus cf. P. Joüon, "La parabole des mines (Luc 19:13–27) et la parabole des talents (Matthieu 25: 14–30), *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 29 (1939): 489–94.

narrative function. Luke Timothy Johnson noted the editorial link between the kingship parable and the entry to Jerusalem (19:29–44).[71] Jesus tells the parable "because he was near Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately" (Ἀκουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα προσθεὶς εἶπεν παραβολὴν διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἰερουσαλὴμ αὐτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅτι παραχρῆμα μέλλει ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι: Luk 19:11).[72] The parable is situated between verses 19:11 and 19:28 which form an *inclusio* from two indications of moving towards Jerusalem.[73] In 19:28, which concludes the parable the verb ἀναβαίνω (cf. 18:31) appears again, and Jesus goes up to Jerusalem (ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα).[74]

The good servants of the parable, as the disciples of Jesus, recognize the king's authority, the enemies who did not want the king instead, bear resemblance to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The punishment of those who did not recognize the king in 19:27 corresponds to the destruction of the city in 19:43–44, of which, in fact, Jesus will be concerned shortly afterwards. The approaching to Jerusalem is underlined again three times by use of other verb of movement, ἐγγίζω.[75]

7 Jesus' lament over Jerusalem (Lk 19:41–44)

The second prediction of the fall of Jerusalem (19:41–44) is found only in the Gospel of Luke, and it concludes the travel narrative.[76] The travel narrative begins with Jesus' decision to go to Jerusalem, and has its climax in the rejection

71 Luke Timothy Johnson, "The Lukan Kingship Parable (Lk 19,11–27)," *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 139–59.

72 Luke makes Jesus recount the parable because the people were thinking of the imminent parousia. The parable makes it is clear that the return of the master to judge his servants is not imminent (he went to the distant country ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν Lk 19:12). This is one of the places where Luke seems to rewrite his sources because he is aware of the delay of the parousia, cf. Christopher M. Tuckett, "Luke," in John Riches, William R. Tellford and Christopher M. Tuckett, *Synoptic Gospels* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 276 (originally published as Christopher M. Tuckett, *Luke* (New Testament Guides 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

73 Jan Lambrecht, "The Parable of the Throne Claimant," 115.

74 In 19:11 Luke uses as his usual the biblical name Ἱερουσαλήμ but in 19:28 the Hellenistic Ἱεροσόλυμα, the use of the profane name may be due to the fact that the city will not recognize Jesus.

75 ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανία[ν] (Lk 19:29); ἐγγίζοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν (Lk 19:37); ὡς ἤγγισεν ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν (Lk 19:41), see: Giblin, *Destruction*, 47.

76 In the opinion of many scholars, the limit of the travel narrative is 19:28, the last verse of the Parable of the Pounds. For the overview of the scholarship, see: Denaux,

of the city to recognize the Messiah. For the third time Luke repeats that Jesus was approaching the city connected to his final rejection:[77]

41Καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν
42λέγων ὅτι εἰ ἔγνως ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην· νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου.
43ὅτι ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ ἐχθροί σου χάρακά σοι καὶ περικυκλώσουσίν σε καὶ συνέξουσίν σε πάντοθεν,
44καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν σοί, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου (Lk 19:41–44).

41As he came near and saw the city, he wept over it,
42saying, "If you, even you, had only recognized on this day the things that make for peace! But now they are hidden from your eyes.
43Indeed, the days will come upon you, when your enemies will set up ramparts around you and surround you, and hem you in on every side.
44They will crush you to the ground, you and your children within you, and they will not leave within you one stone upon another; because you did not recognize the time of your visitation from God."

The guilt of Jerusalem consists in not having recognized ἔγνως (Lk 19:42) the sent one. The oracle against the city can be better understood on recalling that Jesus pronounced the woes on the Galilean villages Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum on his way to Jerusalem in Q 10:13; 15, and the first oracle of destruction of Jerusalem in Q 13:34–35.[78] The main difference is that Q 13:35 predicted the abandonment of the Temple, whereas in 19:43–44 Luke describes the destruction of the entire city. Since the verses are peculiar to Luke, many scholars have seen them as an original oracle of Jesus - as Fitzmyer[79] and Manson.[80] Bultman postulated their origin in an old Aramaic source.[81] Lloyd Gaston and

"Travel Narrative," 10–11. Luke in this section was following Mark, but he inserted the verses 19:41–44. Note the response to the Pharisees: ἐὰν οὗτοι σιωπήσουσιν, οἱ λίθοι κράξουσιν (Lk 19:40), an allusion to Habakuk 2:11 διότι λίθος ἐκ τοίχου βοήσεται καὶ κάνθαρος ἐκ ξύλου φθέγξεται αὐτά. Habakuk meant the coming of the Chaldeans to destroy Israel as a punishment.

77 Jesus approached Jerusalem by the way of Bethphage and Bethany (Lk 19:29), and then descending from Mount Olivet (Lk 19:37). However, the expression "to go up to Jerusalem" is also frequently used in the LXX: ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς Ιερουσαλημ (2Sam 8:7), etc.

78 Bultmann classifies 19:41–44 to the admonitions, *History*, 123.

79 *Luke X–XXIV*, 1253.

80 Thomas W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1949), 320.

81 Bultmann, *History*, 123.

Kim Paffenroth considered the possibility of it being pre-Lucan and coming from the L source.[82] The passage, however, shows no clearly un-Lucan vocabulary.[83] The only trait that could be considered pre-Lucan is the parataxis, which Luke usually avoids.[84] In 19:43–44 καὶ appears seven times between verbs.[85] The mention of Jesus weeping: "seeing the city he wept over it": ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν (Lk 19:41) is also not usual for Luke who normally avoids any references to Jesus' emotions, but the LXX allusion can explain it.[86] Furthermore, it is poignant that Luke mentions weeping on the destiny of Jerusalem twice: the first time before Jesus' entry, and the second time, during Jesus' way to the cross (Lk 23:28): it seems a stylistic device.

The passage contains numerous scriptural allusions and in particular from the major prophets (Isa 29:3, 37:33; Jer 6:6; 22:8–9, 23:38–40; Ezek 4:2).[87] On these grounds Dodd decided that the oracle in Luke is composed entirely from the Old Testament language and is not connected in any way to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.[88]

The saying in Q 13:44–45 shows that there existed a tradition of Jesus' prophecy on the destruction of Jerusalem. As aforementioned, the other prophecies of the fall of Jerusalem were circulating in the 1 century. Josephus records a certain Jesus ben Ananias who in 62 CE prophesized the destruction of the Temple (*Bell.*

82 Gaston, *No Stone*, 359; Paffenroth, *The Story of Jesus*, 38–9, but finally, because of the lack of evident pre-Lucan characteristics does not include the verses in his reconstruction of L.

83 According to Jeremias to the pre-Lucan vocabulary belong ἐγγίζω and ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι: Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980), 157; 181. Also Easton "Linguistic Evidence," 147 considers ἐγγίζω characteristic of L.

84 Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 108.

85 Luke usually uses τε/δὲ instead, Cadbury, *The Style*, 142–43.

86 Also the mention of crying "seeing the city he wept over it": ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν (Lk 19:41) which is not typical of Luke, who as mentioned before downplays Jesus' emotions, is maybe due to the Scriptural allusions (ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν Gen 50:1; κλαίουσιν ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ Num 11:13; καὶ ἔκλαυσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ 2Ki 8:11. Weeping over the city will be mentioned by Luke another time in 23:28 the address to the Daughters of Jerusalem.

87 The Old Testament background of the prediction in 19:41–44 and in 21:20–24 is described in Felix Flückiger, "Luk 21, 20–24 und die Zerstörung Jerusalems," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 28 (1972): 385–90; Charles Harold Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation,'" *Journal of Roman Studies* 37 (1947): 47–54.

88 Also, according to Riecke, *Synoptic Prophecies*, 122.

6:300–309) and in his prophecy he quoted from Jeremiah chapter 7.[89] The prediction in Lucan special material is different from that in Q 13:34–35, because it contains a description of the siege (19:43), with rather technical vocabulary (χάραξ, περικυκλόω, συνέχω) and the subsequent complete demolition of the city. According to Bultmann, Luke intended these verses as a prophecy *ex eventu* for the capture of Jerusalem in 70.[90] The simplest explanation is that Luke had in mind the Roman siege of the city, which he described using OT imagery.[91] So either Luke was drawing from the prophetic books to present in the LXX style his knowledge on the events of the siege by Titus' forces, or he used a source that knew of the destruction of the city.[92] That the special material of Luke is posterior to the Roman conquest and knows of the destruction of Jerusalem, has already been suggested by Weiss.[93] In my opinion, the heavily Septuagintal style outweighs the claim for the Lucan authorship of the passage, because the L passages usually neither imitate nor quote the LXX extensively.[94] Luke could have redacted himself an oral tradition, and inserted into the movement towards Jerusalem.[95] In any case his authorship of the passage is more probable than the use of a written source. It is opportune to note that, even if the knowledge of Josephus by Luke is usually denied by scholars, Josephus also spoke of the doom

89 φωνὴ ἀπὸ δύσεως φωνὴ ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων φωνὴ ἐπὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ τὸν ναόν φωνὴ ἐπὶ νυμφίους καὶ νύμφας φωνὴ ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν πάντα τοῦτο μεθ' ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτωρ κατὰ πάντας τοὺς στενωποὺς περιῄει κεκραγώς. Ben Ananias was also brought before the Roman procurator and released considered a harmless madman (Jos. *Bell.* 6:301). Craig Evans, *From Jesus to the Church. The First Christian Generation* (Louisville– Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 111–15 has suggested that he could have been a member of Jesus movement.

90 Bultmann, *History*, 123.

91 This is also the opinion of Drury, *Tradition*, 105.

92 On Luke imitating the style of the LXX, cf. the style of the infancy narrative. Hedley Frederick Davis Sparks, "The Semitisms of Luke's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1943): 129–38.

93 Bernard Weiss, *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1907), 259. However, Weiss drew this conclusion because he considered the Jerusalem passages as belonging to L, so the argument is circular.

94 Weiss also considered the infancy narratives as belonging to L.

95 The L source, if it were a written document, which is a matter of discussion, consists mainly of the parables and healings. The passages on the destruction of Jerusalem seem not to fit the genre of the L source. The possibility of the oral traditions being a base for the so-called L passages is discussed in Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels. An Examination of a New Paradigm* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996): 284–87.

of Jerusalem that has been foretold (*Bell.* 6.109)[96] and uttered a lament on the destiny of Jerusalem, and stated that the destruction of the city was due to its pollution.[97]

The description in Luke 19:41–44 is modeled on the LXX of Jeremiah who is the main prophet of the fall of Jerusalem. Jeremiah also showed his grief when prophesying the city's doom (Jer 8:18). The image of the siege of Jerusalem (παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ ἐχθροί σου χάρακά σοι (Lk 19:43) comes from Jeremiah 52:4 (περιχαρακόω); περικυκλώσουσίν σε καὶ συνέξουσίν σε πάντοθεν (Lk 19:43) from περιῳκοδόμησαν αὐτὴν τετραπέδοις λίθοις κύκλῳ (Jer 52:4), and καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ πόλις εἰς συνοχήν (Jer 52:5); τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου (Lk 19:44) is parallel to καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς (Jer 6:15).[98] The image of the children crushed on the ground καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί (Lk 19:44) is borrowed from the LXX descriptions as Psalm 136:9 ἐδαφιεῖ τὰ νήπιά σου πρὸς τὴν πέτραν (Psa 136:9, also Nah 3:10; Ezek 31:12). Josephus also uses the noun ἔδαφος in the descriptions of destruction of Samaria and Jerusalem, and in particular, when describing the crushing of children of Jerusalem, albeit for different reasons.[99]

After having uttered the prediction, Jesus entered the Temple (Lk 19:45: Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν). It is surprising, given the emphasis on the approaching to Jerusalem through the Gospel of Luke, that in the moment of climax Luke does not mention explicitly the entry of Jesus in the city. Conzelmann stated that Luke consciously separated the city and the Temple.[100] According to Denaux, Luke's lack of mentioning of Jerusalem is due to the city's guilt in not recognizing

96 τίς οὐκ οἶδεν τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν ἀναγραφὰς καὶ τὸν ἐπιρρέποντα τῇ τλήμονι πόλει χρησμὸν ἤδη ἐνεστῶτα τότε γὰρ ἅλωσιν αὐτῆς προεῖπον ὅταν ὁμοφύλου τις ἄρξῃ φόνου.

97 *Bell* 5.19 τί τηλικοῦτον ὦ τλημονεστάτη πόλις πέπονθας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων οἵ σου τὰ ἐμφύλια μύσῃ πυρὶ καθαροῦντες εἰσῆλθον θεοῦ μὲν γὰρ οὔτε ἧς ἔτι χῶρος οὔτε μένειν ἐδύνασο τάφος οἰκείων γενομένη σωμάτων καὶ πολέμου τὸν ναὸν ἐμφυλίου ποιήσασα πολυάνδριον δύναιο δ' ἂν γενέσθαι πάλιν ἀμείνων εἴγε ποτὲ τὸν πορθήσαντα θεὸν ἐξιλάσῃ.

98 The image of the children crushed to the ground καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί (Lk 19:44) comes from the Psalm 136:9 ἐδαφιεῖ τὰ νήπιά σου πρὸς τὴν πέτραν.

99 *Bell.* 5.433; *Vit.* 99; *Ant.* 5. 248). The difference is that in 5.433 were the inhabitants of the city themselves to do this during the famine. Cf. Dodd, "The Fall," 50; Neyrey, "The Address," 86, note 33.

100 In Mark, Jesus is said to enter both the city and the Temple εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (Mk 11:11); ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (Mk 11:15) Conzelmann, *Theology*, 75.

Jesus.[101] Another compositional choice made by Luke consisted of shortening the description of the purging of the Temple (Mk 11:15–16; Mt 21:12) to only one fact: Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας (Lk 19:45). Goulder observed that the prediction of the fate of Jerusalem could explain why Luke has so abbreviated the Purging of the Temple, omitting all the colorful details from Mark.[102] It is because the cleansing of the Temple is pointless for Luke's Jesus, as the real purging of the city, which did not repent, will come in its destruction.

8 The Parable of the Wicked Tenants Lk 20:9–19[103]

The Parable of the Wicked Tenants in the Gospel of Luke belongs to the section concerned with the teaching in the Temple.[104] Luke describes the hostility of the scribes and the priests to Jesus (19:47), meanwhile the people (ὁ λάος ἅπας) were favorable to him and were listening. In several places Luke underlines the guilt of the Jewish leaders for Jesus' death and the non-complicity of the λάος. The Parable of the Wicked Tenants belongs to the Triple tradition, but there are hints that Luke did not use Mark as a source for his parable, but another, pre-Marcan version. However, the arguments on the use of the pre-Marcan version are discussible, and the differences could be due to Lucan editorial hand.[105] It is not easily explainable why Luke omitted the details regarding the vineyard

101 Denaux, "Travel Narrative," 31. The obvious reason would be that Jesus entered Jerusalem from the East, through the Shushan gate, and in this place the city wall leads directly to the Temple. The recent discussion on the various opinions regarding the geography of the Temple and Luke's knowledge of it is in Bart B. Bruehler, *A Public and Political Christ. The Social-Spatial Characteristics of Luke 18: 35–19:43 and the Gospel as a Whole in Its Ancient Context* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series 157; Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2011), 263–72.

102 Goulder, *Luke*, 689.

103 Erich Grässer, *Das Problem Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte.* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 22; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977).

104 On the parable in Luke: Giblin, *Destruction*, 57–73; John Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard. Ideology, Economics, and Argarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 195; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 201–18. The parable belongs to the triple tradition, Luke follows Mark in situating the parable between the question on Jesus' authority (Lk 20:1–8; Mk 11:27–33) and the question about the tribute to the Caesar (Lk 20:26; Mk 12:13–17).

105 See: the broad discussion in Kloppenborg, *The Tenants*, 203–5.

of the Marcan parable (Mk 12:1)[106] which come from the Song of the Vineyard in Isaiah 5:2, reducing the introduction to a simple "A man planted a vineyard" (Lk 20:9).[107] As Luke likes and is usually abundant in scriptural quotations, the explanation could be that he deleted the allusions to Isaiah 5:2 because he did not want his readers to identify the vineyard with Jerusalem.[108] This would mean that he saw the destiny of the owner of the vineyard in more distant eschatological terms, and not connected with the destruction of Jerusalèm, which he clearly knows that has already happened.[109] But the narrative setting of the parable shows that it was considered by Luke as pertinent to the Jerusalem motif: the parable in the Lucan narrative has the function of connecting the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem in 19:41–44 and the detailed description of razing the city to the ground and massacre of her inhabitants in the eschatological discourse in 21:20–24. In the first two predictions Jesus accused the city of being guilty of not having recognized him. The Parable of the Wicked Tenants moves the accusation further: the inhabitants are going to cast him out and kill him

106 The description of Mark mentions the fence, the winepress, and the tower. The Gospel of Thomas 65 also has only the brief statement of planting of the vineyard. This, however, is not a proof of the existence of a "primitive" version of the parable (as Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1283), but an argument for Thomas's knowledge of Synoptics and in particular his working through the Gospel of Luke, cf. Mark S. Goodacre, *Thomas and the Gospels. The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 89–90; 151 and in particular 190; also, Simon Gathercole, "Luke in the Gospel of Thomas," New Testament Studies 57 (2010): 114–44; 127–31.

107 In fact, Luke 20:9 has one of the minor agreements of Luke and Matthew against Mark. See: the discussion of Luke using a non-Marcan version of the parable in Tim Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: eine Literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 14; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 154–78. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (Translated by S. H. Hooke; London: SCM Press; New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), 56 – postulated that the Lucan version is original. But the placing of the parable in Luke indicates that he used Mark, and the differences are due to his re-writing. The version of the parable in the Gospel of Thomas 65 is not an argument for another version of the parable as postulated Schramm (159–60) because nowadays, there is a suspicion of the knowledge of the author of Thomas of the Synoptics.

108 Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 243.

109 The Lucan addition of the expression χρόνους ἱκανούς could be also a reference to the delay of the Parousia, but it is a matter under discussion: John Dominic Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper&Row, 1973), 87.

violently.[110] Telling the parable, Jesus warns the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and in particular their leaders, of the consequences of what they are going to do. The punishment for slaying the son of the owner of the vineyard is ineluctable.

9 The days of vindication in Lk 21:20–24

The next prediction of the fall of Jerusalem is contained in the pericope that belongs to the synoptic eschatological discourse, present also in Mark and Matthew. The teaching on the end takes place on Mount Olivet in Mark 13 and Matthew 24, whereas in Luke 21 it is instead in the Jerusalem Temple.[111] Luke also includes the motif of the destruction of Jerusalem in 21:20–24.[112] This pericope is probably like the previous one, a prophecy *ex eventu*, related to the destruction of the city in 70 CE. Mark (13:14) and Matthew (24:15) have only a reference to the profanation of the Temple, Luke instead does not mention the Temple, but the siege of the entire city.

> [20] Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἰερουσαλήμ, τότε γνῶτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς.
> [21] τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρείτωσαν καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν,
> [22] ὅτι ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως αὗταί εἰσιν τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα.
> [23] οὐαὶ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις· ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὀργὴ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ,
> [24] καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα, καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν (Lk 21:20–24).

> [20] When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near.
> [21] Then those in Judea must flee to the mountains, and those inside the city must leave it, and those out in the country must not enter it;
> [22] for these are days of vengeance, as a fulfillment of all that is written.

110 Giblin, *Destruction*, 73.

111 Luke locates the teaching in the Temple to indicate that Jesus had a broad public, Conzelmann, *Theology*, 79.

112 The eschatological discourse is discussed in detail in Nicholas H. Taylor, "The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Transmission of the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse," *HTS Teologiese Studies* 59/2 (2003): 283–311; Dodd, "The Fall"; Felix Flückiger, "Luk. 21.20–24 und die Zerstörung Jerusalems, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 28 (1972): 385–90; Bo Reicke, "Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem," in David E. Aune (ed.), *Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren* (NovTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 121–34; Giblin, *Destruction*, 87–92.

> [23] Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days! For there will be great distress on the earth and wrath against this people;
> [24] they will fall by the edge of the sword and be taken away as captives among all nations; and Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.

Luke describes Jerusalem under siege, because he is probably influenced by his knowledge of the destruction of the city by Titus' forces (cf. Josephus, *Bell.* 6:130–7:4).[113] Dodd on the other hand, contrary to this opinion, argued that the description of the siege in Luke is based entirely on the allusions to the Septuagint, and therefore has no connection with the historical events of the Roman war.[114] The reason for casting the oracle entirely in military imagery coming from the LXX may also be because of Luke's attitude in general, noted by Goulder: when Luke writes on a theme familiar to him, his language is "Lucan" and hapax legomena are rare; when he writes about more technical matters, as the siege for example, he often employs the Old Testament allusion.[115] The passage is full of scriptural allusions to the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 BC by Nebuhadnezzar. In section 21:20–24 which derives from Mark 13:14–20, where Mark applies the apocalyptic imagery from the book of Daniel,[116] Luke describes a siege of the city in military language.[117] The verses have a strong similarity to the prediction of the fall of Jerusalem in Luke 19:41–44. In the opinion of Fitzmyer, Luke did not adopt the apocalyptic language of Mark, because of the target of his Gospel: the gentile readers. Whereas it is true that Luke, who writes in the diaspora, is addressing the gentile public, he is also targeting a Jewish audience.[118] He broadly adopts Septuagintal language in his Gospel, so he takes for granted the knowledge of Scripture among his readers. The reason for removing the apocalyptic only from

113 Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1343.

114 Dodd, "The Fall," Craig A. Evans, *Luke* (New International Biblical Commentary 3; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1990), 294–95; Lars Hartman, *Prophecy interpreted* (Uppsala: Almqvist&Wiksell, 1966), 226–35 proposes a Hebrew source underlying the passage.

115 Goulder, *Luke*, 703.

116 According to some scholars Mark was referring to the imagery from the book of Daniel to the crisis under Caligula in 40–41 Nicholas H. Taylor, "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis, II: The Markan eschatological discourse," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 62 (1996): 13–41.

117 Conzelmann, *Theology*, 134.

118 On Lucan community: Philip Francis Esler, *Community and gospel in Luke-Acts. The social and political motivations of Lucan theology* (Society for New Testament Monograph Series 57; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 24–36; 220–24.

this passage was probably that indicated by Conzelmann: Luke described the siege as a historical account.[119]

The doom of Jerusalem (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) is viewed as approaching (ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς Lk 21:20). The word for desolation, ἐρήμοσις comes from Mark 13:14, who draws it from Daniel 12:11, where it refers to the profanation of the Temple. Luke, instead, although he keeps the word ἐρήμοσις, uses it as a reference not to the Temple, but directly to the city Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυ κλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἰερουσαλήμ, τότε γνῶτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς (Lk 21:20): "When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near."

Since ἐρήμωσις is frequently used also in LXX Jeremiah (4:7; 7:34 etc.) where it pertains not to the Temple, but to the land (εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ Jer 7:34), it seems that Luke was inspired by the main prophet of the fall of Jerusalem. As in other passages that concern the fate of Jerusalem, a verb of fulfillment appears (here πίμπλημι "τοῦ πλησθῆναι" Lk 21:22)[120] which recalls the necessity that the fate of the city, which has been predicted, must be completed. The context of judgment on Israel is evoked by the expression "the days of vindication" ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως (Lk 21:22) cf. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως (Dt 32:35); ἥκασιν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἐκδικήσεως (Hos 9:7).[121] The doom of the city is seen as a necessity ἀνάγκη μεγάλη (Lk 21:23).[122] Luke, although avoiding the apocalyptic imagery from Daniel, introduces the prophetic language from Jeremiah and the disaster of 587 a.c., as in the previous prediction for the fate of Jerusalem. The first element which demonstrates that he thought of the Roman siege of Jerusalem, is his mention of the encircling of the city κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 21:20), which was also described by Josephus: κυκλώσασθαί τε γὰρ τῇ στρατιᾷ τὴν πόλιν (*Bell.* 5:496).[123] An interesting detail is that Luke omits the Marcan reference to the winter προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος (Mk 13:18) "pray that this will not be in winter." This shows that Luke indeed had in mind the Roman siege of Jerusalem, which began in the spring, and the fall of the city in August.[124] The Old Testament model also does not explain his mention of the

119 Conzelmann, *Theology*, 135.

120 Luke uses πίμπλημι also with reference to time: ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι (Lk 1:23).

121 This scriptural expression is not present in Mark.

122 Another word connected in Luke with inevitability and fulfilment, cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 180, but appears also in Josephus' description.

123 Josephus described how after the attempt to take the city with the machines failed (*Bell.* 490–91), Titus was advised to surround the city and take it with famine (*Bell.* 493)

124 Fizmyer, *Luke IX–XXIV*, 1346.

complete razing of the city, which, as we know, concluded the Roman operations. The deportation of the captives (Lk 21:24) is also probably an echo of the events that succeeded Titus' capture of the city. Josephus mentions the large number of prisoners taken after the fall of Jerusalem.[125]

The meaning of the last phrase is discussed: καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα, καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν (Lk 21:24): "they will fall by the edge of the sword and be taken away as captives among all nations; and Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." Mark also describes the limit to the days of tribulation given by the Lord (ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας, Mk 13:20). The trampling of the sanctuary occurs in Daniel 8:13, and in Daniel 8:14 the prediction of the time when the sanctuary will be restored is given. From Daniel 8:23 comes the verb πλερόω: καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν πληρουμένων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται βασιλεὺς ἀναιδὴς προσώπῳ διανοούμενος αἰνίγματα, "when the sins [of the Gentile kings] are fulfilled." Luke in 21:2 makes an allusion to the Gentile mission, which was mentioned in Mark 13:10, and which theme he develops further in Acts: γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ· αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται (Acts 28.28).

The changes Luke made to the eschatological discourse in comparison with Mark 13, describing the events of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, are significant because they mean that Luke did not interpret the eschatological discourse as referring really to the end of times.[126] This involves the whole question of Lucan eschatological expectations and his editorial changes to his sources, in order to modify the texts that speak of the imminent parousia.[127]

10 Woe to the Daughters of Jerusalem (Lk 23:27–31)

It is remarkable that Luke made Jesus predict the destruction of Jerusalem again during his way to the cross. The last of prophetic texts of Jesus regarding

125 Josephus, *Bell.* 6.420 counts 97000 captives. Philip Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*, 27–28.

126 Tuckett, *Luke*, 277.

127 The concept, today no longer considered valid, is due to Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology*, cf. also Richard H. Hiers, "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 145–55.

Jerusalem is the woe to the women who were accompanying him, together with a large crowd, on his last way.[128]

27Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν αἳ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν.
28στραφεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ· πλὴν ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν,
29ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσιν· μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἳ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν.
30τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσιν· πέσετε ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς· καλύψατε ἡμᾶς·
31ὅτι εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται (Lk 23:27–31).

27A great number of the people followed him, and among them were women who were beating their breasts and wailing for him.
28But Jesus turned to them and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children.
29For the days are surely coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never nursed.'
30Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'Fall on us'; and to the hills, 'Cover us.'
31For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?"

This passage is unique to Luke and has often been considered as originating in a pre-Lucan source, as the previous texts concerned with the destruction of Jerusalem.[129] The analysis of the language and the scriptural allusions support the Lucan authorship of the passage. The formal analysis by Jerome Neyrey shows that the saying has the same structure of a judgment oracle, like all Jesus' other warnings to Jerusalem.[130] The literary motif of the grief in Jerusalem perhaps recalls Zechariah 12:10–14. The mention of the women who were mourning and wailing for him ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν (Lk 23:27) bears again a similarity with Josephus. Luke uses the same verbs κόπτω and θρηνέω that appear in Josephus' description of the mourning for Saul: σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἦγον κοπτόμενοι καὶ θρηνοῦντες τὸν βασιλέα (*Ant.* 6:377).[131] The address to the women θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 23:28) recalls many LXX passages where the Daughters of Jerusalem or of Zion are mentioned (Cant. 2:7; 3:10; 5:16; Isa 37:22). Neyrey notes that the reason that the women are explicitly mentioned among the large number of people πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ (Lk 23:27) following Jesus, is because Luke wants to make a distinction between the two groups.[132] Luke repeatedly underlined that the λάος was not guilty of Jesus' death.[133] The Daughters of Jerusalem instead are symbolic figures that represent the city which rejects and kills the prophets, and the leaders of which were responsible for condemning Jesus. The chiastic construction of the phrase 23:28 μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ· πλὴν ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν (Lk 23:28) is typical of Luke.[134] Jesus, according to Luke, wept when approaching the city ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν (Lk 19:41) because he knew of her destiny, and in the last moments of his way again Luke mentions weeping for Jerusalem and her people: μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ· πλὴν ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν (Lk 23:28). Luke, as previously, gives a Septuagintal flavor to Jesus' prediction of the fall of Jerusalem. The expression "the days to come" ἔρχονται ἡμέραι (Lk 23:29), was used previously in 5:35; 17:22; and especially in the same context of the prediction for Jerusalem (ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι Lk 19:43), is typical of the LXX: ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται (Jer 7:32) where it is associated with the judgment of the Lord.[135]

The woe to the pregnant and nursing mothers from Lucan eschatological discourse (21:23) is reformulated in 23:29, with an allusion to Isaiah 54:1, and the reversal of the blessing of Luke 11:27, where the words κοιλία and μαστοί appeared also together as a pair.[136] Verse 23:30 (τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσιν· πέσετε ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς· καλύψατε ἡμᾶς) is a quotation from Hosea 10:8 ἐροῦσιν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καλύψατε ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς πέσατε ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς, the only difference being that the order of the verbs πίπτω and καλύπτω is inverted.[137] A similar saying to the mountains appears in Revelation where also the context is of judgment and wrath: ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν (Rev 6:17). It is worth observing that the mountains and other parts of nature as heaven, earth, appear as witnesses in the OT *rîb* passages, another proof of Luke's knowledge of the prophetic lawsuit.[138] The meaning of words of Jesus in 23:31 is interpreted

128 Included by Bultmann among the minatory sayings, Bultmann, *History*, 115–16. A prophetic oracle according to Neyrey, "Jesus'Address," 79.
129 Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1494. Jerome Neyrey considers the oracle a composition of Luke.
The saying similar to 27:29 is in Gospel of Thomas 79.
130 Jerome Neyrey, "Jesus' Address," 79–83.
131 Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1497.
132 Neyrey, "Jesus' Address," 75–76.
133 Luke's use of the word to distinguish between the chief priests and the "people" is discussed in detail in Jerome Kodell, "Luke's Use of the LAOS, "People," especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk. 19:28–34,53)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31 (1969): 327–43.
134 Cf. Lk 10:20; 14:12, Goulder, *Luke*, 762.
135 Bultmann, *History*, 116, supposed an Aramaic source as an origin of the saying.
136 An allusion maybe to LXX of Gen 49:25.
137 The Hebrew text has the same order as the LXX. The manuscript A of the LXX has the same order of the verbs as Luke, but it could be due to the Christian scribes who harmonised the text of Hosea with Luke.
138 Nielsen, *Yahweh*, 74.

in various ways: ὅτι εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται (Lk 23:31), "For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?"

The best explanation is that the reference is again to the destruction of Jerusalem. If the inhabitants of the city condemned Jesus (the green wood) who came to save them, to death, the treatment reserved for them (the dry wood) will be much worse and will be accomplished in the terrible destruction involving not only the vanquishing of the leaders but also women and children.[139]

11 Conclusions

The passages that speak of the fall of Jerusalem can reveal much of the Lucan mode of constructing a narrative. The author of the Third Gospel consciously reworked his sources to pursue his literary aim. Luke inserted in his travel narrative the notions of approaching to Jerusalem, changed the context of the Q saying on Jerusalem, and introduced three other sayings, probably of his own composition, concerned with the fall of the city. The emphasis on Jerusalem is linked with eschatological expectations, and with the theme of the restoration of Israel, which cannot be pursued here.[140]

Luke, who depicted Jerusalem and the Temple as a centre of the Jewish cult, in his infancy narrative underlining the event of the fall of the city and the Temple also implicitly meant that Jerusalem would not regain that importance after the destruction. However, when in Acts 1:8 Luke makes Jesus address his disciples: "you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the farthest parts of the earth" (Acts 1:8), he means that although Jerusalem failed to accept the Messiah, it nonetheless becomes the place from where the new, good message will depart.

139 Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 529–30, also accepted by Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1498–99.

140 For the overview of the meaning of Jerusalem and the Temple for Luke's eschatology: J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem.*