UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE

LUKE'S GOSPEL AND GRECO-ROMAN PANEGYRICS:

THE SERMON ON THE PLAIN (LK 6:20-49) IN ITS SOCIAL CONTEXT

Louis W. Ndekha

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Gloucestershire in Accordance with the Requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Education and Humanities

February 2020

Word Count: 81,667.

Declaration

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of the University of Gloucestershire and is original except where indicated by specific reference in the text. No part of the thesis has been submitted as part of any other academic award. The thesis has not been presented to any other education institution in the United Kingdom or overseas. Any views expressed in the thesis are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University.

Date: 01.08.2020. Signature of Candidate:

1st Supervisor: Prof Philip Esler, University of Gloucestershire.

2nd Supervisor: Dr Adrian Long, University of Gloucestershire.

Thesis Examiners: Prof. Edward Adams, King's College, London.

Prof. Louise Lawrence, University of Exeter.

doi: 10.46289/RP76BS28

Copyright

Date: 01. 8.2020. **Signature of Candidate**

Dedication

I dedicate this work to Rev A.O. Folayan, my bible college Tutor. His nurture, support and trust helped me to believe in me. His ability to combine both ministerial and academic rigour in his lectures had a massive influence on what I have over the years become.

Acknowledgement

Special gratitude also goes to my Professor Philip Esler, first for accepting to take me as a student. His supervision took me on the deep paths of learning. He guided me into new discoveries and insights into not only the world of Luke but also the whole sweep of the New Testament and Christian origins. He guidance in Greek and Latin grammar and textual interpretation was also exceptional. In addition, his patience even in the face of my short comings was inspirational and encouraging. I also thank Dr Adrian Long, my second supervisor for his insightful perspectives on the project and for the necessary technical support and advice.

This study would not have been done without the University of Gloucestershire's support through the Kirby Laing Studentship Programme. Similar gratitude to the Foundation of St Matthias for their generous grants in the second and third year of my studies. The same gratitude goes to the University of Malawi, Chancellor College, for granting me study leave and supporting for my studies.

Special gratitude goes to my wife Olipa and kids Louis jnr, Chimwemwe and Philip who had to bear long hours of an absent husband and Dad respectively. Special thanks for my wife who had to work hard to supplement for the family budget during my time of study.

Lastly, special thanks also go to all the post-graduate students in Theology and Religion and all other departments. Their interactions with me shaped my academic and social life in the University of Gloucestershire.

Abbreviations

ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der romischen Welt/ Rise and Death of the Roman World.
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BCE	Before the Christian Era.
CE	Christian Era.
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of New Testament Theology.
ECB	Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible.
IBS	Irish Biblical Studies.
HTS	Hervormde Studies/ Theological Studies.
GRch J	Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature.
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies.
LXX	The Septuagint.
LS	Lewis, Charlton T. and Short Charles, *A Latin Dictionary*, Perseus Digital Library.
LSJ	Liddell, Scott, Jones Ancient Greek Lexicon, Perseus Library, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/search
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary.
NIV	New International Version.
NTS	New Testament Studies.
NT	New Testament.
OT	Old Testament.
CMS	Church Missionary Society.
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary.

Abstract

The dissertation argues that the Sermon on the Plain is best interpreted from the perspective of the Greco-Roman paradigm of praise and blame. In the first chapter, the dissertation outlines the historical challenges in the interpretation of the Sermon and proposes panegyric praise and blame as a plausible framework for its reading. In the second chapter, the thesis argues that Greco-Roman makarisms and woes have their context in praise and blame. The (established) affinities between Greco-Roman and Lucan makarisms and woes, therefore, provide a basis for interpreting the latter from the perspective of praise and blame. The third chapter takes up the analysis of the function of praise and blame in the Greco-Roman context. It argues that in the Greco-Roman world, panegyrics served, inter alia, in the integration of victors and the re-enforcement of community values. These core functions provide the methodological framework for the interpretation of the Sermon.

In chapter 4 the thesis demonstrates how the different layers of communication in the Sermon, its conception of community and communion, and the presentation of riches and poverty reflect its Greco-Roman context. At the heart of the discussion is the question of Greco-Roman conception of power and powerlessness (embedded in poverty and riches) which had implications for identity and social interactions between the rich and poor in the Lucan churches. Therefore, in the exegesis of the Sermon in chapter 5, the study identifies the integration of catechumens and the re-enforcement of the value of *κοινωνία* as the major thrust of the Sermon. In chapter 6 the dissertation traces the paradigm of praise and blame across the Gospel. It argues that the praise of God and Jesus' magnanimity on the one hand, and Jesus' praise and blame of generosity and stinginess, respectively, on the other, demonstrates the rhetorical role of the praise and blame in the Gospel.

Finally, since a panegyric reading of the Sermon implies a community reading of the text, such an approach has implications on the Gospel community debate. Therefore, in chapter 7, using old and new evidence from both primary and secondary sources, the dissertation argues for the local audience thesis as the most plausible reading of the Gospels.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

SITUATING THE STUDY

This dissertation argues that the Sermon on the Plain[1] (Lk 6:20-49) is usefully understood from the perspective of the Greco-Roman panegyrics. It posits that Greco-Roman panegyrics, with their combination of praise and blame, provide a framework for understanding the function and meaning of the Sermon within its original social context. This proposal for a new reading is based on the record of the Sermon's troubled history of interpretation. In the study of Jesus' discourses, the Sermon remains a neglected text. It is surprising that although most scholars believe that the Lucan version of the Sermon is more original than that of Matthew,[2] a search in NT abstracts and databases for studies on Jesus' Sermons from the past twenty years reveals an unbalanced scholarly interest in favour of the Sermon on the Mount. Coupled with the above trend is not only the treatment of the Sermon as an addendum to the Sermon on the Mount but also the use of the latter as the interpretative framework for the Sermon.[3] For example, in his commentary on Luke, when Craig S. Keener gets to the section on the Sermon, he refers to his comments on Matthew.[4] Similarly, Betz in his seminal work on the Sermon on the Mount presents an extensive discussion of the Sermon.[5] While the Sermon is given some space, the depth of its treatment demonstrates the subsidiary nature of the Sermon to its Matthean counterpart. Probably influenced by the academic trends, the same pattern is also discernible in the church both in the Majority world and the West. While the Sermon on the Mount forms part of the common parlance in Christian circles and beyond, the text of the Sermon is rarely part of the hermeneutical discourse. One rarely hears a homily or an address from the text of the Sermon.[6] In a few instances where this is done, it is either read along with the Sermon on the Mount or the later provides the interpretative framework. The above Matthean priority in both

---

[1] Hereafter referred to as Sermon.
[2] See Biblical World Editorial, 1903: 84; Marshall, 1978: 246; Nolland, 1989: 280; McCowon, 1927: 50. Hoyt (1980:38) argues that the originality of Luke's Sermon is verified by the fact that even the Gnostic version of the Gospel of Thomas never uses Matthew's *τῷ πνεύματι*, which it would have referred to had the tradition been known to Thomas.
[3] Betz, 1995. See also Meadors, 1985: 305-314; Matson, 2000: 623-650.
[4] Keener, 1993: 204.
[5] See Betz's (1995) treatment of the Sermon.
[6] The researcher has heard the text of the Sermon being expounded on very few occasions in the West. On very few occasions when Lk 6: 20-26 was used as a sermon text, Matthew 5: 3-12 was read along with it, and before long the Sermon became an exposition of Matthew 5: 3-12.

the study and interpretation of Jesus' Sermons tends to fly in the face of established scholarly opinion on the originality of the Sermon. This apparent neglect of the Sermon, coupled with the scholarly preoccupation with Matthean interpretative framework, suggests that perhaps there is something about the Sermon that eludes scholarship, which this dissertation aims to offer.

An investigation into the immediate literary setting of the Sermon (vv. 13-19) demonstrates that it is conceivable to read the Sermon not only in its own guise but also in a way that resonated with its primary audience. It can be observed that quite distinct from Matthew, Luke's depiction of Jesus' appointment of his disciples (v. 13) and the ensuing bestowal of makarisms on the disciples (v. 20) creates a sequence of events which evokes the sense of the Sermon as a victory speech or panegyric, whose functions were to integrate victors into the community and to inculcate shared values within it respectively. When the Sermon's structure of makarisms and woes (vv. 20-26) followed by exhortation (vv. 27-49) is considered against the contents of Greco-Roman panegyrics and their constituent praise and blame and exhortation, it offers a new reading of the Sermon from the perspective of Greco-Roman panegyrics. Such a reading discloses a richness of meaning in the Sermon currently overlooked by means of the focus on the Matthean version.

The need to offer an alternative reading of Lk 6:20-49 is also important given the significant differences between the Lucan and Matthean Sermons. The Lucan version (Lk 6:20-49) represents a unique presentation of Jesus' sermon. Its makarisms and woes and their juxtaposition of poverty and riches (Lk 6:20-26) and its exhortation (6:27-49) put the relationship between the rich and the poor in the spotlight. This unique structure gives the Sermon a rather radical slant when compared to the spirit of Matthew's makarisms in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7). Therefore, to interpret the Lucan version using Matthew is a failure to appreciate the fact that Luke's primary audience did not have Matthew to compare with as the text of the Sermon was read out to them. Luke's primary audience heard the Sermon as it came to them and interpreted it within the framework of their own experiences. Although contested, most scholars hold that underlying the Matthean Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7) and the Lucan Sermon (Luke 6:20-49) is one basic piece of tradition.[7] This understanding

[7] Davies and Alison, 2004: 435; Meadors, 1985: 306. Johnson, 1991: 10; Talbert, 1986: 68; Tuckett and Goulder, 1983: 207.

suggests that their differences in tone demonstrate redactional intentions and particular audience application. It is the contextual differences that influenced how each version of the Sermon was heard in its original context, including the intended consequences of each communication process.[8] In this case, the peculiar emphases of the Sermon and its theological import cannot merely be judged with respect to a related external text. Instead, the Sermon is best evaluated and judged based on its place in the Lucan gospel, and the Hellenistic context in which it arose.[9] While this understanding continues to elude scholarship, this dissertation argues for a reading of the Sermon that resonates with the cultural conventions of its mostly Greco-Roman audience. In advocating for a Greco-Roman reading of the Sermon, the study does not exclude the Jewish influence in the Sermon and the whole gospel of Luke. Instead, it is concerned with how the Sermon's literary context, structure and language would have been heard within its Greco-Roman context and its implications for its audience.

1.2. RESEARCH AIM

This dissertation aims to interpret the text of the Sermon in its Greco-Roman context. It seeks to demonstrate that the original meaning of the Sermon, particularly the uniqueness of its makarisms and woes (Luke 6:20-26), is best explained from the perspective of praise and blame which are expressions of the Greco-Roman honour and shame culture. The dissertation argues that the Sermon reflects the honour and shame setting of a local Greco-Roman community or a group of similar churches of first-century CE Christ-followers. Judging from its juxtaposition of riches and poverty, the community was likely troubled by the co-existence of poverty and wealth amongst its membership. This social structure had implications for interpersonal relationships between the rich and the poor. In the Sermon, Luke presents Jesus as a Greco-Roman orator who adopts the panegyric *encomium* with its inherent combination of praise and blame and exhortation as a pedagogical technique. This pedagogical approach aimed to both integrate new members into the community and reinforce the values of κοινωνία within the rest of the community. The integrative nature of the Sermon is evident from both Theophilus as a new member and the fact that the Sermon follows soon after Jesus' appointment of his disciples (Lk 6:13-18). The Sermon's intention to inculcate commonly held values in the community is evident from 6:27, where, apart from the disciples, the general audience is also in view. The Sermon, therefore, attempts to re-invent the world of its audience, both new and old, by

[8] Thomas Hoyt also argues that the two Sermons are also thematically different. While the Sermon on the Mount emphasises replacement of the new law with the old law, the Lucan one emphasises charity. Hoyt, 1980: 32.
[9] Fitzmyer, 1981: 629; Johnson, 1991: 22; Creamer, Spencer, and Vijoen, 2014: 7; Dowling, 2011: 140.

supplanting those values deemed honourable and shameful by the dominant culture with a new set of values and identity that would define the communities of Christ-groups associated with Luke. These new values, adopted from the experience of destitution, are powerlessness, dependency, and therefore vulnerability. These values would be a significant contrast to the valorised Greco-Roman values of strength or power (physical or social, defined in terms of excellence[10], *ἀρετή* and self-sufficiency (*αὐτάρκεια*), which had alienating effects on human relationships, especially between the rich and the poor. The adoption of the values associated with destitution for both the rich and poor would result in their common dependence not on material wealth but the Lord, for their daily provisions. In turn, common dependence on the Lord would allow for the camaraderie and *κοινωνία* between the rich and the poor within the community of Christ-groups. In a recent essay, Joel Green agrees with this conception but applies it to the whole of Luke's gospel. He argues that the good news to the destitute summarises Jesus' message in Luke. He further argues that by bringing into focus issues of power and wealth, Luke touches on the issues of belonging, power and social privilege.[11] In this way Luke underscores the fact that following Jesus entails the construction of a new reality of belonging, wealth and privilege in the new community.

The presentation of Jesus' Sermon within a panegyric framework became necessary with the spread of the Jesus movement from its initial Palestinian environment into the Greco-Roman hinterland. The polytheistic, multi-ethnic and socially differentiated Greco-Roman world created new questions and realities for Christ-groups from which they needed *ἀσφάλεια*, assurance. In the preface, Luke sets out as his objective to ensure that Theophilus knows the certainty of what he had been taught. The reference to *κατηχέω* (v. 4) with its sense of introducing the rudiments of a new teaching, resembles the integration of new members into the community and their introduction into a lifestyle commensurate with their new reality. This understanding agrees with Philip Esler's contention that Luke wrote in a community which had been associated with the synagogue before becoming Christians, some of whom were rich and some poor. [12] According to Esler, these people needed a strong assurance that their decision to

[10]According to Papademetriou (2011) the original Latin equivalent of *ἀρετή* was *virtus*, whose corresponding words were *gloria*, *dignitas*, and *honour*, were generally understood in terms good of service to the government, army and religion. It was the quality to contribute to the public *eudemonism*. Thus, at the heart of *ἀρετή* was how much an individual was able to contribute to the body politic, not their intrinsic worth as a human being. This understanding had the tendency to alienate the poor who were deemed as expendable in society.
[11] Green, 2014: 173-179.
[12] Esler, 1987: 142.

convert and adopt a different lifestyle had been a correct one.[13] The difference between this study's thesis and Esler's point of view is in the latter's view that the community is sectarian and therefore, Luke is trying to legitimate their new reality. For this study, the Christian movement's changing context from Palestine into the wider Greco-Roman world raised new questions for the movement, which Luke's gospel addresses.[14] Among such questions would have been the implications of Jesus' message on the relationships between the rich and the poor within the communities of Christ-groups. This question would be more pertinent for new believers steeped in the Greco-Roman system of kinship and reciprocity.

There are two complementary ways of understanding the exact nature of the *ἀσφάλεια* that Luke wanted Theophilus to attain. Fitzmyer argues that this certainty is historical assurance.[15] He argues that writing during a later period of the church, the gospel aims to assure Theophilus and other readers that the teachings of the church of his day and its practices were rooted in the period of Jesus. The gospel, therefore, aimed to strengthen them in their fidelity to that teaching and practice.[16] Fitzmyer does not mention the content of this church's teaching and practice. It is likely that the *ἀσφάλεια* that Theophilus needed was not only about God's vindication of Jesus. In a polytheistic environment, arising from his Messiahship, this *ἀσφάλεια* was probably also about the implications of Jesus' ethical and practical directives on interpersonal relationships and identity within the community of Christ-followers for whom Luke was writing.[17] For Luke, these two issues, which are encapsulated in the Sermon, form the overarching framework that shapes his gospel's presentation of Jesus' message of salvation.

The importance of panegyric or encomiastic praise and blame in Greco-Roman education and social conventions, including their adaptability to different contexts is widely attested in literature.[18] The educational and advisory function of praise is traceable from the Greek lyrical poetry (such as Pindar's epinicions and Bacchylides' odes) to the communal Greek panegyrics such as Isocrates' *Panegyricus* and *Panathenaicus.* This dissertation argues that from the structure of the Sermon it is likely that Luke combined features of both the lyrical poetry of ancient *epinicia* (Lk 6:20-26) and the prose of the panegyric (Lk 20:27-29). While the gospel

---

[13] Ibid.
[14] Among such questions would be the entrenched Greco-Roman kinship system and its implications for reciprocity with the Lucan communities comprising the ethnically diverse rich and poor.
[15] Fitzmyer, 1981: 9.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Topel, 2001: 7.
[18] Gallia and Mawr, 2012: 4; Miller, 2018: 21-41.

makarisms are not poetry in the sense of being structured around the iambic meter, it is interesting to note that lyrical poets often used makarisms in their odes.[19] In addition, a number of scholars such as H. Hatton and D. Clark, H Green, H. Songer, and F.A. Sullivan recognise the poetic nature of the makarisms, especially when they appear in collections.[20] The closeness of gospel makarisms to poetry underscores the relationship between the Sermon and the lyrical poetry of ancient Greek encomia.

Although the relationship between Luke and Greco-Roman literature has recently attracted significant interest, so far, no study has examined Luke's gospel or the Sermon from the perspective of Greco-Roman panegyrics.[21] The dissertation argues that reading the Sermon from the perspective of Greco-Roman praise and blame provides a plausible alternative for understanding the uniqueness of the Sermon with its makarisms and woes and their function within their original social setting. The approach enables the text of the Sermon to be read as it was heard within its primary audience and not as a subtext of the Sermon on the Mount.

1.3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

With the above aim in mind this dissertation has the following research objectives:

1. First, the dissertation attempts to establish the relationship between makarisms and woes and praise and blame, and by extension, the relationship between Greco-Roman panegyrics and the Sermon.
2. Second, arising from the relationship between Greco-Roman panegyrics and the Sermon, the dissertation intends to identify the function of the Sermon (6:20-49) within its original social context.
3. Third, in view of the panegyric reading of the Sermon, the dissertation intends to establish how the paradigm of praise and blame inherent in the Sermon is also discernible across the whole gospel of Luke, and the implications of this reading on the gospel communities' debate.

[19] Bacchylides 5.50: Pindar, *Olympiad*, 7. 10; Pindar, *Pythian*, 5. 60. The poetic nature of the makarisms, especially when they appear in collections, is also recognised by several scholars such as Green, 2001: 37-46; Songer, 1992: 165-177; Hatton and Clark, 1975; 132-138; Sullivan, 1961:49-76.
[20] Green, 2001:37-46; Songer, 1992: 165-177; Hatton and Clark, 1975; 132-138; Sullivan, 1961:49-76.
[21] Some of the representative works on the relationship between Luke and Greco-Roman literature are Macdonald, 2015; Umurhan and Penner, 2013:165-193; Penner and Stichele, 2003; Kennedy, 1984.

Through the above objectives, the dissertation contributes to a new reading of the Lucan makarisms and woes and the Sermon as a whole. In this way the dissertation helps push research in Lucan studies in new directions.

1.4. STATE OF THE QUESTION: THE SERMON IN SCHOLARSHIP

Due to the immense historical significance of Jesus' Sermons contained in the gospels of Matthew and Luke and their makarisms, it is difficult to present a complete account of the history of their interpretation. It also needs to be noted that due to the parallels between the two Sermons, their interpretation has historically been mutually inclusive. However, an examination of key studies on the two Sermons reveals several questions that remain without scholarly consensus. Among some of the issues are: (1) the relationship between Matthew, Luke and Q; (2) the origins of gospel makarisms; (3) the Matthean question in the study of the Sermon; (4) audience of the Sermon; and (5) the function of the Sermon in its original context.

1.4.1. Luke, Matthew and Q

One of the major issues in the interpretation of the Sermon is the literary interdependence among the Synoptic Gospels. Particularly significant is the role of Q in the relationship between Matthew and Luke. The Two Document Hypothesis has traditionally been regarded as the most plausible explanation for the Synoptic Problem.[22] The theory is based on two assumptions. The first assumption is that Luke did not know Matthew or even if he did, did not use the latter. The second assumption is that since Luke and Matthew share 235 verses not found in Mark, they must have had access to a second source consisting mainly of Jesus' sayings technically called Q. Luke's independence of Matthew is thought to be confirmed by Luke's apparent ignorance of Matthew in the passages they both share with Mark (triple tradition passages).[23] This position has support from several scholars. [24] The assumption in this dissertation is that the hypothesis that makes the most sense of the gospel data is one that posits that Luke, independent of Matthew, used Mark, Q and other special Lukan material. Even if he did know Matthew, Luke did not use Matthew's gospel.

---

[22]Kloppenborg, 2000: 12-13.
[23] Ibid.
[24] See, Foster, 2002: 295-300; Tuckett, 1984; Garland, 2011: 4; Carrol, 2012: 8. Howes (2015) in his analysis of the Q contribution to wisdom-apocalypticism in historical Jesus studies rightly demonstrates that is possible to reconstruct Q with precision.

Some scholars have, however, questioned the above alleged Lucan ignorance of Matthew and the existence of Q. Scholars like M.D. Goulder, Allan McNicol, Mark Matson and M. Goodacre, based on evidence in the gospels' parallel texts, have argued that Luke not only knew Matthew but also used him along with Mark.[25] For example, Mark Matson, based on the close thematic structure of parallel texts, argues that the Lucan Sermon is a re-writing of the Sermon on the Mount. He argues, for example, that the more focused and thematically integrated nature of the Lucan Sermon in contrast to that of Matthew suggests Luke's deliberate reworking of the Matthean Sermon. Another critic of the traditional approach to the Synoptic Problem, one devotedly committed to the case against Q, is Mark Goodacre. Goodacre argues that Q does not exist and that Luke, apart from using Mark, reworked Matthew. For example, concerning the Sermon, Goodacre argues that Luke's reworking of the Matthean text was influenced by his conceptual framework of a "preferential option for the poor." Thus, influenced by this option for the poor, in the Sermon, Luke reworked Matthew οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι (Mt 5:3) to a mere οἱ πτωχοὶ (Lk 6:20).[26]

It can, however, be argued that despite the above objections to Q's existence, not only is there continuing support for the Q hypothesis[27] but also that there is enough compelling evidence that supports the two-source hypothesis as the dominant paradigm in solving the Synoptic Problem. For example, the presence of pericopes in Matthew, and absence in Luke, advocating for table-fellowship between Jews and Gentiles, demonstrates Lucan ignorance of Matthew. Granted that Luke used table fellowship as the fulcrum for his reconstruction of new communities in Christ,[28] the Matthean (8:11) reference to "people coming from the east and west and recline at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven" would likely have been taken up by Luke if he knew Matthew. The absence of this reference in Luke makes it hard to believe that he knew Matthew.

Second, there are also some double traditions in the two gospels whose differences are difficult to explain except by the fact that the two evangelists did not know each other. A classic example is Jesus' genealogy in Matthew (1:2-16) and Luke (3:23-38). Goodacre classifies Luke 3:23-

[25] For example, Goulder, 1978: 218-34; McNicol, 1996; Matson, 2000: 1-37.
[26] Goodacre, 2002: 135.
[27] See, Garland, 2011: 4; Carrol, 2012: 8; Howes, 2015.
[28]Moxnes, 1986: 158-67.

28 as special L material.[29] Yet while the two genealogies differ in the portion from David to Joseph, they also agree from Abraham to David.[30] This makes the two pericopes double traditions. Studies have also demonstrated that genealogies were very important in honour and shame cultures. They not only acted as the regulators of honour and shame but also served as master narratives that evoked both ancestral spirits and the narrative world of the community.[31] Also, in some cases, they played a legitimating function in the construction of communities through accounts of patrilineal descent.[32] The above importance of genealogies in community construction suggests that the similarities and differences in the Lucan and Matthean genealogies can be attributed to separate and independent development of the traditions in the communities from which the two gospels arose. Although sharing common elements, their uniqueness reflects community attempts to both legitimate themselves and make sense of their origins. The idea of separate development within the early Christian movement is also confirmed by Kloppenborg, who, in his recent work, has demonstrated that, among other things, Christ-groups did not have a uniform system of governance.[33] The lack of a unified governance system could have been both a result and a demonstration of separate developments within the early Christian movement. Such separate developments would also have been reflected in the differences in the mushrooming literary works across the early Christian movement. It is, therefore, likely that Luke did not know Matthew but had access to Mark and another source which he shared with Matthew.

1.4.2. Origins of Gospel Makarisms and Woes

Another major issue in the study of the Sermon is the question of the origins of the gospel makarisms. This question mainly relates to whether the gospel makarism formula has its origins in a Jewish context or a Greco-Roman context.[34] Most scholars see the gospel makarisms formula as having its roots in Jewish makarisms.[35] This position is largely influenced by the significant prevalence of makarisms and woes in Jewish scriptures and other literature.[36] For some scholars like C. H. Dodd, even the antithetical formula of the Lucan makarisms was by

[29] Goodacre, 2001: 45.
[30]Sanders, 1913: 185.
[31] See Loubser, 2005: 127-140.
[32] Guynn, 1999: 113.
[33] Kloppenborg, 2019; See also Spinks, 2001: 338-340.
[34] Parsons, 2015: 101-102; Thompson, 1999: 109-116.
[35]McCown, 1927: 50-61.
[36] Dodd, 1968: 3. According to Parson, (p. 101-2) makarisms were particularly common in Jewish literature such as Ps 1:1; 41:1; Pro 14:21; Sir 31:8

no means peculiar.[37] The same has its counterpart in the Septuagint (LXX) where the word *μακάριος* renders the Hebrew אֶ֫שֶׁר (*e.sher*) while the Greek *οὐαὶ* corresponds with the Hebrew היי (*oy)*.[38] Thus for these studies, the makarisms formula is rooted in the form and theology of Hebrew Scriptures.[39] This view of the origins of the gospel makarisms resonates with the alleged Jewishness of Matthew's gospel and therefore continues to dominate beatitudes' scholarship.[40]

Some scholars, however, hold a different view on the origins of the makarisms formula. They locate the makarism formula in the various cultures of the ancient world such as Egypt and Ancient Greece, most of which antedate the Jewish nation. For example, Darrel Bock and Francois Bovon after him, agree that makarisms were common in the ancient world.[41] They were prevalent in Egypt in both cultic and wisdom context. They represented cultic language employed in praise of those who walked in the ways of God.[42] In terms of functional setting, Bovon locates the makarism formula in the family with its happy occurrences and the school in which the happiness of the observant was praised giving rise to the beatitudes. Similarly, within Greek culture, apart from its cultic function, the makarisms formula was part of the broader form of congratulation or compliment.[43] An example of the congratulatory nature of makarisms is Odysseus' complimentary words to the lovely Nausicaa in Homer's *Odyssey*.[44] Furthermore, in his cultural analysis of the Matthean makarisms, K.C. Hanson concluded that makarisms and woes belong to a word-field and value system of honour and shame. From this, he translated Matthews's *μακάριος* and *οὐαί* as "how honourable" or "how shameful" reflecting the honour and shame culture to which they correspond.[45] Hanson's reference to the honour and shame value system, like the other studies above, places makarisms and woes not just in the Jewish milieu but also within the wider context of the Greco-Roman world.

[37] Dodd, 3.
[38] Dodd, 3. Some studies, however, agree that the blessings and woes are not identical to the blessings and the curses of Deuteronomy 27 and 28.6. See Thompson, 1999: 109-116.
[39] McEleney, 1981: 1-13.
[40] Some notable scholars on the Jewishness of the Matthew are David Sim (Sim, 1995:19-48; 2002: 767-783; Sim, 1998) and Hare, 2000: 264-77.
[41] Bock, 1994:572; Bovon, 2002: 221.
[42] Bovon, 2002: 221.
[43] Hornblower, 1996: 914.
[44] *Odyssey*, 6.145-155. In 6:155 Odysseus says to Nausicaa, --"if thou art one of mortals who dwell upon the earth, thrice-blessed then are thy father and thy honoured mother and thrice-blessed thy brethren.
[45] Hanson, 1996: 81-111

It can be observed from the above discussion that the question of the origins of the gospel makarisms remains in a state of flux. Yet establishing the context of the makarisms formula is important to the interpretation of the Sermon and its makarisms and woes. This dissertation argues for a Greco-Roman orientation for the Lucan makarisms and woes. It holds that the makarism formula was part of the wider Ancient Near East (ANE) and later Greco-Roman culture of which the Jewish nation was part. Jewish literary and institutional adaptation from their surrounding nations, such as wisdom and monarchy, is well known.[46] Therefore, it is possible to argue that, the gospel makarism formula, especially those from the gospel of Luke, although related to and sometimes resonating with Jewish makarisms, belongs to the wider context of the Greco-Roman world. This notion is further explicated in chapter two.

1.4.3. The Matthean Scope

Another trend in the study of Jesus' Sermons has been the scholarly preoccupation with the Sermon on the Mount and the neglect of its Lucan counterpart. Some eminent scholars agree with this observation. For example, Betz observes that most of the history of exegesis of Jesus' Sermons has been concerned with the Matthean Sermon on the Mount.[47] Similarly, Bovon also observes that in both scholarship and the church, the Matthean Sermon has crowded out the Lucan Sermon which must be heard in its own right.[48] Although Betz and Bovon's studies were published more than and nearly two decades ago, respectively, an examination of current NT abstracts on the two Sermons reveals an unbalanced distribution of scholarly engagement with the two versions. The Lucan version continues to take a far less prominent part in the history of the interpretation of Jesus' seminal speech while the Matthean Sermon remains, for many scholars, the most attractive text for understanding the meaning of gospel makarisms and Jesus' sermons.[49]

There are, however, some notable works that have given voice to the Sermon on the Plain. Among such scholars are John Topel, Ranjar Sunil and Drew Strait.[50] The studies, however,

46 See McCown, 1927: 50-61
47 Betz, 1995: 5.
48 Bovon, 2002: 215.
49 See, Betz, 1995: 5.
50 See Ranjar, 2017; Strait, 2009; Topel, 2001.

use different approaches in the study of the Sermon. While recognising the rhetoric of the Sermon, Topel uses literary criticism to interpret the Sermon. He is also heavily dependent on the LXX in the interpretation of the Sermon. On the other hand, Sunil employs redaction criticism to the study the Sermon. He underscores Luke's redaction of Mark and how the theme of mercy arising from the Sermon forms a pervasive motif of the Third Gospel. Lastly, in his book *Luke's Sermon on the Plain and the Restoration of Israel*, Strait uses the OT to interpret the Sermon. It can be observed that most of the studies, except Sunil's, are heavily dependent on the OT as the basis for the interpretation of the Sermon. The heavy reliance on the OT probably reflects the general Matthean influence in the interpretation of the Sermon. The above limited numbers of studies on the Sermon also demonstrate the general scholarly neglect of the Sermon.

Some explanation can be given for the above scholarly attitude to the Lucan Sermon. First, the brevity of the Sermon, when compared to that of Matthew, has led to the unconscious assumption that it is a shorter version of Matthew even among scholars who believe in Q.[51] Among those who reject the existence of Q, the Sermon’s brevity is a product of Luke’s re-writing of the Sermon on the Mount. For Allan McNicol, the Sermon is not only the piece that Luke rewrites from Matthew, but that the entire Third Gospel is a rewriting of Matthew’s gospel.[52] It can, however, be observed that, regardless of whichever side of the debate one is on, the Sermon’s brevity continues to exert significant influence in the interpretation of the two sermons. Second, it is also probable that the Sermon’s ascriptive (defining things as they are, as opposed to prescriptive) purpose and its concentration on real poverty and riches,[53] make it a shallow contrast to the relatively theological and spiritually satisfying Sermon on the Mount.[54]

The above understanding raises the question of how we can understand and interpret the “flesh and blood” terms in the Sermon such as poverty, hunger, mourning, and ostracised which differentiates the Sermon from Matthew’s Sermon. For scholars steeped in the alleged Jewish orientation of the gospel makarisms and concerned with the apparent radical nature of the Sermon, a religious or spiritual understanding provides the best way to understand the

[51] Marshall, 1978: 246; Goulder, 1989: 346; Carson, France, Motyer and Wenham, 1994: 991.
[52] See McNicol, 1996.
[53] Green, 1997: 265. Craig, 1993: 108.
[54] Biblical World Editorial, 1903: 84-85

Sermon.[55] For Charles Talbert, the religious dimension of the Sermon is the most important because the gospel never canonises the "sociological state" (cf Lev. 19:15; Sir 35:15-17).[56] According to him, although the vocabulary of poverty initially had "sociological" meaning, over the centuries it took on a spiritual meaning.[57] He further argues that in the history of Israel, the economically poor observed the spirit of Israel's religion more faithfully (Isa. 29:18-19) than did the affluent elite.[58] Talbert's understanding of the Sermon, which other scholars also espouse, exploits the lexical affinities between the Greek *πτωχοί* and the Hebrew עָנָו for the poor[59] and, therefore, gives a spiritual accent to poverty. Going along the same line, Dale Allison argues that the poor, whatever their socioeconomic situation, are beggars before God and have abandoned human ambition.[60] Allison's position and that of Talbert above are true in as far as their conclusion concerning the poor's dependence upon God is concerned. In an insecure world, the poor easily find refuge in God.[61] However, Talbert's and Allison's generalised and unqualified other-worldly description of the experience of poverty is problematic when understood from Luke's depiction of Jesus' attitude to poverty in the Third Gospel. The apparent Lucan preoccupation with material poverty and riches evident across the whole gospel, which some studies also affirm,[62] flies in the face of a spiritualised understanding of poverty. The reference to the destitute and the rich (v. 20 b / 24 a) and the hungry and filled (v. 21 a/ 25 a) and the injunction to give (v. 30) and lend (v. 43) speaks to the proximity of riches and destitution among Luke's audience, a contradiction that needed to be addressed. Therefore, to say that Luke and Matthew are saying the same thing, albeit in different ways, is to blur the differences between the two Sermons and how they are uniquely presented as reflections of what Betz calls conceptions of human society that resonate with the social condition of their primary audiences.[63]

[55] Byrne, 2008: 29–46; Matson, 2000: 623-650; Meadors, 1985: 305-314.
[56] Talbert, 2002: 73.
[57] Talbert, 73. Talbert should have used "social" not "sociological." The latter refers to a discipline that came into existence in the late 19th /20th century.
[58] Talbert, 2002: 73.
[59] Meadors, 1985; 305-314.
[60] Allison, 1999: 45.
[61] Contemporary trends in the relationship between religion and poverty support this claim. For example, Gustavo Gutiérrez, although he regards poverty as a social evil from which God intends to liberate the poor, also understands one dimension of poverty in terms of spiritual childhood. With this conception of poverty, the poor are the clients of YHWH. Poverty is the ability to welcome God, an openness to God, and a willingness to be used by God. (Gutierrez, 1973:296). It is, therefore, possible to argue that while all social classes are capable of being open to God, contemporary global religious statistics demonstrate more religious consciousness among poor regions of the world than the more affluent parts.
[62] Evans, 1990: 108; Green, 2014: 173-179.
[63] Betz, 1995: 5.

1.4.4. The Function of Makarisms and Woes

Another key question related to the interpretation of the Sermon is the function of its makarisms and woes. The importance of understanding the function of the makarisms and woes is underscored by the fact that the theme of the Sermon essentially lies in the makarisms and woes.[64] Scholars, however, differ in their approach to the function of the Lucan makarisms and woes. Emphases have predominantly been determined by the scholarly perspective on whether the makarisms originated in a Jewish or a Greco-Roman context. Those who take an OT perspective, like Nolland and Parsons, hold a significantly spiritual or otherworldly view of the function of makarisms in the Sermon.[65] For example, Nolland outlines three contexts in which makarisms functioned both in the OT and other Jewish literature and how a similar function is evident in the Sermon. He argues that in wisdom, prophetic and eschatological contexts makarisms respectively served to commend the proposed path of goodness.[66] According to him, makarisms also expressed confidence in God's intervention to put right the present unhappy situation (Isa 30:18; Dan 12:12) and spoke of a future state of happiness respectively.[67] On his part, Parsons argues that the function of the makarisms in the OT was platitudinous; they expressed the common wisdom in which those who are near to God already share in divine favour and prosperity. He further argues that Jewish apocalyptic literature expanded makarisms to include hope for the eschatological deliverance rooted in YHWH (Dan 12:12; Ps of Sol 17:50; Tob. 13:14).[68] Three views, however, dominate the discussion on the functions of makarisms: (1) an eschatological/other-worldly perspective; (2) creative balance; and (3) an utterly this worldly perspective.

1.4.4.1. Eschatological/ Other-Worldly Perspective

Eschatology has to do with the future. In relation to this view, scholars like Meador, Parsons and Thompson see eschatological reversal as the background to the whole Sermon. [69] Meador argues that Luke 6:20-26 stands in the literary tradition of an eschatological reversal motif found in Psalm 37, Isaiah 61 and in certain Qumran materials. According to Parson, the Sermon reflects the eschatological function of the makarisms and woes which focuses not on the painful

[64] Biblical World Editorial, 1903: 84.
[65] Nolland, 1989:280; Mikeal Parsons, 2015: 101-102.
[66] Nolland, 1989: 280, Betz as a representative of the Greco-Roman perspective, notes four occasions that might produce a beatitude: religious context, secular fortune, the exhortation of wisdom, or satire. Betz, 1995:25.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Parsons, 2015: 101-2.
[69] Meadors, 1985: 1; Thompson, 1999: 113. See also Levine and Witherington III, 2018: 177.

reality of the present but in an awareness of the ultimate outcome of history.[70] Within this motif of reversal, the beatitudes, as Thompson argues, serve a paracletic/consolatory function to the poor, the hungry, and those who weep.[71] The juxtaposition of beatitudes and woes, and the second-person address provide eschatological assurance to those who hear.[72] For Levine and Witherington, the knowledge of this reversal is already part of the Kingdom of God.[73] They give the example of the experiences of Lazarus in Chapter 16 as a probable clue to the otherworldly thrust of the Sermon. The above views suggest that although the Sermon uses everyday experiences such as poverty, hunger or mourning, the thrust of its subject matters can only be understood in relation to the future. This approach projects the solution of the poor into the eschatological future and therefore renders the gospel's interest in materialistic and inter-personal issues as of no immediate consequence to Luke's audience both poor and rich. According to this dissertation, when the makarisms and woes are read from the perspective of praise and blame, an emphasis on the present reality of the audience and its future implications provides a balanced understanding of the function of the makarisms in the Sermon.

1.4.4.2. Creative Balance: Realised and Yet-to-come

Other scholars like Bock and Green think there is significant realised eschatology in the Sermon. For example, Bock argues that Luke's initial beatitude (Lk 6:20b) has three peculiarities; it refers to a state, is given in the less common second person, and is in the present tense. As such, the blessing is not in the future but already exists. At the same time, the first makarism sets the stage for the makarisms that follow, which have the future promise in view.[74] In this case, according to Bock, with whom Green agrees, Jesus' promises, when taken as a whole, wed the present and the future in a way that is typical of his already-not yet eschatological language.[75] Jesus' vision of the new world is eschatological, although this vision is not relegated to the future.[76] From the above discussion, the makarisms and woes contain a realised eschatology. They reflect "the yet and not yet" aspects of the Kingdom of God. This understanding would have had significant implications for those who heard the Sermon both in

[70] For Parson, (2015: 101-102) each beatitude contributes to the unpacking of Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom of God and God's justice that it undergirds.
[71] Thompson, 1999: 113.
[72] Thompson, 1999: 113.
[73] Levine and Witherington, 2018: 177.
[74] Bock, 1994: 572.
[75] Bock, 572, Green, 1997: 265.
[76] Green, 1997: 265.

the time of Jesus and that of Luke. It demonstrated how the present behaviour of those who hear the sermon has a bearing on what is happening to them now and will eventually happen to them in the *eschaton*.

1.4.4.3. This-worldly Perspective

On the other hand, a few scholars have a more "this-worldly" view of the function of the makarisms in the Sermon. Raymond Brown, for example, has argued that in comparison with Matthew, there is a less eschatological tone to the startling demands of the Lucan Jesus for his disciples to love those who hate and abuse them. The demands are addressed to all who would hear (6:27, 47).[77] Brown's statement suggests that the wider audience referred to in 6:27, 47 makes Jesus' demands more this-worldly than other-worldly and therefore less eschatological. Betz explains the thrust of the Sermon by tracing its origins. He argues that although the Sermon is a product of the same branch of the Jesus movement as its Matthean counterpart, its purpose and function differ from those of the Sermon on the Mount. For him, while basically reflecting the same theology, the cultural outlook of the Sermon is Greek and is designed to establish an identity for the disciples within the Greek cultural and religious environment.[78] For this reason, in the Sermon, some Greek presuppositions are confirmed while others are rejected.[79] Betz also points out the generic differences between the Matthean and Lucan Sermon, which is reflected in their makarisms and woes. He points out that whereas in Matthew's Sermon people are either righteous or unrighteous. In contrast, Luke's makarisms and woes present a world in which people are divided between the rich and the poor. According to Betz, the latter reflects the conceptual world of the Hellenistic moralist who viewed the poor positively and tended to castigate the rich.[80] Betz's position is corroborated by William Desmond who in his book *Greek Praise of Poverty* presents a similar Greek conception of wealth. He argues that for the Greeks wealth was not so much a material fact but far more an ethical and political phenomenon with individual greed as the controlling factor.[81] It can be observed that in contrast to the Greek spirit although Hebrew prophets portrayed similar attitudes to wealth, their reference point was always the covenant than a general worldview. Also, Hebrew prophets usually castigated the rich but not riches per se as the Greek tendency demonstrates.[82] Lastly, unlike the Greeks,

---

[77] Brown, 1997: 80.
[78] Betz, 1995: 2.
[79] Ibid. 2
[80] Ibid. 572.
[81] Desmond, 2006: 4-5.
[82] Cf Isaiah 5: 8-23.

Hebrew prophets also rarely praised the poor (c. Ps. 40:17; Isa. 41:17). The results of the Q project, which traces the beatitudes for the poor, hungry, and mourning back to the historical Jesus, further support Betz's argument.[83] Therefore, the unequivocal nature of Jesus' reference to destitution, hunger and mourning suggests a context significantly different from the qualified makarisms of poverty, hunger and mourning in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount.

It can be observed from the above discussion that there are different approaches to the function of the makarisms and woes in the Sermon. The differences reflect the continuing scholarly attempts to understand the Sermon's social setting and function. It can, therefore, be argued that while the eschatological element in the Sermon's makarisms and woes cannot be eliminated, including its realised aspects, Betz's reference to the Greek context of the Sermon is a strong pointer to the social context in which the Sermon arose. Although Betz does not refer to the panegyric as a possible framework of the Sermon, his point is significant for this study. The Greek context provides a socio-linguistic perspective for understanding the inherent praise and blame exhibited through the makarisms and woes in the Sermon, as is demonstrated in chapter two.

1.4.5. The Audience of the Sermon

Another interesting trend in Jesus' Sermon studies, especially arising from Luke's makarisms and woes, is the question of the actual addressees of the Sermon. Although there is no agreement amongst scholars on the exact nature of Luke's audience, the general scholarly consensus supports a mixed church with a significant Gentile majority located in a Mediterranean social context.[84] Also, from a literary point of view, when it comes to the Sermon, most scholars agree that from Lk 6: 20 the audience of the Sermon is Jesus' disciples.[85] Yet from the structure of the makarisms and woes, the exact nature of these disciples remains significantly variegated. Scholars like Bock, Evans and Topel, while agreeing that the primary audience of Jesus' teaching are his followers, think that the woes are directed at outsiders.[86] According to Bock,

[83] See the work by Hieke, 2001.

[84] Johnson, 1991*:* 22; Vinson, 2014: 387; Creamer, Spencer, Vijoen, 2014: 7; Dowling, 2011: 140; See also Kuhn*,* 2015.

[85] Marshall, 1978: 246; Fitzmyer, 1981: 627. In Matthew Jesus appears to address the Sermon to both his disciples and the crowds (Mt 5:1-2).

[86] Bock, 1994:571; Evans, 1990:107; Topel, 2001:113.

the woes have relevance to outsiders, who thus know later God will one day reveal his justice.[87] W. G. Lampe argues the Lucan woes are not addressed to the disciples but indicate the condition of those who reject the Kingdom.[88] The ambiguity of Lampe's position is such that it is not easy to establish whether those who reject the Kingdom are inside or outside the community. Further, Carrol Stuhlmueller also argues that, apart from casting Jesus into a prophetic role, his condemnation in the woes seems to be directed at those not present.[89] The problem with Bock's, Lampe's and Stuhlmueller's positions is that by ascribing the woes to outsiders they assume that the Lucan churches comprised the destitute only. Yet this understanding flies in the face of textual evidence that indicates the presence of the rich in the Lucan churches (Lk 1:1-4; 19:1-8) who may have constituted Luke's primary audience. Besides, the position also raises the problem of when the rich got to hear the Gospel if they were outsiders.

To solve the above problem, David Balch argues that the Sermon is directed at a community of disciples divided by economic class with the woes directed at the rich. [90]Although the direction of the woes cannot precisely be determined from the text of the Sermon, given the possible rhetoric of the text, Balch's argument suggests an intra-community basis for the Sermon, which also agrees with Esler's analysis of the Lucan community.[91] This community understanding of the Sermon's audience is significant for this dissertation's proposed panegyric approach to the same. The socially diverse audience for whom Luke wrote is evident across the gospel and the book of Acts.[92] The structure of Luke's makarisms and woes also betrays a community orientation and the possibility of significant social differences within the communities of which Luke was part.[93] By bringing the rich and the poor into sharp focus, Luke may not just be looking at a broad Greco-Roman context but Christ-groups he was associated with. These would act as microcosms for the nature of Christ-groups and the ethos they must reflect as counter-cultural communities.

[87] Bock, 1994: 571.
[88] Lampe, 1962: 830.
[89] Stuhlmueller, 1970: 136.
[90] Balch, 2003: 1116. See also Tannehill, 1996: 115.
[91] Esler, 1987: 183-185.
[92] Tannehill (p.24) refers to the presence of both the poor and the "leading" or "high standing men and women (Acts 6:1; 17: 4, 12).
[93] The question of the gospel's community orientation, which remains a contentious issue, is discussed in chapter seven.

In summary, it can be argued that the above scholarly impasse in relation to the origins of makarisms and woes, the function and audience of the Sermon, coupled with the apparent scholarly neglect, demonstrates the lack of a consistent framework for the interpretation of the Lucan Sermon. This stalemate calls for the development of an alternative framework for the interpretation of the Sermon.

1.5. RECASTING THE FRAMEWORK: WHY THE PANEGYRIC PARADIGM OF PRAISE AND BLAME?

The challenges in the interpretation of the Sermon discussed above call for the recasting of the Sermon's interpretative framework. According to this dissertation, the best framework for understanding the meaning and function of the Sermon is to read it as a Greco-Roman panegyric. The word panegyric is a Latinised form of the Greek *πανηγυρικός*. Lexically, the word has the sense of "an assembly of the entire people, a solemn gathering at a festival or a festive convocation."[94] The speeches of these gatherings, whether prose or in verse, in which praise was an integral part, came to be known as a panegyric. Poetic panegyrics were often associated with victory ceremonies in Greek festivals' games.

Two characteristics of panegyrics provide a context for understanding the function of the Sermon in its original social context: their audience specific nature and their ability to combine praise and blame with exhortation. In relation to their community nature, Greco-Roman panegyrics were often directed at a particular audience. For example, Isocrates' panegyric of Evagoras was intended for the latter's son Nicocles.[95] Similarly, Zeba Crook points out that panegyrics had specific audiences. He gives two examples, the first being that of Cicero whose panegyrics were not armchair reflections but had a direct audience.[96] Another example is that of Pliny who wrote the *Panegyricus* for the Emperor Trajan with whom he had a benefactor/beneficiary relationship.[97] This demonstrates that panegyrics had specific audiences and issues they addressed.

---

[94] Mounce, 1993: 349; BDAG, 2000: 753-754.
[95] Isocrates, *Evagoras*, 9. 1.
[96] Crook, 2004: 121.
[97] Ibid. 120.

A second distinctive feature of a panegyric was its combination of praise and blame with the rhetoric of advice found in deliberative rhetoric.[98] This was the most pervasive feature of a panegyric. For example, Isocrates, in his *Panegyricus*, given at a Panhellenic festival, combined both the exhortation to the Greeks to unite against "common the enemy, Persians" and an invective against discordant Greek cities such as Sparta.[99] The element of praise and blame is also prevalent in Pindar's and Bacchylides' victory odes.[100] During the Roman imperial period, panegyric praise acted as admonitory guidance to both the emperor and new senators.[101] It was given by senators and represented prominent senators' totalising view of what an ideal emperor should be, and the values a newly ennobled member of the senate wished to be seen to endorse.[102] In relation to the integration of new senators, it is reported that Cicero praised the consuls-designate for 43 BCE, A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa, even before they entered office. Among other things, he praised them for their concern for the *res republica* although he (Cicero) was unaware of the two men's republican attitudes.[103] His praise was, therefore, meant to commit them to a policy favoured by him. The panegyrics' ability to direct praise and blame at the same audience in the panegyrics has a strong resonance with the structure of the Sermon. The combination of praise and blame in the Lucan makarisms and woes in vv. 20-26 and the corresponding exhortation in vv. 27-49 provides a plausible case for a new reading of the Sermon as a panegyric speech intended for both new and old members of Luke's primary audience.

The above-proposed framework for reading the Sermon has further significant support in several studies. First, it can be argued that Betz and other scholars' recognition of the Greco-Roman context of the Sermon, demonstrated above, provides a plausible basis for associating the Sermon with panegyrics.[104] Second, there is a successful demonstration of the relationship between makarisms and reproaches and honour and shame by such scholars as Hanson and Neyrey.[105] Although the investigations by Hanson and Neyrey concern Matthew's makarisms and woes, by placing the makarisms and woes in the context of honour and shame, they provide

[98] Nightingale, 1995: 97
[99] Ibid.
[100] See, Pindar, *Pythian* 1. 95; *Bacchylides*, 1. 190.
[101] Roche, 2011: 6-7.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Manuwald, 2011: 208.
[104] See, Betz, 1995: 572; Balch, 2003: 1116.
[105] See, Hanson, 1996:81-111; Neyrey, 1998:165.

a common ground for understanding gospel makarisms and woes in general and their Greco-Roman context in particular.

It is also established that in the Greco-Roman world, praise and blame were the vehicles of exchange of honour and shame.[106] This understanding creates a corresponding relationship between makarisms and woes and praise and blame, respectively. Third, some influential scholars acknowledge the presence of rhetorical devices in the gospel of Luke and indeed in the Sermon. For example, Kennedy refers to the Sermon as deliberative because, in the Sermon, Jesus gives advice. [107] Yet he singles out the beatitudes as epideictic because they celebrate human qualities and that in their position at the beginning, they are a proem.[108] By recognising the beatitudes as epideictic, Kennedy, without mentioning it, recognises the praise and blame inherent in the makarisms and woes. It can, therefore, be argued that the above evidence, plus Kennedy's recognition of the epideictic nature of the makarisms and woes, provide an important basis for this dissertation's proposed panegyric reading of the Sermon.

1.5.1. Praise and Blame and Greco-Roman Honour and Shame Culture

Another factor that supports the interpretation of the Sermon from the perspective of praise and blame is its cultural context of honour and shame. One distinctive feature of the Greco-Roman culture was the prevalence of honour and shame as normative values that governed human behaviour. In order to understand the wider implications of praise and blame, it is important to first establish the meaning of honour. There are several definitions of honour in literature. Bruce Malina's insights derived from Mediterranean anthropological research of the 1950, 60's and 70's, which have been corroborated by scholars,[109] provide a comprehensive analysis of the meaning of honour and its implications. Neyrey, for example, drawing from Malina's work, defines honour as the general abstract word for the worth, value, prestige, and reputation which an individual claims, and which is acknowledged by others.[110]Similarly, Eng defines honour as social worth which is shaped by two factors: (1) the norms of a particular society and (2) one's

[106] Kurke,1991: 6.
[107] Kennedy,1984: 45.
[108] Kennedy, 2003: 45.
[109] Eng, 2019: 194; Neyrey, 1998: 15.
[110] He further argues that according to its Greek roots honour (τιμή) refers to the price paid as compensation or satisfaction for an injury or insult. Neyrey, 1998: 15.

reproduction of those norms in one's own behaviour.[111] At the heart of the two aspects of honour, according to Malina, is the intersection of authority, gender, status and respect.[112] The above definitions suggest that deeper cultural underpinnings define honour. Underlying the issues of honour then is the quest for social control over others (authority) as a result of one's alignment with the expected social standard of behaviour representative of one's gender. The social recognition of one's behaviours leads to community recognition (respect).

There are two ways in which one can acquire honour. According to Malina, the first type of honour is the ascribed honour. This is the honour that one is born with through the family, ethnic group, or by virtue of being bestowed by a person of authority such as a king or a god.[113] The other type of honour is acquired honour which one obtains by excelling others in daily social interactions. [114] This type of honour can be won or lost on a daily basis through acts of benefaction and the antagonistic context of challenge and riposte. According to Malina, the dynamic of challenge and riposte, which could only occur between and among equals, defined interpersonal relationships in the Greco-Roman world, especially between non-family members.[115]

Building on Malina's earlier research, Jeremy Neyrey has also argued that the major characteristic of an honour and shame culture was the extent to which people took seriously the need to both care for and protect their honour and to fight to retrieve it if it had been lost. According to him, this phenomenon was prevalent in contexts like the Mediterranean world. It was built on the perception that access to honour was limited.[116] This led to the concept of "zero-sum game" (that an individual's gain or loss of success is a product of the loss or gain of another individual's success) which was understood to apply to all areas of life. This notion gave expression to the Greco-Roman competitive (agonistic) spirit wherein individuals were driven to win and be called ἄριστος (the best).[117] The sole object of competing and striving was to win honour, which was the public recognition of one's skills or achievement.[118] For example,

[111] Eng, 2019: 194.
[112] Malina, 2001: 30
[113] Ibid. 32.
[114] Ibid. 33.
[115] Ibid. 35; See also Crook, 2009: 593.
[116] Neyrey, 1998:525.
[117] Pomeroy, Bursten, Donlan and Roberts, 1999: 60.
[118] Ibid.

as Leslie Kurke has demonstrated, even giving, receiving and repaying were understood and practised within the context of challenge and riposte. The one who received a gift or a challenge was obligated to make a return that was equal to or superior to this original gift or challenge.[119] It is said that in striving to outdo each other, the motto was "anything you can do, I can do better."[120] Failure to return an equal or superior gift/response resulted in a loss of honour. In this context, the language of praise and blame served as the vehicle through which honour and shame were exchanged.[121] In other words, praise and blame were the ways the community expressed value judgements on certain persons and their action. Neyrey argues that this was done by use of the correlative pair of words: praise and blame *κάλως* /*αἰσχρός*, ἔπαινος/ψόγος-ψέκτος, ἔπαινος/αἴτιος or *laus/vituperatio*.[122] In addition, Eng has also recently argued that honour and shame served to maintain social control. This, according to him, is evident from the way rhetorical handbooks affirm the deep-seated identification of honour and shame in Greco-Roman culture by recommending the use of the commendable and the disgraceful to persuade one's audience.[123]

Malina's honour model has over the years undergone significant criticism and modification. Among some of its weaknesses has been the alleged inflexible ascription of honour as a male quality and shame as a female quality[124] and the use of abstracts models and static use of understanding culture.[125] Other scholars think the model's over-emphasis on honour as an overriding concern in Mediterranean culture,[126] and its failure to recognise inter-status honour challenges and women's agonistic behaviour represent some of it weaknesses[127] Yet, along with its modifications, the model continues to provide the basic framework for understanding the cultural ethos of the Greco-Roman world in which the NT communities subsisted.

The above discussion has important implications for this study. The pervasive nature of honour and shame in the Greco-Roman world suggests that speech was an important part of social

[119] Kurke, 1991: 93
[120] Fox, 2005: 68.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Neyrey, 1998: 71
[123] Eng, 2019: 194.
[124] Wikan, 1984: 636-52.
[125] Lawrence, 2003: 22-34.
[126] Downing, 1999: 53-73.
[127] Cook, 2009: 599, 604.

control. If praise and blame were the vehicles of the exchange of honour and shame, the use of the same, apparent in the Sermon, has significant implications on how we can interpret the function of the Sermon in its original context.

1.5.2. Praise and Blame in Greek Lyrical Poetry and Panegyrics

The relationship between praise and blame and panegyrics goes far back into the history of classical antiquity. Before the genre of *encomium* was developed as an epideictic discipline, praise had always been part of the Greek and neighbouring cultures. Hilary Mackie refers to the significance of public praising and blaming in the Homeric depiction of Achaean and Trojan societies respectively.[128] The use of νεῖκος, (reproof or taunt) as the linguistic medium through which the Agamemnon stirred the slackers among his warriors to action, demonstrates the significance of praise and blame in Greek society.[129] Further, as Laurent Pernot has argued, poetic praise (or blame) such as Pindar's and Bacchylides' victory odes had long been part of Greek language and culture.[130] It is even interesting to note that both the poetic and prose panegyric which Pindar wrote were called *encomia*. For example, Simon Hornblower demonstrates that Athenaios (Frag 573) calls Pindar's *Olympiad* 13 an encomium, though Pindar wrote a separate category of *encomia*. Similarly, among the *epinicion* odes, Nemean 13 is non-athletic but is none-the-less referred to as encomium.[131] Furthermore, Felix Budelmann states that an Alexandrian "standard edition" of Pindar assembled by Aristophanes of Byzantium is known to have comprised one book of *encomia*.[132] In addition, in *Pythian* 10:53 and *Nemean* 1.7 Pindar also used the adjective ἐνκώμιος for his *epinicia*.[133] Budelmann has also outlined the relationship between *epinicia* and *encomia*: (1) They all honour an addressee, usually with explicit praise and both are composed in triads and use similar metres and dialect; (2) while *epinicia* are concerned with athletic victory, some *encomia* also mention victory, and (3) sometimes *epinicia* and *encomia* were commissioned to mark the same occasion as in Bacchylides Frag. 20C, 175.[134]

---

[128] Mackie, 1996: 127, 136.
[129] Ibid. 83. For example, Homer reports: Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπε νείκει ὀνειδίζων...ὤ μοι ἀπειλητῆρες Ἀχαιΐδες οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί. Menelaus arose among them and spake, chiding them with words of reviling, ""Ah me, Ye braggarts, ye women of Achaea, men no more! Iliad, 7. 94-95.
[130] Pernot, 2014: 1.
[131] See, Hornblower, 2006: 18.
[132] Budelmann, 2010: 174.
[133] For example, in Pyth. 10: 53 he recites "The choicest hymns of praise (ἐνκώμιος) flits from theme to theme like a bee."
[134] Ibid. 175.

The similar designations for different categories of Pindar's panegyrics above demonstrate the relationship between praise poetry and epideictic *encomium*. Both have their roots in village (*κώμη*) festivals where poets sang hymns to gods and praised victors of the games.[135] The long-standing historical importance of praise in Greek culture is re-enforced by Pindar's assertion that:

> ἦν γε μὰν ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος
> δή πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι
> τὰν Ἀδράστου τάν τε Καδμείων ἔριν.[136]
>
> The encomium has existed for a long time even before the ἔρις (strife) between Adrastos and the Thebans ever happened.

By referring to the legendary Adrastos and his wars with the Thebans, which are mythological, Pindar attempts to recognise both the time-honoured and the deeply traditional nature of encomium as a primordial genre. The reference also underscores the highly entrenched nature of praise in Greek society. Such pervasiveness suggests that as a cultural phenomenon, knowledge of panegyric did not require the systematic analysis of subject matter and arrangement of demonstrative (epideictic) oratory which became characteristic of the later phase in the history of encomium. It is likely that Luke as a Hellenistic author would have been conversant with the practices of praise and blame. His depiction of Paul's use of rhetorical conventions in the Areopagite speech (Acts 17:16-34) demonstrates his facility with rhetorical conventions. His literary echoes from Greco-Roman literature, which is supported by a number of studies, suggests his probable facility in Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions.[137] In addition, it is also probable that the rudiments of this practice could have been transferable and adaptable to new conditions, especially with the development of new voluntary associations such as the early Christ-groups that became widespread across the Greco-Roman world.[138] Many scholars have demonstrated Luke's use of rhetorical conventions such as *chrea*, maxims and fables

[135] Kennedy, 2003: 81.
[136] Pindar, *Nemean*, 8.50–51, tr. by Harvard Classical Society, URL.
[137] See Macdonald, 2013: 463-496. Macdonald, 2015: 48. Lehtipuu, 2007: 75.
[138] See Ascough, 2002: 4-19; Kloppenborg, 1996: 16-30

thereby confirming the transferability and adaptability of rhetorical conventions to new situations.[139]

It can also be pointed out that the development of the preliminary exercises of the schools, the *Progymnasmata,*[140] or Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* on the Latin side, ushered in the age of prose panegyric. The above standard texts for oration defined the finer details of oratory into such devices as *topos*, *chreia,* commonplace, and encomia/invective and *synkrisis*.[141] For example, Isocrates, in *Evagoras* prides himself on being the first to write encomia in prose.[142] This demonstrates that for a long time the prime medium of praise and blame was poetry.[143] Yet as Raffaella Cribiore's study has shown, the practice of delivering poetic panegyric continued even after the development of prose *encomia*.[144] A number of studies see elements of poetry in gospel makarisms and woes. [145] Although their metre is yet to be established, the lyrical tone of the makarisms and woes especially when read together in collection, is probably the basis of the above scholarly observation. In this case, the presence of both poetic and prose *encomia* in antiquity helps to put in perspective Luke's combination of poetry and prose in the makarisms/woes (Lk 6: 20b-26) and the paraenesis (Lk 6: 27-49) respectively.

1.5.3. The Makarism as Epideictic Topos

Establishing the relationship between makarisms and woes and their place in Greco-Roman panegyric is fundamental to establishing the function of the Sermon in its social context. It can, however, be argued that, although Greco-Roman orators and poets made significant use of makarisms in their practice,[146] the relationship between makarisms and panegyric has historically not been an obvious one. While makarisms were part of the broader form of congratulation or complement,[147] they were never automatic aspects of panegyrics. Yet it can also be observed that there were instances in which makarisms were used as a *topos* in an

[139] Hock, 2003: 181-96; Klyne, 2008:45–77; Penner, Todd. 2012: 349-360; Yan. 2012: 3-28.
[140] Vickers, 1983: 500.
[141] See Kennedy, 2003: 15, 50, 79, 83.
[142] See Poulakos, 1987: 95.
[143] Center for Hellenistic Studies, 2019. URL.
[144] Cibriore also notes how in Liban. Or. 40.19–28, a high official was not content to be celebrated by a prose encomium written by a sophist but also requested a poetic encomium from an Egyptian poet who resided in Antioch. See Cribiore, 2008: 96.
[145] Green, 2001:37-46; Songer, 1992: 165-177; Hatton and Clark, 1975: 132-138; Sullivan, 1961:49-76.
[146] Pindar, *Olympiad* 7. 10; Pindar, *Pythian*, 5. 60; Bacchylides 5. 50.
[147] Hornblower, 1996: 914.

encomium. In the *Progymnasmata* a *topos* was the language amplifying something that is acknowledged to be either at fault or a brave deed.[148] It is related to the *proemium* (*proem*) which is a series of statements made at the beginning of a speech as felicitations.[149] Aristotle underscores the relationship between makarisms and the epideictic *topos* when he says:

> μακαρισμὸς δὲ καὶ εὐδαιμονισμὸς αὐτοῖς μὲν ταὐτά, [τούτοις] δ᾽ οὐ ταὐτά, ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ἡ εὐδαιμονία τὴν ἀρετήν, καὶ ὁ εὐδαιμονισμὸς περιέχει ταῦτα.[150]
>
> Blessing and felicitation are identical with each other, but are not the same as praise and encomium, which, as virtue is contained in happiness, are contained in felicitation.

Aristotle's reference above suggests that although makarisms have their context in praise, they themselves do not constitute praise. Yet, as he postulates, makarisms could also be used as felicitation or as a *topos* in an *encomium*. There is literary evidence of the use of makarisms as either epideictic *topos* or fecilitation in Greco-Roman panegyric which supports the above analysis. For example, Gorgias's encomium to the people of Elis starts with Ἦλις, *πόλις εὐδαίμων*", "Elis, blessed city."[151] Further, the encomium of Doscoros starts with Ὄλβιε, *πανόλβιε τῷ γένει*, "Blessed, and truly blessed for your birth."[152] A mere felicitation or *topos* virtually identical to the above but without a makarism is found Gorgias' *Olympic oration* which starts with: *ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἄξιοι θαυμάζεσθαι, ὦ ἄνδρες* Ἕλληνες." "Worthy of being admired by many people, o men of Greece!"[153] The above examples of makarisms as *topos* not only support the relationship between makarisms and felicitation but also on a wider scale, the relationship between makarisms and praise. Such connections, which will be further clarified in chapter 2, provide insight into the nature of the makarisms and woes in Luke 6:20-26 and their overall function in the Sermon.

[148] Kennedy, 2003: 206.
[149] Ibid. 80.
[150] Aristotle, Rhetoric 9. 34, translated by J. H. Freese.
[151] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*. 3. 14.12- modified translation.
[152] Quoted in Cribiore, 2008: 96.
[153] Olympic Oration, *On Concord*, 248-249.

1.5.4. Luke and Greco-Roman Literature

Another important issue which touches on the use of the panegyric framework in the interpretation of the Sermon is the question of Luke's acquaintance with Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions. First, it can be argued that the influence of Greco-Roman literature on the development of the NT texts is now axiomatic in scholarship.[154] With reference to the NT and rhetorical conventions, David Aune has argued that the presence of cultural codes such as the *chrea*, the diatribe, the style of ancient Greek letters, the writing of biographies and the Greek novel have resonance with the way the NT was written.[155] This suggests significant convergence between the Greco-Roman literature and NT texts.

Beyond the NT generally, the relationship between Luke and Greco-Roman literature has recently received significant scholarly attention. Among the major questions has been the extent to which Luke employed Greco-Roman sources and whether his use of rhetorical devices is evidence of his knowledge of the *Progymnasmata* or other Greek or Roman rhetorical handbooks. Denis Macdonald is representative of the scholarly interest in this area. In his comparative study of *Acts and Bacchae*, he argues that, while in Lk 1:1-4 Luke acknowledges his sources, it is by no means clear whether he had the same sources for his composition of the Book of Acts. He, however, further argues that although it is possible that Luke had literary models from the Septuagint, most of his sources must have come from classical Greek literature, including Socrates' dialogues, Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the Euripidean tragedies.[156] In another of his studies, *Luke and Virgil*, McDonald further outlines the profound connections between Luke and classical Greek poetry, particularly Pindar's praise poetry. For example, McDonald establishes a special connection between the experience of Jason in Pindar's *Fourth Pythian Ode* and that of the Jason of Acts 17:1-9.[157] Macdonald's conclusions on the relationship between Luke and Greco-Roman literature are corroborated by other earlier studies. For example, Outi Lehtipuu demonstrated that Luke's reference to the after-life in the parable of Lazarus and Jesus' Gethsemane prayer in which he asks to be spared the cup of suffering echo Pindar's idea of the metempsychosis and Pindar's *Nemean Ode* 9:28ff, respectively.[158] The above literary echoes between Luke and Greek literature and poetry not

---

[154] See Aune, 1984; Macdonald, 2013: 463-496; Umurhan and Penner, 2013: 165-93.
[155] Aune, 1984: 74.
[156]Macdonald, 2013: 463-496.
[157] Macdonald, 2015: 48.
[158] See Lehtipuu, 2007: 75.

only suggest a common context and Luke's access to the cultural resources of his time but also the probability of his knowledge of panegyrics, both poetic or prose.

Beyond the above discussion, the question of how far Luke was conversant with the *Progymnasmata*, which could determine the extent of his use of rhetorical conventions, remains a contested area. While some scholars acknowledge Luke's awareness of the progymnastic exercises,[159]others have demonstrated, through the critical application of progymnastic exercises on Lucan texts, Luke's facility with progymnastic exercises. [160] For example, in his analysis of in Luke 11:1-13, Vernon Robbins establishes Luke's probable acquaintance with the progymnasmatic enthymeme.[161] Similarly, Mikeal Parsons has also demonstrated the relationship between Luke and the *Progymnasmata*. He argues that the existence of rhetorical devices in Luke such as the *chreia*, the *fable* and *inflexion*, among others, demonstrates Luke's knowledge of the *Progymnasmata* and its influence on his writing.[162] However, other scholars like Adams, although acknowledging Luke's exposure to basic rhetorical training, are cautious of his sophistication in the use of rhetorical devices.[163]

Although Luke's level of education and the extent to which he acquired some level of rhetorical education remain contested by scholars like Adams, that he had some basic knowledge of rhetorical conventions cannot be disputed based on the above studies and the evidence from the Gospel itself. For example, Kennedy has rightly argued that in the Third Gospel, Luke maintains a persistent polarisation starting from the *proem* and continuing throughout the epilogue: some are blessed and some cursed, some will harken, and some not, some are built on a rock and some without a foundation.[164] Why this should be so, there is no explanation.[165] Kennedy's argument above is demonstrable from the way Luke uses of conditional particles between the protasis and apodosis of the makarisms and woes which creates enthymemes. An enthymeme is an argument, used in oratorical practice, in which one premise is not explicitly stated.[166] By presuming the premise, for example "blessed are the poor" (Lk 6: 20b) as self-

[159] Parsons, 2003: 43-64; Martin, 2008: 18–41.
[160] Van Aarde 2019: 1–9.; Rice, 2013: 355–76; Stegman and Thomas 2007: 328–52.
[161] Robbins, 1989: 191-214.
[162] Parson, 2003: 43-64.
[163] See Adams, 2016: 137-154.
[164] Kennedy, 1984: 66
[165] Ibid.
[166] Vernon K Robbins provides a helpful discussion of Luke's use of enthymemes. See Robbins, 1989: 191-214

explanatory or leaving the conclusion such as "to you belong the Kingdom of God" unexpressed, the Sermon demonstrate elements of rhetoric. Similarly, Eric Franklin notes Jesus' direct addressees of his disciples as the poor, the hungry, the weepers and the excluded and yet not all were, in fact, these, though many within the community were.[167] Kennedy and Franklin do not provide answers to their observations. Yet there are implications behind their remarks. One such implication is that the issues Jesus raised in the gospel were more than literal but symbolic of something deeper that is reflective of the book's rhetorical style. The above rhetorical traits of the gospel place the author of the Third Gospel significantly higher on the rungs among those of his time who were conversant with Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions.

1.5.5. The Question of Lucan Authorship and Audience

Although the authorship of the Gospel of Luke remains contested, most recent studies hold that the author is Luke the companion of Paul.[168] This dissertation proceeds on the assumption that the author of the Gospel is Luke the companion of Paul (Col. 4:14; 2 Tim. 4:11; Phil. 24). The fact that he was a non-Apostle and a Gentile and therefore the most unlikely candidate demonstrates the probability of his authorship.[169] Further, the question of Luke's audience, like for all gospels, remains unresolved.[170] This dissertation proceeds on the assumption that Luke's primary audience was a group of homogenous and mixed churches in a Gentile Mediterranean and Hellenistic social setting. The full import of this vexing question, which was stirred up by Bauckham's "gospel for Christians" thesis, is discussed in chapter seven. Yet at this preliminary stage, it is important to state that the problems of identifying Luke's audience are alleged to stem largely from the gospel's apparent universalism, which suggests that in his itinerant ministry the author picked up stories as he went about with Paul.[171] The Gospel's universal theological perspective has also often fuelled this position.[172] However, recent trends in Lucan scholarship seem open to the possibility of a Lucan audience. For example, while acknowledging the difficulty of establishing a Lucan audience most scholars agree that the

[167] Franklin, 2001: 934.
[168] Edwards, 2015: 5-8; Carrol, 2012: 1-2; Garland, 2011: 1-4.
[169] See Edwards, 2015: 5-8.
[170] Some scholars like W. D. Davis and D.C. Allison Jr (1998) hold that the probable existence of at least a Matthean community has somehow achieved some level of scholarly consensus. See also Sim, 1998 and Overman, 1990. There are still however, some quarters in gospel scholarship who do not see Matthew within Judaism. See Levine, 2007.
[171] Allison, Jr. 1988: 64.
[172] Ibid. 1.

Lucan audience was a mixed church in a Hellenistic context.[173] It was probably a community of churches composed of individuals from diverse social status and religious background.[174] The non-elite would probably have been the dominant group with some who came from the elite periphery.[175] The Hellenistic context of the audience suggests that they not only had a shared identity and a sense of belonging but also that most of them were conversant with the pedagogical role of panegyrics in their community.[176] The adoption of the panegyric in Christian discourse later in the history of the early Christian movement demonstrates the influence of Greco-Roman panegyric. Eusebius' 315 CE panegyric in Tyre and his 335 CE *Tricennial Orations* to Constantine, although far removed from Luke's time, represent the trajectory of Christian adoption of the Greco-Roman panegyric.[177] All this demonstrates the continuing relevance of the panegyric in the early Christian movement and its adoption by the author of Luke's Gospel.

1.6. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In examining the Sermon, this dissertation makes use of redaction criticism as an aspect of historical criticism, enhanced by social-scientific perspectives. The significance of using historical criticism in the present research is underlined by the method's concern with both the history of the text and also with its interest in the original meaning of the text.[178] An understanding of the history of the Sermon and its meaning and function within its original context is also the primary aim of this study. The relevance of redaction criticism is that it describes the editorial work carried out by the gospel writers on their sources when they composed the Gospels.[179] As Norman Perrin puts it, the discipline is concerned with exploring the theological motivation of an author as it is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing and modification of traditional material, and the composition of new material or the creation of

---

[173] Carrol, 2012*:* 2; Moxnes, 1994: 379-389; Creamer, Spencer, & Vijoen, 2014: 7; Tannehill, 1996: 24.
[174] Tannehill, 1996: 24, Esler, 1987: 183
[175] Moxnes, 1994: 387.
[176] There is a possibly that the level of exposure to panegyric encomia would have been different within the different social strata of the communities of Christ-groups. Yet the general cultural context of shame and honour and its corresponding praise and blame elements would have made it possible for their general comprehension of panegyrics.
[177] For example, in 315 CE, Eusebius of Caesarea at the request Bishop Paulinus of Tyre delivered a panegyric to a new church building at Tyre. Similarly, in 335 CE, in the thirtieth year of Constantine's reign Eusebius also delivered a panegyric to Constantine's celebrating the piety and faith of the emperor. The *Oratio de Laudibus Constantini*, as it was popularly known, extolled the virtues of Constantine and his achievement as an ideal Christian emperor. See the works of Smith, 1989:226-246 and Drake*,* 1976.
[178] Barton, 1998: 10.
[179] Smalley, 1979: 181.

new forms within the traditions of early Christianity.[180] Similarly, this project is concerned with examining how and why Luke used his sources, Mark, Q and L, to present Jesus' message as he did in the Sermon. It is concerned with understanding the social, economic and theological issues behind the text of the Sermon. However, this study's application of redaction criticism does not in any way undermine the authority of the text. It is merely an acknowledgement of the relationship between history and theology and how Jesus's message was summarised by the evangelist within his context.

The use of redaction criticism in the present dissertation is also enhanced by social-scientific perspectives. This use of social-scientific perspectives is necessary if we are going to examine the text in the social context of the evangelist and how his context helped to shape the message of Jesus. The importance of the social context of the evangelist is best summarised by Willi Marxsen who aptly says:

> We enquire into the situation of the community in which the gospels arose. The community ought not to be unqualifiedly viewed as located in a specific place, though we should keep in mind the possibility of defining it exactly. Our concern is much more with what is typical in this community, its view, its time, perhaps its composition.[181]

Marxsen's reference to "the situation of the community" takes redaction criticism beyond the text into the realm of the "social" world of the text to uncover the theological motivation of the gospel writers. Yet, as it is, redaction criticism is only successful in as far as it examines the text and its structure. Without a tool for socio-analysis, it cannot analyse the context of the text. As Philip Esler has argued, redaction criticism, like form criticism before it, failed to generate a method for investigating social context.[182] As a result redaction criticism has never adequately grasped the larger context of the motivation beyond the individual text. However, as John Elliot posits, the NT contains witnesses to a social phenomenon, the gathering of a community around Jesus of Nazareth conceived as Israel's Messiah and society's saviour. This event, in turn, is only comprehensible within a larger constellation of social, economic, political, and cultural

---

[180] Perrin, 1969: 1.
[181] Marxsen, 1969: 24.
[182] Esler, 1987: 4.

currents.[183] In other words, without a tool for investigating the social aspects of the text, redaction criticism fails to grasp how community dynamics in which the author and his faith community subsist provided the right conditions for the production of the text.

The above shortfalls in redaction criticism necessitate its enhancement with social-scientific criticism. As John Elliot puts it, the usefulness of socio-scientific criticism is that it helps to analyse not only the social aspects and content of texts but also the conditioning factors and intended consequences of the communication process. Further, it also helps to examine the correlation of the text's linguistic, literary and theological (ideological) and social dimensions, and the way the textual communication was both reflection of, and a response to a particular social and cultural context.[184] From Elliot's point of view, it can be observed that socio-scientific criticism incorporates almost a full range of the practices of historical criticism. Vernon Robbins is therefore right to argue that as a sub-discipline of historical criticism, socio-scientific criticism brings historical criticism to its fullest expression.[185] The fact that historical criticism can be enhanced by sub-disciplines underscores its malleability and, therefore, its continuing relevance as a method of biblical interpretation.

The use of social-science techniques in the study of the NT is part of the development of interdisciplinary studies. The employment of social science tools and social-scientific ideas and perspectives including anthropology has been its distinctive feature. The practice represents the continuing recognition of the need to interpret the Bible from the context of the culture that produced it. The adoption of interdisciplinary approaches has had quite a significant enriching effect in some academic studies. It has thus become possible to study classics and anthropology together with a view to gaining the meaning of ancient human institutions. For example, James Redfield and Marcel Detienne have highlighted the complementary roles of classics and anthropology.[186] The touching point for the two disciplines is when individuals attempt to "do anthropology with the Greeks and Romans."[187] Comparative studies of Greco-Roman anthropology resulting from classical-anthropological studies not only shed light on ancient human institutions but also how they compare with modern institutions. For example, Walter

[183] Elliot, 1993: 9.
[184] Ibid. 7.
[185] Robbins, 1995: 275.
[186] Redfield, 1991: 5-23; Detiene, 2005: 63-74.
[187] See Detienne, 63-74.

Scheidel, using physical and anthropological records of polygyny in the Greco-Roman world, was able to establish how Greco–Roman monogamy has historically played a role in shaping Christian and later 'Western' marital norms that eventually gained global influence.[188] Such studies, which benefit from the intersection of classics and anthropology, demonstrate that it is possible for biblical scholars, just like classical scholars, to mine anthropological data useful for understanding the social context of early Christian communities in which texts like the Sermon arose. Bruce Malina's *NT World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* demonstrates how NT studies can benefit anthropology.[189] All this demonstrates the useful insights the application of social-science findings can bring to the study of the Christian religion in general and biblical studies, in particular.

The primary interest of the present dissertation lies in uncovering the original message of the Sermon and how its unique features, particularly its makarisms and woes, reflect both Lucan redactional intentions and community application. It is the community dimension of the study which necessitates the use of social-scientific perspectives. However, the use of social-scientific criticism adopted in the present study differs from most social-scientific studies of the NT. This study takes up the broad approach of redaction criticism and fuses it with a conscious application of the results of anthropology and Greco-Roman rhetoric. It particularly employs the Greco-Roman cultural paradigm of praise and blame as a framework for analysing the function of the Sermon and its makarisms and woes in their original context. It compares how the praise and blame in Greco-Roman panegyrics, both as a cultural phenomenon and as a product of rhetoric, can shed light on the function of the Sermon. To do this, the dissertation, first, using Greco-Roman primary sources, analyses the relationship between praise and blame and makarisms and woes in the Greco-Roman context. Second, using both primary and secondary sources from classical studies, it examines the function of Greco-Roman praise poetry and panegyrics, the way the paradigm of praise and blame are used in these works and how the same informs the antithetical presentation of the Lucan makarisms and woes. Through this approach, the study not only offers a new reading of the Sermon but also an interpretation that allows the text of the Sermon to speak in its own guise and not as a subset of the Sermon on the Mount.

---

[188] See Scheidel 2009: 280-291.
[189] See also Malina, 2001.

1.7. DISSERTATION STRUCTURE

The dissertation has eight chapters. The first chapter is the introduction. It introduces the context, the aims and objectives, a survey of literature and the methodology employed in the study. In the second chapter, the relationship between makarisms and woes and Greco-Roman language of praise and blame is analysed. The chapter examines the content and context of makarisms and woes in Greco-Roman literature and its relationship to panegyric praise and blame, and their affinities with the Lucan makarisms and woes.

In the third chapter the study analyses the function of praise and blame in Greco-Roman world in its different contexts. The aim is to set forth the theoretical framework for the interpretation of the Sermon.

The fourth chapter examines the Greco-Roman context of the Sermon. It attempts to draw parallels between the Sermon and its Greek context. The aim is to locate and therefore interpret the Sermon as a panegyric and its implications for Luke's audience.

The fifth chapter provides an exegesis of the Sermon from the perspective of the Greco-Roman panegyric. It draws on the results of the previous chapters, especially, the function of the panegyrics in their original context and brings such functions to bear on the reading of the Sermon.

The sixth chapter traces how the paradigm of praise and blame inherent in the Sermon is also traceable across the whole of the Third Gospel. Its central argument is that the paradigm of praise and blame is not only uniquely inherent in the Sermon but is also a pervasive Lucan motif that colours the gospel's presentation of Jesus' message.

The seventh chapter brings out and discusses the implications of the panegyric reading of the Sermon on the gospel community debate. In view of the community reading of the Sermon, the chapter re-assesses the gospel communities' debate. Using both new and old evidence the chapter argues for the continuing relevance of the local audience thesis. Finally, the last chapter offers a summary of the study findings and the conclusions drawn from the whole study.

CHAPTER 2

PRAISE AND BLAME AND MAKARISMS AND WOES IN GRECO-ROMAN LITERATURE

2.1. INTRODUCTION

One of the critical issues in proposing a panegyric reading of Lk 6:20-49 is to establish the relationship between the Sermon's makarisms and woes and the Greco-Roman panegyric paradigm of praise and blame. This relationship, which remains unexplored, is essential for identifying parallels between the praise and blame of the panegyrics and the Lucan makarisms and woes (Lk 6:20-26). Although most of makarism scholarship holds onto the OT context for the gospel makarisms, dissenting voices who make an exception to this consensus, have never been wholly absent.[190] Joseph Fitzmyer, for example, who acknowledges that gospel makarisms have counterparts in Egypt, classical Greek literature and the OT, notes that there is in the Matthean and the Lucan Gospels something that cannot be explained by the Old Testament background.[191] He argues that while there are paired beatitudes in 1 Kings 10.8; 2 Chron. 9:7; Ps 32:1-2, there is no extended collection of makarisms such as one finds in Mt 5:3-11 and Luke 6:20-26. Fitzmyer's observation is endorsed by Nolland, Thompson and Talbert.[192] Nolland, after acknowledging the uniqueness of the gospel makarisms collection, argues that the only remote parallel is provided by the list of blessings and curses in for example, Dt 27:15-16 but, according to him, beatitudes are not blessings.[193]

It therefore appears that the observations of Fitzmyer and others demand an alternative explanation for the origins of gospel makarisms. This chapter argues that the Lucan makarisms and woes not only have their setting within the broader context of Greco-Roman honour and shame culture but also reflect the paradigm of praise and blame. The chapter has two main sections. In the first section, it examines the concepts used in Greco-Roman makarisms and

[190] Parsons, 2015: 101-2; Thompson, 1999: 109-116; McCown, 1927: 50-61; Dodd, 1968*:* 3. According to Parson, (p.101-2) makarisms were particularly common in Jewish literature such as Ps 1:1; 41:1; Pro. 14:21; Sir. 31: 8.
[191] Fitzmyer, 1981: 623; Fitzmyer, 2000: 114.
[192] Nolland, 1989: 279; Thompson, 1999: 112; Talbert, 2002: 73.
[193] Ibid.

woes construction. In the second section, the chapter analyses the similarities between Greco-Roman and Lucan makarisms and woes and their relationship to praise and blame.

2.2. DEFINING CONCEPTS: PRAISE AND BLAME: OLBIOS, EUDAIMON AND MAKARIOS AND OUAI

2.2.1. Ὄλβιος, Εὐδαίμων and Μακάριος

Makarisms (Gr. Μακαρισμοί or Latin *beatitudines*) were part of the language of Greco-Roman culture.[194] The makarism represented the broader form of congratulation or compliment for good behaviour.[195] As an expression of a person's inner happiness, the makarism extolled the good fortunes of a person or exalted the person (themselves) for the good fortune that they have had.[196] With their setting in the family, with its happy occurrences, and the school in which the happiness of the observant was praised, makarisms constituted the affirmation of values the community wished to validate.[197] Several adjectives such as ὄλβιος, εὐδαίμων, μακάριος and their cognates were used in makarisms construction. A basic makarism was constructed from an adjective or verbal noun followed by relative or an indefinite pronoun. Occasionally, this was also followed by the reason for attaining that status.[198] The corresponding Latin adjectives used were; *felix*, *beatus*, and *fortunatus* and their cognates. Typical Latin *beatitudes* started with the formula *felix qui*, *beati qui*, or *fortunatus qui*.[199]

Depending on their context, a makarism could have either a secular or sacred meaning or both at the same time. However, owing to the fluidity of the Greco-Roman conceptions of the spiritual and the profane, the difference between the two meanings was subtle and sometimes indistinguishable. For example, while prosperity could be understood in secular terms, in the Greco-Roman context, its sources were often associated with the gods. Sullivan argues that as used by poets the makarisms referred to earthly felicity but when the mysteries came, they took on sacred meanings and became ἱεροὶ λόγοι (sacred words) with promises of future bliss based

[194] The word *beātitās*/ *beatitūdo* refers to supreme happiness. See Morwood, 1994: 22.
[195] Hornblower, 1996: 914.
[196] Fitzmyer, 1981: 632.
[197] See, Bovon, 2002: 222.
[198] E.g. μακάριος, ὃς ἔχεις καὶ πεδὰ μέγαν κάματον λόγων φερτάτων μναμήϊ' - "blessed are you, who have, even after great hardship, a memorial of the best words." Pindar, *Pythian*, 5.60. tr. Diane Arnson Svarlien.
[199] E.g. *Felix, qui potest rerum cognoscere causas*, "blessed is he who knows the cause of things", Virgil, *Georgics*, 2.490-494, tr. J. B. Greenough.

on present religious experience.[200] From the above definitions, it can be surmised that at the core of the meaning and function of makarisms was both the recognition of and bestowal of happiness and honour upon those to whom they were pronounced. Such happiness was understood in both the secular and spiritual sense.

2.2.1.1. Ὄλβιος

The term ὄλβιος has both secular and sacred meaning. It can refer to material fortunes related to possessions and wealth.[201] For example, Odysseus refers to the δῶρα (gifts) that he received from Alcinous as a 'blessing.'[202] Similarly, in Euripides' *Bacchae* wealth is referred to as ὄλβος.[203] This materialistic meaning is also echoed in the Latin *beatus*, *felix* and *fortunatus*, which have the sense of fruitfulness, productivity and prosperity.[204] However, in a number of instances, a religious sense of ὄλβιος is also implied. For example, in the Hymn to Mother Earth, the meaning of ὄλβιος is significantly connected with divine favour. In praising Mother Earth for her generous bounty, the narrator says:

> ὃ δ' ὄλβιος,
> ὅν κε σὺ θυμῷ
> πρόφρων τιμήσῃς.[205]
> Happy is the man whom you (the gods) delight to honour.

By connecting the source of happiness to the gods, the narrator gives ὄλβιος a sacred sense. It can also be observed that the above makarism has its context in praise. It is a praise of the goddess' (Mother Earth) generosity. The makarism captures the implications of this divine generosity on those whom the goddess favours. The catalogue of good things that accrue to the

---

200 Sullivan, 1961: 394-5.
201 Ibid. 395.
202 Using it as a verb he says, τά μοι θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες ὄλβια ποιήσειαν 'may the god of heaven they bless them to me", Homer, Odyssey, 13.42, tr. Samuel Butler.
203 O ἑτέρᾳ δ' ἕτερος ἕτερον [ὄλβῳ] καὶ δυνάμει παρῆλθεν. "One surpasses another in different ways, in wealth or power. Euripides, *Bacchae*, 902. tr. T. A. Buckley.
204 LS at Perseus, Bĕātus.
205 *Homeric Hymn*, 30.7-8, tr. Hugh G. Evelyn-White.

favoured of the gods (9-15) reflects the concept of honour which was the quest of every Greco-Roman male.[206]

In some instances, both the social and religious meaning of ὄλβιος is conspicuous. For example, Bacchylides, in his recognition and praise of Hieron's single horse victory at the 476 BCE Olympia says:

> Ὄλβιος ᾧτινι θεὸς
> μοῖράν τε καλῶν ἔπορεν
> σύν τ' ἐπιζήλῳ τύχᾳ
> ἀφνεὸν βιοτὰν διάγειν.[207]
> Prosperous is he to whom a god has given a share of fine things, and a rich life to live out with enviable luck.

It can be observed in the makarisms above that while 'fine things' are secular and social phenomena, their source in the gods gives the word ὄλβιος a religious meaning. The praise context of the above makarisms is also obvious. The makarisms is part of a victory ode in which the exploits of the victor are not only extoled but also described as a gift from the gods. To further illustrate the double meaning of ὄλβιος we use the makarism from Bion of Phlossa who says:

> Ὄλβιοι οἱ φιλέοντες, ἐπὴν ἴσον ἀντεράωνται [208]
>
> "Happy are lovers when their love is requited."

[206] In 30. 9-15 the poem says of the favoured: "He has all things abundantly: his fruitful land is laden with corn, his pastures are covered with cattle, and his house is filled with good things. Such men rule [orderly] with order in their cities of fair women: great riches and wealth follow them: their sons exult with ever-fresh delight, and their daughters in flower-laden bands play and skip merrily over the soft flowers of the field. Thus, is it with those whom you honour, O holy goddess, bountiful spirit."
[207] Bacchylides 5.50, tr. D. Arnson Svarlien.
[208] Bion of Phlossa, Frag. 8.

In the above makarism Bion uses the example of Theseus and Perithous, Orestes and Pylades, and Achilles and Patroclus (Aeacid) to glorify and celebrate mutual love and friendship between men.[209] The verb ἀντεράωνται from ἀντεράω has the sense of "loving in return" which, from the given examples of Theseus versus Perithous and Orestes versus Pylades, can be understood in everyday human terms. However, the fact the favour is reciprocated in the afterlife gives ὄλβιος a simultaneous religious and spiritual sense. The praise context of the above makarisms is also obvious. The idea of "loving in return" carried in the verb ἀντεράω reflects the Greco-Roman concept of reciprocity in which the one who receives must make a return that is equal or superior to the original gift. The long-term loss of face that followed failure to reciprocate a challenge of honour for both parties, was among the most agonising experiences in classical antiquity. Therefore, for Theseus, Orestes and Achilles to have their love "requited" implied that the obligation of honour had been reciprocated. The circumvention of shame through reciprocation provides the right context for praise, hence the above makarism.

2.2.1.2. Εὐδαίμων

Another word used to render a makarism is the adjective εὐδαίμων. This word was rooted in the idea of a man with a good god (εὐ-δαιμονία,) who assigned him a great portion.[210] It meant being endowed with a good genius and therefore fortunate in worldly terms.[211] It can be observed that when analysed in a specific context, the word's rootedness in "a good god" gives it a double meaning. It underscores the fact that all good things come from the gods. Aristotle, however, regards εὐδαίμων as a mere substitute for εὖ ζῆν ("doing well and living well").[212] According to him, this life entailed living a virtuous life in the *polis* and experiencing external prosperity.[213] However, the poetic use of εὐδαίμων in Euripides' *Bacchae* demonstrates a broad secular and religious meaning. For example, in *Bacchae* the Chorus declares:

εὐδαίμων μὲν ὃς ἐκ θαλάσσας

---

[209] Wasdin, 2018: 65.
[210] Sullivan, 1961: 395.
[211] Liddell and Scott, 2007: 280.
[212] See Kraut, 2018, URL.
[213] Aristotle, *Nich. Ethics*, 1095a. See also Sullivan, 1961: 396.

ἔφυγε χεῖμα, λιμένα δ᾽ ἔκιχεν.[214]

Happy is he who has fled a storm on the sea and reached harbour.

εὐδαίμων δ' ὃς ὕπερθε μόχθων

ἐγένεθ'·[215]

Blessed is he who has overcome all his problems.

A secular meaning is evident in the above two makarisms. Yet when understood within their broader context, a religious meaning also becomes conspicuous. The two makarisms above have their context in the Chorus' declaration (880-900) that the gods have both the power to punish the impious and give mortals wisdom (*τὸ σοφόν*) and honour (*τὸ κάλλιον*). One such God-given goodness is the strength over the head his of one's enemies (900). In this case, the ability to escape from the sea and overcome all problems are aspects of blessedness.

It can further be observed that the idea of strength over enemies above echoes the agonistic world of the Homeric male with his relentless pursuit of *τιμή* (honour). Such honour was understood in terms of *ἀγαθός*, which constituted the virtues of strength, agility and bravery and wealth.[216] Therefore, as a re-enforcement of desired behaviour, the set of makarisms is a praise for those who follow and worship the Bacchae and upon whom the above manly qualities of honour would be graciously bestowed.

Further, while Euripides' use of *εὐδαίμων* above is secular in meaning, when it is understood in a context where all this blessedness is bestowed by the gods, a religious meaning to the makarisms above emerges. For example, in Hesiod's reference to the blessedness (*εὐδαίμων*) and luck (*ὄλβιος*) of he who does not offend (*ἀναίτιος*) the deathless *ἀθανάτοισιν* (gods), a spiritual/religious sense emerges.[217]

[214] Euripides, *Bacchae,* 902-911, tr. T. A. Buckley.
[215] Ibid.
[216] See, Duke, 2013: 14; Adkins, 1971: 1-14
[217] cf, *τάων εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος, ὃς τάδε πάντα εἰδὼς ἐργάζηται ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, ὄρνιθας κρίνων καὶ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων*. "That man is happy and lucky in them who knows all these things and does his work without offending the deathless gods, who discerns the omens of birds and avoids transgression." Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 825ff, tr. Hugh Evelyn-White.

In some instances, as in the previous case above, *εὐδαίμων* is used together with ὄλβιος in the same makarism. This use of both εὐδαίμων and ὄλβιος in the same makarisms suggest the similarities in meaning between the two adjectives.[218] Lastly, it can also be observed that Hesiod's makarism above has its context in praise. It is rooted in his praise of the knowledge of days and the specific tasks associated with them, for a successful life (800-824).

2.2.1.3. Μακάριος

Μακάριος (or its cognates such as *μάκαρ*) was the most common adjective for makarism construction in the Greek speaking world and the NT. Rooted in the idea of happiness, and mostly used as an adjunct to the word θεός, *μακάριος* originally referred to the trouble-free existence of the gods.[219] The phrase οἱ *μάκαρες* θεοί, "the happy gods", is frequently found in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* with special reference to the gods' trouble-free existence. [220] With reference to a human being, *μακάριος* meant she or he was happy like the "happy gods" in their good fortune.[221] The comparison of human fortune with the trouble-free status of the gods is illustrated in much Greek literature. For instance, in praise of Helen and her husband Menelaus, Electra tells Helen, *σὺ δ' εἶ μακαρία μακάριος θ' ὁ σὸς πόσις* [222] "you are highly blessed you and your husband too." The larger context of this makarism was Helen and her husband Menelaus's arrival in Argos from a seven-year wealth amassing spell in Egypt after the Trojan War. Meanwhile, Agamemnon, Electra's father, had been killed by his wife who in turn was killed by her son Orestes. Therefore, the double misfortunes of Agamemnon's household, to which Electra belonged, provided a striking contrast with the fortunes and supposedly trouble-free life of Helen and Menelaus. In this case, the meaning of *μακάριος* in the above makarism can also be understood in physical terms. It can also be noted that the contrasting fortunes of Helen and Electra in the story make praise the context of the above makarism. It is the praise of the good fortunes of Hellen and her husband Menelaus vis-à-vis the deplorable situation of

[218] For example, Dybikowski notes that in Oedipus (1.1528-30) the chorus assert "Count no man *ὄλβιος* ..." (here ὄλβιος is essentially equivalent to εὐδαίμων). See also Dybikowski, 1981:197.
[219] De Heer, 1969:4.
[220] Homer, *The Iliad*, 24.22.
[221] Sullivan, 1961: 395.
[222] Euripides, *Orestes*, 85.

Agamemnon's family. In the *Progymnasmata*, good fortune related to power and wealth belonged to the praiseworthy topic of achievement.[223]

A similar secular meaning of *μακάριος* can be identified from the statement of Dikaiopolis' wife (in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*) to her daughter on the night of her participation in Bacchic sacrifices:

> ὡς μακάριος
> ὅστις σ' ὀπύσει κἀκποιήσεται γαλᾶς
> σοῦ μηδὲν ἧττους βδεῖν. [224]
> Happy is he, who shall be your possessor and embrace you so firmly at dawn.

In the above makarism, the daughter's possessor, who is probably one of her male consorts in the Bacchic revelries, is praised for the opportunity to embrace this youthful maiden. The word *ὀπυίω* from which *ὀπύσει* is derived has the sense of taking a wife or wedding. In this case, the makarisms could be a celebration of the virgin's beauty on behalf of her to-be-identified suitor during the Bacchic ceremonies. This celebration of the possible nuptials of this girl locates the above makarism in the context of praise.

In some cases, *μακάρ* carries a religious sense as Euripides below demonstrates:

> ὦ
> μάκαρ, ὅστις εὐδαίμων
> τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδὼς
> βιοτὰν ἁγιστεύει.[225]

[223] See Kennedy, 2003: 108.
[224] Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 250-255.
[225] Euripides, *Bacchae*, 70-75.

The blessed one (blessed) is he who, being fortunate and knowing the rites of the gods, keeps his life pure.

The context of the above makarisms is Bacchus' (Dionysius) declaration to be the son of Zeus and therefore demand to be worshiped. Those who oppose him will face his war (50-55). The word *βιοτὰν* is a noun which means sustenance or living. At the same time *ἁγιστεύει* means to perform sacred rites. Together the two words imply a "life of worship." The makarism is part the Chorus' praise of those who will, beforehand, be wise to heed the warning above and worship Bacchus accordingly. Such understanding places the makarism in the context of praise.

A double physical and religious sense is also conspicuous in Theognis' makarism below:

ἆ μάκαρ εὐδαίμων τε καὶ ὄλβιος, ὅστις ἄπειρος
ἄθλων εἰς Ἀΐδεω δῶμα μέλαν καταβῇ,
πρίν τ' ἐχθροὺς πτῆξαι καὶ ὑπερβῆναί περ ἀνάγκῃ
ἐξετάσαι τε φίλους ὅντιν' ἔχουσι νόον.[226]

Ah blessed and happy and fortunate is he that goes down the into the black house of death without knowing trouble, and ere he has bent before his foes, sinned of necessity, or tested the loyalty of his friend.

The context of the above makarism is Theognis' talk to Kyrnos (119-128) on loyal friendship. The reference to a trouble-free life, not bending down to enemies, and testing the loyalty of friends mirrors the values of Greek excellence (*ἀρετή*) and honour (*τιμή*) which resonate with the encomiastic values of wealth, courage, valour and loyalty.[227] These values give a secular, everyday life dimension to *μάκαρ*. However, the reference to περβηναι (aorist infinitive) from *ὑπερβαίνω*, "to transgress, trespass, or sin", takes the meaning of the makarisms from the physical to the spiritual realm.[228] Although the idea of transgression generally refers to the

[226] Theognis, *Elegy and Iambus, Vol.I.* 1013-1016, tr. J. M. Edmonds.
[227] See, Kennedy, 2003: 50, under goods of the mind and soul.
[228] LSJ at Perseus, *ὑπερβαίνω*.

breaking of the law (νόμος), its semantic range is wide enough to include "sin" against the gods. Such an understanding gives the above three adjectives used in the above makarism a spiritual dimension.

The meaning of the Latin *beatitudines* was like that of the Greek μακαρισμοί. Both a secular and spiritual meaning was implicit in them. Lexically, the words, *beatus*, *felix* and *fortunatus*, meant fruitfulness, success, productivity and prosperity, wealth.[229] The physical or secular emphasis of the *beatitudines* is demonstrable in Cicero's self-praise:

> o nos beatos,
> o rem publicam fortunatum,
> o praeclaram laudem consulatus mei! [230]
> O happy shall we be, fortunate will be the republic, illustrious will be the renown of my consulship.

The above makarism is part of Cicero's tirade against Catiline who, in 63 BCE, attempted to overthrow the Roman republic. In the makarism, Cicero imagines the happiness that would ensue in the city of Rome if Catiline and his rebels departed the city. It can be observed that underlining the above makarism is self-congratulation for staving off an opponent. This self-congratulation not only demonstrates the importance of praise in Greco-Roman world but also underscores the relationship between makarisms and praise. Another Latin *beatitudes* comes from Virgil's praise for those who perished in the Trojan wars and demonstrates a spiritual meaning of the *beatitudines*:

> ……………'O terque quaterque beati,
> quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis,
> contigit oppetere!'[231]

---

[229] LS at Perseus, *Beatus*, Morwood, 1994: 22, 74, 78.
[230] Cicero, *Against Catiline*, 2.5.
[231] Virgil, *Aeneid*, l. 94-96, tr. John Dryden.

> O thrice and four times blest, ye whom your sires and whom the walls of Troy looked on in your last hour!

Here Aeneas, echoing Odysseus' adoration and praise of Achilles, eulogises the Trojans who had fallen under the Greek sword.[232] He compares their present situation of bliss in the world of the dead with his troubled life as a Trojan fugitive. He, therefore, considers the dead Trojans as happier than him. The blessed and, therefore, praise-worthy status of the dead marks a significant contrast to the troubled life of Aeneas and his group. Here, again, praise form the context of the makarism.

It can also be observed that while Greco-Roman makarisms were constructed out of several adjectives, in the NT, *μακάριος* was the only adjective used in makarism construction. In terms of frequency, *μακάριος* appears 50 times in the New Testament. Within the above occurrences, μακάριος appears 15 times in Luke's gospel. This frequency means the Third Gospel has the highest occurrence of *μακάριος* in the NT. The same adjective appears 13 times in Matthew. While this difference between Matthew and Luke might appear negligible, the distribution of *μακάριος* across the two Gospels has implications for their outlook in relation to praise. For example, it can be observed that of Matthew's 13 occurrences, 9 are concentrated in the Sermon on the Mount, leaving only 4 spread across the gospel. Luke has the opposite arrangement. Out of the 15 makarisms in the gospel, only 4 are devoted to the Sermon and the rest are spread across the gospel. The steady distribution of the adjective *μακάριος* in the Third Gospel demonstrates its interest in praise.

2.2.2. O , *Heu, Vae*

The Greek *οὐαί* and the Latin the *vae* or *hue* were the indeclinable interjections used in the woe construction.[233] They represented the antithesis of happiness in the Greco-Roman world.[234] The word *οὐαί* signified the experience of Greek *κακία* (badness) which had the sense of ill-fatedness

---

[232] Cf. Homer, *Odyssey*, 11: 485.
[233] BDAG, 2000:734; Morwood, 1994: 182.
[234] In the LXX they were used as a rendering of the Hebrew *hoy* and were therefore associated with indictment, condemnation or lament. See Gerstenberger, 1962: 249-263.

and misery.[235] It was measured in terms of quality as the opposite of ἀρετή, and, therefore, associated with cowardice, sloth, moral badness, wickedness and vice.[236] Epictetus' declaration, οὐαί μοι διὰ τὸ παιδάριον, διὰ τὸν ἀδελφόν, οὐαὶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα,[237]"woe unto me for my child, for my brother, for my father", represents a typical Greco-Roman expression of shame. Here Epictetus presents the difference between a common person (διώτης) and a philosopher's conception of honour and shame. In the above woe, a common person thinks his honour can be compromised by his kin, while the philosopher believes he is responsible for his own shame and honour. Here, Epictetus not only provides rare evidence for the use of the woe formula in Greek social conversation, but also highlights the pervasive nature of the Greco-Roman values of honour and shame, and how, in several instances, makarisms and woes in the form of praise and blame facilitated the exchange of these normative values. In a similar use of the woe in a Latin context Libanus' exclaims:

> vae illi,
> qui tam indiligenter observavit ianuam.[238]
> Woe to the person that has so carelessly kept the door!

In the above woe, Libanus, suspecting robbery in his master's house, blames the one who kept the door for being slothful. The word *indiligenter* means carelessly, heedlessly, negligently, and it was, therefore, the opposite of *diligenter*.[239] The relationship between woe and shame is evident in the above woe formula.

Apart from the common *οὐαί, heu or vae,* other interjections like φεῦ, ἰατταταιὰξ were also used.[240] In some cases, the negative adjectives such as δειλός, ἄθλιος or κακός were used in woe

[235] BDAG, 2000: 500.
[236] LSJ at Perseus, κακία, κακός.
[237] Epictetus, *Discourses* 3:19, tr. George Long.
[238] Plautus, *Sinarius*, 2.5-10, tr Henry Thomas Riley. The use of *heu* is also evident in Cicero woe formula against Mark Antony: heu, me miserum! cur senatum cogor, quem laudavi semper, reprehendere? heu, me miserum! cur senatum cogor, quem laudavi semper, reprehendere? Cicero, *Philippic,* 7.57.
[239] Elim and Lewis at Perseus, *indīligenter*.
[240] In Aristophanes *Ecclesiasuzae*, the cursed young woman exclaims,
αἰαῖ τί ποτε πείσομαι;

construction. For example, Empedocles exclaims, δειλός δ' ὧ σκοτοεσα θεῶν περί δόξα μέμηλεν,[241] "wretched is he in whom dwells darkened understanding of the god." The word δειλός, also used in the *Odyssey* and *Iliad,* has the sense of cowardly, vile, and worthless.[242] Similarly, Dion says ἄθλιος δὲ ὁ τῶν ἀδίκων βίος,[243]"wretched is the life of the unjust." The sense of misery, wretchedness and suffering implied in the word ἄθλιος, including δειλός above, demonstrates the accusatory and shameful tone associated with woes.[244]

The above examples demonstrate the various ways in which the Greco-Roman woe formula was constructed. From them, one cannot fail to notice that the various uses of οὐαί, *vae* or *heu* reflected common usage in everyday life. It is also telling to note that of the 32 occurrences of the woe formula in the NT Luke has 15 occurrences against Matthew's 13 and Mark's two. While Matthew concentrates 8 of his woes in chapter 23, Luke only concentrates 4 of his woes in the Sermon with the rest spread across the gospel. This once again demonstrates the use of blame as a pervasive motif in the Third Gospel.

2.3. PRAISE AND BLAME: AFFINITIES BETWEEN GRECO-ROMAN AND LUCAN MAKARISMS AND WOES

This study has identified four characteristic which Lucan makarisms share with their Greco-Roman counterpart. These characteristics are (1) their existence in collections; (2) their antithetical structure; (3) their conditional nature; and (4) and their second person construction. These similarities strongly point to the significant Greco-Roman influence behind the Lucan makarisms and woes.

οὐχ ἥκει μοὐταῖρος;
μόνη δ' αὐτοῦ λείπομ. "Alas! alas! What is to become of me? There is no lover! I am left alone." See Aristoph. *Eccl.* 911. Prometheus' lament also provides an example of the use of φεῦ.
φεῦ, τὸ παρὸν τό τ' ἐπερχόμενον
πῆμα στενάχω, πῇ ποτε μόχθων
χρὴ τέρματα τῶνδ' ἐπιτεῖλαι.
"Woe, for present misery and misery to come I groan, not knowing where it is fated that deliverance from these sorrows shall arise." See, Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, 95 tr. Herbert Weir Smyth.

241 Empedocles, Frag. 132.

242 Odyssey.8.351; *Iliad*,1.293, BDAG, 2000: 215, Mounce, 1993: 133

243 Plutarch, *Dion*, 5.1. Tr, Bernadotte Perrin.

244 This sense only in attic form. See, LSJ, ἄθλιος.

2.3.1. Makarism and Woes Collections

The occurrence of Matthew's and Luke's makarisms in long collections, as opposed to OT makarisms, has historically been recognised by scholars.[245] However, a comparative study of the Lucan makarisms and woes against their Greco-Roman counterparts remains to be undertaken. A critical examination of makarisms in Greco-Roman literature reveals a striking similarity in the collective appearance of makarisms. The triple makarisms of Euripides *Bacchae* provide an illustration:

> εὐδαίμων μὲν ὃς ἐκ θαλάσσας
> ἔφυγε χεῖμα, λιμένα δ' ἔκιχεν·
> εὐδαίμων δ' ὃς ὕπερθε μόχθων
> ἐγένεθ'·.....
> τὸ δὲ κατ' ἦμαρ ὅτῳ βίοτος
> εὐδαίμων, μακαρίζω.[246]
>
> (1) Happy is he who has fled a storm on the sea and reached harbour. (2) Happy too is he who has overcome his hardships. (3) But I call him blessed whose life is happy day to day.

The praise context of the above makarisms has already been discussed above; they all demonstrate the prudence of worshipping Bacchus and accruing from it every good thing (τὸ κάλλιον) necessary for an honourable life.

Another set of Greco-Roman makarisms comes from Aristophanes' 392 BCE play, the *Ecclesiasuzae*:

> ὦ μακάριος μὲν δῆμος, εὐδαίμων δ᾽ ἐγώ,
> αὐτή τέ μοι δέσποινα μακαριωτάτη,

[245] Fitzmyer, 2000: 114; Nolland,1989:279; Talbert, 2002: 73.
[246] Euripides, *Bacchae*, 902-911, tr. T. A. Buckley.

ὑμεῖς θ’ ὅσαι παρέστατ’ ἐπὶ ταῖσιν θύραις
οἵ γείτονές τε πάντες.[247]

(1) What happiness is the people's! What joy is mine, and above all that of my mistress! (2) Happy are ye, who form choruses before our house! (3) Happy are ye, both neighbours and fellow citizens!

The larger context of the makarisms above is Athenian women’s assumption of government control through a staged midnight senatorial assembly in which they introduce a novel communitarian society that proscribes private wealth and enforces equality for all. The immediate context of the above set of makarisms is the Athenian demos’ gathering for the communal meal, as part of the implementation of the new reforms, at the house of Praxagora (leader of the women’s movement). The makarisms, said by Praxagora’s maid, are therefore, the praise for the bravery and wisdom of her mistress for leading the reforms in Athens, and the Athenians for honouring the new reforms evident in their gathering for the communal meal. The context of the above makarism compares closely with the exuberant makarism from the woman in Luke 11: 27 who exclaims: μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας (Luke 11: 27). "Blessed is the womb that bore you and the breasts at which you nursed.” In the Lucan makarism above, the woman is awe-struck by Jesus’ dramatic casting out of a mute demon and his resulting discourse on Beelzebub (v. 14).

A third collection of Greco-Roman makarisms the element of praise of which has been discussed above, can be gleaned from Dion of Phlossa (from around 100 BC). In celebrating the power of love Dion writes:

Ὄλβιοι οἱ φιλέοντες, ἐπὴν ἴσον ἀντεράωνται.
ὄλβιος ἦν Θησεὺς τῶ Πειριθόω παρεόντος,
εἰ καὶ ἀμειλίκτοιο κατήλυθεν εἰς Ἀΐδαο.
ὄλβιος ἦν χαλεποῖσιν ἐν Ἀξείνοισιν Ὀρέστας,
ὥνεκά οἱ ξυνὰς Πυλάδας ἄρητο κελεύθως.

[247] Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae*, 1112. Tr. Eugene O'Neill.

ἦν μάκαρ Αἰακίδας ἑτάρω ζώοντος Ἀχιλλεύς

ὄλβιος ἦν θνᾴσκων, ὅτι οἱ μόρον αἰνὸν ἄμυνεν.[248]

(1) Happy are lovers when their love is requited. Theseus, for all he found Hades at the last implacable, (2) was happy because Perithoüs went with him; and (3) happy Orestes among the cruel Inhospitables, because Pylades had chosen to share his wanderings; (4) happy also lived Achilles Aeacid while his dear comrade was alive, and died happy, seeing he so avenged his dreadful fate.

Although Dion's makarism collection above constitutes both clear makarisms and narrative, his combined usage of ὄλβιος and μάκαρ plus real life-examples of the blessed, not only highlights the individual makarisms in the collection but also the relationship between the two terms.

A fourth set of makarisms can be observed in Plutarch's *Numa* which says:

μακάριος μὲν γὰρ αὐτός' ὁ σώφρων ὡς ἀληθῶς,

'μακάριοι δὲ οἱ συνήκοοι

τῶν ἔκ τοῦ σωφρονοῦντος στόματος ἰόντων λόγων...[249]

(1) Blessed, indeed, is such a wise man 'in himself, and (2) blessed, too, are those who hear the words of wisdom issuing from his lips……...

The larger context of the above makarisms is Plutarch's eulogy of the life of Numa, Romulus' successor as the king of Rome. In the above makarism, Plutarch highlights Numa's blessedness based on his wisdom. This praise of wisdom, which was itself a topic of encomium, makes praise the context of the above makarism. Second, Plutarch also pronounces as μακάριος those who heard the words of wisdom from the mouth of the blessed Numa. The lexical meaning of συνήκοοι is "to listen together." This meaning demonstrates a school or community dimension to the transmission of the wisdom from a king to his subjects that leads to mutual blessings.

[248] Bion of Phlossa, *Fragmenta*, 8, tr. John Maxwell Edmonds.
[249] Plutarch, *Numa*, 20.7-8, tr. Bernadotte Perrin.

The last pair of makarisms is from Virgil's *Georgics*, an agricultural poem written around 29 BCE. In one of the passages Virgil writes:

> Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.
> Fortunatus et ille deos qui nouit agrestis
> panaque Silvanumque senem Nymphasque sorores.[250]
> (1) Happy, is he who had the skill to understand Nature's hidden causes.
> (2) Blest too is he who knows the rural gods, Pan, old Silvanus, and the sister-nymphs!

The larger context of the above pair of makarisms is Virgil's adoration of pastoral and rural life and the serenity associated with it (2.458-482). In the above makarisms, understanding (*cognosco*) nature and knowing (*nosco*) the gods are juxtaposed as the inherent constituents of the blessed life. Although *cognosco* and *n*osco were not formal topics of encomia in Roman panygerics, they fall within the bracket of wisdom which was a praise-worthy virtue.[251] Thus, even in these makarisms, praise forms the background to the above makarisms.

The above Greco-Roman makarism collections provide an interesting parallel to the collections found in the gospels of Matthew and Luke.[252] Their broad social and religious dimensions reflect the different contexts in which they arose and functioned.[253] Apart from the collections in the Sermon, other occurrences of collections of makarisms in the gospel are in Lk 11:27, 28 (cf. Mk 11:9-10). Recent studies in Dead Sea Scroll 4Q 525, written around 50BCE, reveal relatively longer makarisms collections like those of Matthew and Luke.[254] A similar trend is found in 1 Enoch, written around 300 BCE and, therefore, a contemporary of most of the Greek texts.[255] Fitzmyer thinks that by their emphasis on one topic, which is wisdom, and having no eschatology, the Qumran beatitudes are different from the NT ones.[256] It can also be added that unlike Qumran makarisms, Lucan makarisms are both antithetical and conditional or promissory, characteristics which they share with Greco-Roman makarisms and some selected

[250] Virgil, *Georgics*, 2.490, 493-494.
[251] See, Kennedy, 2003: 50.
[252] Collections of woes, although not common, are also evident in Epictetus's *Discourse* 3:19.
[253] See, Virgil's *Georgics* 2.490-494; *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 480-482, tr. Hugh G. Evelyn-White.
[254] Two of the makarisms read as; [Blessed is he who speaks truth] with a pure heart and who does not slander with his tongue]; [Blessed are those who cling to his statutes and who do not cling to her ways of perversity.]
[255] Sparks, 1984: 348-9.
[256] Fitzmyer, 2000: 116.

makarisms in 1 Enoch, though the latter are more otherworldly than the Lucan ones.[257] In this case, it can be argued that the broad topics in the various Greco-Roman makarisms collections, and the presence of a conditional or promissory and their eschatological nuance, which will be discussed below, demonstrate Lucan affinity with Greco-Roman literature. This affinity helps to locate the gospel's makarisms in the Greco-Roman context

In addition, the fact that most Greco-Roman makarisms are either pre-Christian, such as those in Euripides, Aristophanes, and Dion or contemporary to it, such as those of Plutarch, demonstrates that by the time of Luke's writing, the use of makarisms had saturated the Greco-Roman world. This suggests that for Luke the Gentile, the Greco-Roman makarisms may have provided the immediate context for his contextualisation of the makarisms in Jesus' Sermon. This view suggests that although conventional scholarship strongly favours the OT and Jewish roots to the appearance of makarisms in collections, the prevalence of the same in the Greco-Roman world points to an alternative explanation for makarisms' collection in the Gospels in general, and Luke's gospel in particular

2.3.2. Antithetical makarisms

Another close relationship between Luke and Greco-Roman literature is the common presence of antithetical makarisms. These makarisms, using a woe, or other negative adjectives, contrast the blessed life with its opposite. The first example comes from the Homeric Hymn to Demeter:

> *ὄλβιος, ὃς τάδ' ὄπωπεν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων*
> *ὃς δ' ἀτελὴς ἱερῶν ὅς τ' ἄμμορος, οὔποθ' ὁμοίων*
> *αἶσαν ἔχει φθίμενός περ ὑπὸ ζόφῳ ἠερόεντι.*[258]
>
> Happy is he among men upon earth who has seen these mysteries; but he who is uninitiated and who has no part in them, never has lot of good things once he is dead, down in the darkness and gloom.

[257] Part of 1 Enoch 58:2-3 says, "Blessed are you, righteous and elect ones, for glorious is your portion."
[258] *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 480-482, tr. Hugh G. Evelyn-White.

In the above makarism, a contrast is made between the fate of those initiated into the mysteries and those who were not. Such a contrast appears in the form of "good things" for the initiates and not so "good things" for the non-initiates. This antithesis parallels the structure of the Lucan makarisms and woes; blessed are the poor, woe unto the rich (Lk 6: 20, 24). It can also be observed that although the antithetical side of the above makarism does not contain the woe interjection, its contrasting imagery about the fate of the initiates and non-initiates strongly resonates with the paradigm of praise and blame. This antithesis is also evident in the Lucan makarisms and woes.

A second example of Greco-Roman antithetical makarism is from the pre-Socratic philosopher Empedocles. In one of his fragments, he says:

> ὄλβιος ὁς θιεῶν πραπίδων ἐκτήσατο πλοῦτον δειλός δ' ὧ σκότοεσα θεῶν περί δόξα μέμηλεν.[259]
>
> Blessed is the man who has gained the riches of divine wisdom; wretched he who has a dim opinion of the gods in his heart.

The context of the above makarism is difficult to ascertain. It is possible as some classical scholars have argued that as a scientist-cum-philosopher, Empedocles is extoling his rich treasure of knowledge of the gods against popular belief in the gods. If this was true, it makes the above makarism a self-praise on the one hand, and a blame or denigration of the masses' superstitious belief in the gods, on the other. Instead of using the οὐαί formula, Empedocles used the word δειλός, a word also used in *Odyssey* and *Iliad* which has the sense of cowardly, vile, worthlessness.[260] In this case the makarisms reveal interesting dimensions of blessedness and its antithesis: "wealth of divine knowledge" and "blessedness" on one hand, and "wretchedness" and "darkened understanding of the gods", on the other. This juxtaposition of the honourable and the shameful creates a framework for praise and blame which resonates with Luke's blessing and woes.

[259] Empedocles, Frag 132. tr. Hellenic Library.
[260] *Odyssey* 8.351; *Iliad.* 1.293, BDAG, 215, Mounce, 1993: 133. The word is not used in Luke but is found in Mark 4:4, Mt 8:26 with reference to either being afraid or having little faith.

Plato in Plutarch's *Dion* provides a further example of Greco-Roman antithetical makarisms. In one of the passages Dion reports Plato as saying:

> ὡς μακάριος μὲν ὁ τῶν δικαίων, ἄθλιος δὲ ὁ τῶν ἀδίκων βίος.[261]
>
> Happy are the just and wretched is the life of the unjust.

The context of the above makarism is Plato's discourse before Dionysius 1, the tyrant of Syracuse, about human virtue and manliness. It follows Plato's declaration that tyrants are generally devoid of virtue and that the just are blessed while the unjust are not. Instead of using the indeclinable οὐαί, Plato refers to the life of the unjust as ἄθλιος. Here the word *ἄθλιος,* in its Attic form, designates a state of life which is characterised by struggling, wretchedness and misery.[262] It is, for example, used with the same meaning in Lysias' *Against Diogeiton*, 32.13, in the statement, καίτοι οὐχ οὕτως ἐγώ εἰμι ἀθλία, ("I am not wretched") by a guardian accused of holding out the money belonging to his wards. Within the Greek theory of encomia, justice fell under the deeds of the soul together with wisdom, temperance, courage and piety.[263] By comparing the honourable life of justice with blessedness and its absence of justice with wretchedness, Plato brings out the correlation between the above combination of a makarism and woe and praise and blame, respectively.

A further example of antithetical makarisms comes from Aristotle who, in his discussion of the function of the individual within the state, says:

> ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅ γε εὖ ζῶν μακάριός τε καὶ εὐδαίμων, ὁ δὲ μὴ τἀναντία.[264]

[261] Plutarch, *Dion* 5.1, tr. Bernadotte Perrin.
[262] LSJ at Perseus, ἄθλιος.
[263] Kennedy, 2003: 50.
[264] Plat. *Rep*. 1.354a, tr. Paul Shorey.

> But furthermore, he who lives well is blessed and happy, and he who does not the contrary.

The meaning of εὖ ζῶν, "living well" in the above makarism is open to different interpretations. It could refer to Aristotle's virtuous life in the *polis* lived with prosperity.[265] It could also mean right living as it is related to justice. The second option seems likely given the relationship between the individual and the state which forms the context of the makarism. The makarism is better explained by Plato's wise statement to Crito on the relationship between right living and just living. In response to a suggestion by his friends through Crito, that he (Socrates) should escape prison while the executioner was on holiday, Socrates is said to have answered, τὸ δὲ εὖ καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὅτι ταὐτόν ἐστιν,[266] "living well and living rightly are the same thing." By this statement Socrates meant that if he was a just man, he would rather die a just man than act unjustly in order to live. This meaning reinforces the relationship between justice and the good life. By relating blessedness to justice, which was one of the encomiastic values, and its absence for the unjust, Plato places the above makarism in the context of praise and blame.

Lastly, Homer's *Odyssey* provides a case of antithetical makarisms in Greco-Roman literature. While comparing his situation after the Trojan War to that of dead Achilles, Odysseus says:

> *οὐ γάρ πω σχεδὸν ἦλθον Ἀχαιΐδος οὐδέ πω ἁμῆς γῆς*
> *ἐπέβην, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἔχω κακά. σεῖο δ', Ἀχιλλεῦ,*
> *οὔ τις ἀνὴρ προπάροιθε μακάρτατος οὔτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω.*[267]
>
> For not yet have I come near to the land of Achaea, nor have I as yet set foot on my own country, but am ever suffering woes; whereas than thou, Achilles, no man a foretime was more blessed nor shall ever be hereafter.

---

[265] Aristotle, *Nico. Ethics*, 1095a (15–22). See also Sullivan, 1961:396.
[266] Plato, *Crito,* 48b, tr. Harold North Fowler.
[267] Homer, *Odyssey,* 11. 480-485, tr. Samuel Butler.

In the above antithetical statement, Odysseus is asking dead Achilles for a plan on how he can reach his home in Ithaca. However, in typical Greco-Roman oratorical style, he first praises Achilles as the most blessed man ever to have existed and who continues to be so even after his death. In contrast, the situation of Odysseus who has not yet reached his home country is one of *κακά*, woes. Odysseus' use of *μακάρτατος* and the noun *κακά* provides an interesting case of antithesis in Greco-Roman prayers. Κ*ακά*, related to *κακιά* (badness, evil), had a wider meaning in Greek context. When it referred to one's circumstances, it implied evil, calamity or misfortune.[268] It, therefore, stood in direct opposition to the idea of the good, which represented the state of honour. Thus, praise on one hand and self-blame or lament on the other, provide the context for understanding the meaning of the above makarism and its function within its original Greco-Roman context. This contrasting schema significantly resonates with the antithetical makarisms in Luke's Sermon.

It can be observed from the above discussion that antithetical makarisms were a common feature of Greco-Roman literature particularly in Greek literature. A few differences, however, exist between the antithetical makarisms in Luke and their Greco-Roman counterparts. First, unlike his Greco-Roman counterparts, who combine both the makarism and its antithesis in the same statement, Luke separates his makarisms from his woes. Other scholars regard the arrangement of Lucan makarisms and woes as the product of the church's editorial process; that the woes were added to reinforce the makarisms. Weighing against this view, however, is that Luke's grouping of makarisms and woes is not only confined to the Sermon. Elsewhere in Lk 10:13-15 and Lk 11:27-28 an extended collection of woes and a pair of makarisms follow one another. Second, it can also be observed that, unlike the common use of the *οὐαί* in Matthew and Luke's gospel, a whole host of other adjectives such as δειλός, ἄθλιος and *κακά* are used in Greek woe construction. The word *οὐαί*, on the other hand, was rarely used in Greek antithetical makarisms. This raises the question of the origins of the Greek *οὐαί* and its transposition into the Septuagint, other Jewish writings and the NT writings. While the *οὐαί* is used to translate the Hebrew אוֹי *(oy)* in the Septuagint, it is rarely found in older Greek literature. The earliest usage of *οὐαί* in Greek literature is found in Aristophanes' *Eccleziasusae* (392 BCE) and later in Epictetus' discourses dated from 108 -130AD. If the Septuagint is dated around 250 BCE,

[268] Mounce, 1993: 60.

then οὐαί must have been one of the Greek forms of lament and condemnation which, though not in common use, was adopted by Jewish and Christian writers to express lament or condemnation. It can, therefore, be concluded from the above discussion that not only do the antithetical nature of Lucan makarisms parallel Greco-Roman literature but also that the latter's makarisms have their context in praise and blame.

2.3.3. Conditional or Promissory Makarisms

Another interesting trend in Greco-Roman makarisms, which is rarely recognised in beatitudes scholarship, is the presence of conditional makarisms in Greco-Roman literature. Some scholars like Mullins have argued that Greco-Roman makarisms are flat unconditional ascriptions which markedly differentiate them from their NT counterparts which have a conditional tendency.[269] However, contrary to such scholarly assertions, an examination of Greco-Roman literature reveals the existence of conditional and even eschatological makarisms. In this section seven Greco-Roman conditional makarisms are examined in their context with a view to illustrating the above point. A typical conditional makarism consisted of two parts; the protasis which explained the basic virtue being extolled, and the apodosis which was a future reward resulting from such virtue.[270] In some conditional makarisms, the apodosis took an eschatological dimension. This structure is especially true for the gospel sermon makarisms and woes and those found in the book of Revelation (Rev. 1:3; 14:13; 16:15; 19:9; 20:6; 22:14).[271] The first example of a conditional Greco-Roman makarism comes from the *Hymn to Demeter* which says:

> .... μέγ᾽ ὄλβιος, ὅν τιν᾽ ἐκεῖναι
> προφρονέως φίλωνται ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων:
> αἶψα δέ οἱ πέμπουσιν ἐφέστιον ἐς μέγα δῶμα
> Πλοῦτον, ὃς ἀνθρώποις ἄφενος θνητοῖσι δίδωσιν. [272]
>
> Right blessed is he among men on earth whom they (the gods) freely love: soon they do send Plutus as guest to his great house, Plutus who gives wealth to mortal men.

---

[269] Mullins, 1972/3: 204.
[270] Aune, 2003: 75.
[271] It is also important to note that not all Lucan makarisms are conditional eg, Lk. 11:27.
[272] *Hymn to Demeter*, 485-9, tr. Hugh G. Evelyn-White.

The context of the above makarism is Demeter's return to the family of the gods and the subsequent gathering of the gods at Olympus.[273] It is during this divine conclave that the gods readily (προφρονέως) demonstrate their φίλία upon some specific lucky individuals. The verb φίλωνται from φιλέω can mean both to treat affectionately or kindly.[274] The material aspect of this divine love is confirmed by the gods' sending of Plutus to give the lucky individual wealth. Although "being loved by the gods" is not a virtue and therefore not a standard basis for a protasis, its resulting benefit of wealth was an encomiastic virtue in the *Progymnasmata*. In this case, if being loved by the gods arose out of participation in the mysteries, then the wealth derived from the gods provided the motivation for initiation into the rite of the mysteries. Furthermore, it can also be observed that unlike the Sermon makarisms, the connecting conjunction ὅτι is missing from the above makarism. However, that the second part of the makarism is a ὅτι clause can be understood in the promise- reward structure of the makarism. This absence of the ὅτι in the ὅτι clause is not unique to Greco-Roman makarisms. Even in some Lucan conditional makarisms outside the Sermon like Lk 12:43-44, the ὅτι is only understood.

A second Greco-Roman conditional makarism comes from Hesiod's *Theogony* which was a description of the origins and genealogies of gods. In one of its passages Hesiod says:

> ………………… ὃ δ᾽ ὄλβιος, ὅν τινα gαι
>
> φίλωνται: γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή.[275]
>
> Blessed is he whom the Muses love. From his mouth the stream flows sweeter than honey.

[273] She had left Olympus, to wonder among men, in protest against the abduction and forced marriage of her daughter Persephone.
[274] LSJ at Perseus, φιλέω, φίλος.
[275] Hesiod, *Theogony*, 96.

In the immediate context of the above makarism, Hesiod describes the assembly of the gods at Olympus and their different roles. In this divine division of labour, the special role of the Muses and Apollo was one of nurturing poets and singers.[276] The above understanding suggests that "being loved by the gods" must have constituted divine nurturing. By virtue of the importance of origins as a topic of encomium, the divine nurturing of the poets gave special importance to the poetic profession. It entailed the divine origins of poets and poetry. The common belief in the divine origins of poets and singers is also elsewhere confirmed by Pindar who calls his praise poetry, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, gift of the Muses.[277] Therefore, the verb ῥέει (to stream/flow of αὐδή speech) is a reference to the speeches of praise poets gave for the victors of Hellenistic games. In extolling the divine origins of poetry, Hesiod, himself a praise poet, is clearly indulging in an exercise in self-praise here. This self-praise places the above makarism within the context of praise.

A third example of a promissory makarism can be observed from Theognis' poetically convoluted makarism which states:

> παύροις ἀνθρώπων ἀρετὴ καὶ κάλλος ὀπηδεῖ:
> ὄλβιος, ὃς τούτων ἀμφοτέρων ἔλαχεν.
> πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν: ὁμῶς νέοι οἵ τε κατ᾽ αὐτὸν
> χώρης εἴκουσιν τοί τε παλαιότεροι.
> γηράσκων δ᾽ ἀστοῖσι μεταπρέπει, οὐδέ τις
> αὐτὸν βλάπτειν οὔτ᾽ αἰδοῦς οὔτε δίκης ἐθέλει.[278]
>
> Virtue and beauty fall to but few; happy he that hath share of both. He is honoured of all; alike younger and elder yield him place, and the men of his age; when he growth old he is conspicuous among his townsmen, and no man will do him harm either in honour or in right (sic).

276 The Muses were the inspiration goddesses of literature, sciences and the arts.
277 Pindar, *Olympiad*, 7.9.
278 Theognis, *Elegy and Iambus*, Vol. I, 933-38, tr. J. M. Edmonds.

A paraphrase of the above makarism's protasis would look like: "blessed are those who have virtue and beauty"….. Its apodasis is the honour one receives from all people, which comes in different ways, among which was the ability to be outstanding among peers and being less susceptible to being harmed. However, in its overall promissory tone, despite the absence of the ὅτι connecting particle, the makarism reflects the conditional makarism in Luke 12: 43-44:

> *μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως.*
> *ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν,*
> Blessed is that servant whom his master finds doing so when he returns. Truly I tell you, he will put him in charge of all his possessions.

In the above makarism Jesus reflects on the theme of alertness and doing the right thing in a master-servant relationship. The result of such alertness is the promotion of the Servant to a chief steward. On the other hand, *ἀρετὴ καὶ κάλλος* (virtue and beauty) in Theognis' makarism form the topics of encomia, just as alertness on the part of the servant implied honesty in Lk 12:43-44 which suggests trustworthiness and loyalty. The reference to the topics of encomia such as beauty and virtue in Theognis' makarisms, and loyalty in the Lucan makarisms, places the two in the context of praise.

A fourth example of conditional makarisms comes from Pindar's *Olympiad*. The *Olympiad* was a collection of Pindar's praise poetry given for the victors of the Olympian games. In one of his poetics he says:

> *ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί.*
> *ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος.*[279]
> That man is prosperous, who is encompassed by good reports. Grace, which causes life to flourish, looks with favour now on one man.

[279] Pindar, *Olympiad,* 7.10, tr. Diane Arnson Svarlien.

The immediate context of the above makarism is Pindar's emphasis on the critical function of praise poets in the reception and integration of the victors of Hellenistic games.[280] He compares those who receive victory praise to a bridegroom who receives the honour of precious gifts from his father-in-law on his wedding day. In the above makarism, Pindar underscores the blessedness of receiving good praise after a victory. The word *φᾶμαι* from *φήμη* means reports of a man's character or repute. Therefore, obtaining *ἀγαθαί φᾶμαι* (good reports) enables one to receive Χάρις (grace) which leads to a prosperous life. The importance of good reports would be significant in a world where a community's estimation of one's worth was critical to the creation of friends and kinships.[281] Plutarch upholds this Greek quest for a good report when, in his *Lysander,* he reports:

> In Sparta, from a very early age they wish their boys to be sensitive toward public opinion, to be distressed by censure, and exalted by praise; and he who was insensible and stolid in these matters, was looked down upon as without ambition for excellence, and a cumberer of the ground. Ambition, then, and the spirit of emulation, were firmly implanted in younger boys by his Laconian training and no great fault should be found with his natural disposition on this account.[282]

A good recommendation, therefore, went very far in changing one's fortunes in the Greco-Roman world. Although the apostle Paul would extol personal powerlessness and suffering (1 Cor.2:10; Phil 3: 810), his glowing recommendation of his associates to different Christ-groups confirms the importance of a good report (Rom. 16:1, 3; Col. 1: 7; 4: 13-14). Interestingly, Luke reverses this conception of self-worth when he announces blessings to the despised and woe to those praised (Lk 6: 22, 26). The Lucan rejection of praise, seen within the larger framework of the importance of *φήμη* in the Greco-Roman world, suggests that contextual issues, which will be dealt with later, were at the heart of Luke's makarisms and woes.[283]

---

[280] Ibid. 7.1.
[281] Plutarch, *Lysander*, 2.2.
[282] Ibid.
[283] Ironically Lucan rejection of praise is also overshadowed by his praise of the destitute, hungry, mourning and the ostracised (Lk 6:20-24).

Another example of a promissory makarism come from one of Pindar's fragments.

> ὄλβιος ὅστις ἰδὼν κεῖν᾽ εἶσ᾽ ὑπὸ χθόν᾽·
> οἶδε μὲν βίου τελευτάν, οἶδεν δὲ διόσδοτον ἀρχάν.[284]
> Blessed is he who sees them (or those things) and goes beneath the earth; he knows the end of life and knows its Zeus-given beginning.

In the above makarism, Pindar underlines the benefits of participating in Eleusinian mysteries. The protasis in the above makarism is the blessedness of ἰδὼν ἐκεῖναι, "seeing those things," a reference to the sacred things (or visions) seen during performance of the sacred rites.[285] Although the conditional conjunction γάρ or ὅτι is missing, the makarism's apodasis is evident from the deeper spiritual awareness of the beginning and the end of life that such rites bring to the individual. In this case, participation in the mysteries becomes a praise-worthy activity, especially if it eventuates in the apparent wisdom of knowing the beginning and the end of life. According to the *Progymnasmata*, wisdom, which enables control of everything from peace to war, is the fortunate thing to acquire but impossible to praise adequately.[286] The makarism's apparent connection with knowledge and wisdom, therefore, places it in the context of praise.

In addition, the relationship between blessedness and the ability to see the beginning and end of life, although just a faint echo, signifies the presence of implicit eschatology in Pindar's makarism. The above implicit eschatology is further confirmed by Sophocles, who, using a clear conjunction γάρ, contrasts the fate of the μυστάι (*mystai* "initiates") of the Eleusinia mysteries with the non-initiates. He declares:

> ὡς τρισόλβιοι
> κεῖνοι βροτῶν, οἳ ταῦτα [δερχθέντες] τέλη
> μόλωσ᾽ ἐς Ἅιδου· τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ

284 Pindar Frag 137a tr William H. Race.
285 Orphic fragment, 594, Plut, frag 178.
286 Aphthonius the Sophist in Kennedy, 2003:110.

ζῆν ἔστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἔχειν κακά.[287]

Three times happy are those mortals who have seen these rites and then descended into Hades, for there life is only for them, and all others experience everything bad.

In the above makarisms, like Pindar, Sophocles emphasizes the benefits of participating in the mysteries. The promise in the Hades of ζῆν (life) for the initiates contrasted with that of κακά for the non-initiates demonstrates some eschatological dimension to the makarism. The above reward of life was equivalent to attaining the status of the deathless ἀθάνατοι (gods).[288] Such a status was the most honourable station for which a mortal could crave, even after physical death. The emphasis on life as a praise-worthy status was meant to encourage those already initiated in the mysteries to stay the course, and for those not yet members to consider becoming μυστάι. The idea of "life only for them (the initiates)" in the makarism above also has significant parallels with the life in the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ expected of the blessed poor in (Lk 6:20).

Finally, Virgil in his *Georgics* provides a Latin perspective to Greco-Roman conditional makarisms. In one of his verses Virgil writes:

O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, agricolas! quibus ipsa procul discordibus armis fundit humo facilem victum iustissima tellus.[289]

How excessively fortunate farmers would be, if they knew their own advantages! For them, far from the discord of battle, the bountiful earth itself pours forth an easy living from the soil.

The larger context of the above makarism is Virgil's exaltation of pastoral life. In the above makarisms, he compares the blessedness of being a farmer with the hard and bitter life of a soldier. For Virgil, the result of taking up farming is the easy life of living from the abundance of the earth. The comparison between the life of a farmer and the *discordia arma* reflects the

[287] Sophocles Frag. 837, Pearson-Radt in Petridou, 2013: 309-241
[288] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 800
[289] Virgil, *Georgics,* 2.458-60.

militarism of the Late Roman republic with its frequent civil wars. It is important to recognise that most Roman soldiers were recruited from the townsmen and the upper class not the *rustici*.[290] Therefore, through his praise of the life of a farmer, Virgil calls his audience, which was largely urban, to the rustic life, a totally different lifestyle. The praise context of the above conditional makarism demonstrates the relationship between makarisms and praise. Virgil's use of makarisms to call on his friends to a different lifestyle provides interesting perspectives to understanding the function of the Lucan makarisms in the Sermon.

In summarising this section, it can be argued that the conditional nature of Lucan makarisms and woes cannot only be attributed to the gospel's OT context. The whole array of conditional makarisms in Greco-Roman literature and their relationship to praise demonstrate the Third Gospel's affinity with its context. At the same time, although Greco-Roman eschatology remains largely undefined, a certain level of eschatological imagination can be discerned in Greco-Roman makarisms. Although elements of Jewish influence are discernible in the Lucan makarisms through such elements as the Kingdom of God, when some Greco-Roman conditional makarisms are studied in context, one cannot fail to see that the thrust of the afterlife inherent in most of them probably had a significant influence in early Christian eschatology. The occurrence of the term Ἀΐδης (Hades) in Greco-Roman literature, which found its way into the NT, suggests that apart from Jewish influence, the Greco-Roman eschatological thinking had a wider influence on the development of New Testament eschatology. Among the many appearances of Hades in Greek literature are statements like *Ζεὺς καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατος δ' Ἀΐδης ἐνέροισιν ἀνάσσων*, "Zeus, and myself, and the third is Hades, that is lord of the dead below" (Hom. *Iliad,* 15.188) and *ἄλλ' ἐν Ἅιδου τοῖς κάτω μυθήσομαι...*" but the rest he will tell to Hades" (Soph. *Ajax*, 865).[291] This Greco-Roman influence could have been more significant within the Gentile segment of the early Christian movement. All this again demonstrates the close affinity between Greco-Roman and Lucan makarisms and woes.

290 Phang, 2008: 77-78.

291 See also Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*. 667; Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 69; Theognis, 455; Homer, *Iliad*, 22.389; Homer, *Odyssey*, 4.834. Some NT references to Hades are Mt 11:23, 16:18; Lk 10:15, 16:23; Acts 2:27,31; Rev 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14.

2.3.3. The Second Person Construction

Another distinguishing feature of the makarisms in the Sermon is their second person construction. Some scholars such as Parsons and Dodd argue that this construction resonates with the OT background of Gospel makarisms.[292] The close affinity between Lk 6:25 and Isa. 5:8 has been used as an example. First, it can be argued that while the above similarity provides a possible explanation to the Lucan second person construction, it is not the only explanation. The existence of several second person makarisms construction in Greco-Roman literature suggests a wider context from which the author of the gospel drew his makarisms. Second, it can be argued that, despite the similarities between Lk 6:25 and Isa. 5:8, significant differences also exist between the two texts. Lk 6:20-26 presents a consistent and extended second person construction.[293] Unlike Luke, Isa. 5: 8 is an isolated second person woe construction. Its isolated nature is evident in the fact that, although it attempts to use the second person construction in Isa. 5.8, from Isa. 5:11 the pericope reverts into the third person construction.

A close examination of the Greco-Roman literature reveals a significant number of second person makarisms that resonate with Luke's makarisms. For example, Plutarch reports how Timotheus was censured for indulging in self-praise after he had vanquished Phrynis the son of Carbo, the soft Ionian poet. When the crier announced his victory, he is reported to have cried out:

> μακάριος ἦσθα, Τιμόθεε[294]
>
> Blessed man were you, Timotheus.

Although the above makarism is in reference to himself, Timotheus cast his makarism in the second person. In addition, Timotheus' association of victory with blessedness underscores not only the role of praise in Hellenistic games but also the relationship between makarism, honour and praise.

---

[292] Parsons, 2015: 101-102; Dodd, 1968: 3.
[293] Nolland (1989:279) also acknowledges this difference.
[294] Plutarch, *De Se Ipsum 1,* tr. W.G. Goodwin.

Another example of second person Greco-Roman makarism comes from Pindar's praise of Arcesilas of Cyrene's 462 BC Chariot race victory. He says:

> μακάριος,
> ὃς ἔχεις καὶ πεδὰ μέγαν κάματον λόγων φερτάτων μναμήϊ[295]
> blessed are you, who have, even after great hardship, a memorial of the best words.

The memorial of the best words, λόγων φερτάτων μναμήϊ, represent Pindar's eulogy of Arcesilas' victory. To achieve such a feat and thus claim the honour of such praise represented the greatest state of achievement to which any Greek aspired. This also suggests that those who were defeated experienced the opposite honour: dishonour and its resulting loss of face. It can be observed that the relationship between blessedness and victory places the above makarisms in the context of praise.

Other second person makarisms whose context and relationship to praise had been discussed above are those from Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusa*e and Virgil's *Aeneid*. From Aristophanes we have the following:

> ....ὦ μακαριωτά[τη],[296]
> ὑμεῖς θ' ὅσαι παρέστατ' ἐπὶ ταῖσιν θύραις
> οἱ γείτονές τε πάντες οἵ τε δημόται [297]
> Happy are ye, who form choruses before our house! Happy are ye, both neighbours and fellow citizens.

[295] Pindar, *Pythian*, 5.60.
[296] Aristophanes used the singular when the reference is to a group. This probably suggests that the maid directed her praise at each individual in the group.
[297] Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae*, 1112.

From Virgil's *Aeneid* we have the following makarism:

> …………….*'O terque quaterque beati,*
> *quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis*
> *contigit oppetere*![298] ………………………..
> O thrice and four times blest, ye whom your sires and whom the walls of Troy looked on in your last hour!

To summarise this section, it can be argued that the Lucan second person makarisms construction has significant affinity with its Greco-Roman counterparts. Some overlap, however, does exist between the Lucan second person construction and other makarisms and woes in the OT and Jewish literature. Yet, for a Hellenistic author, the wide variety of second person makarism construction in Greco-Roman world provided the broader scope of options from which Luke contextualised Jesus' Sermon for his largely Gentile audience in the Third Gospel.

2.4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be argued from the above discussion that there is a strong relationship between Greco-Roman and Lucan makarisms and woes. This relationship is evident through their appearance in collections, their presence in antithetical forms, the common second person construction, and the conditional nature of the makarisms. Secondly, it has also been observed that Greco-Roman makarisms and woes have their context in praise and blame, respectively. This close affinity provides a persuasive case for not only understanding the Greco-Roman context of Lucan makarisms and woe but also their location in the context of praise and blame. The affinity also provides a plausible framework for establishing the relationship between the Sermon's makarisms and woe relationship with praise and blame. This, by implication offers the opportunity for understanding the panegyric dimension of the Sermon.

---

[298] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1. 94-96.

CHAPTER 3

PRAISE AND BLAME IN GRECO-ROMAN CULTURE

3.1. INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, we argued that the Sermon's makarisms and woes do not only have their setting in the Greco-Roman world but also that, by virtue of their affinities with their Greco-Roman counterparts, have their context in praise and blame. This chapter examines the function of praise and blame in Greco-Roman culture. The analysis provides both a methodological and theoretical framework for the interpretation of the Sermon. The chapter's central argument is that the nature and function of the language of praise and blame in the Greco-Roman world provides a framework for understanding the form and function of the Sermon in its original Greco-Roman social context. The importance of this analysis is supported by linguistic anthropologists who argue that, for a speaker to acquire and use language skills, they must be a member of a community within which those skills are transmitted and valued.[299] Therefore, in order to understand the role of language in people's lives, it is essential to go beyond the study of grammar and venture into the world of social action, where words are embedded in and constitutive of specific cultural activities such as asking for a favour, insulting or praising.[300] The above anthropological observation has implications for understanding the uniqueness of the Sermon and its role in its original context. It suggests that locating the context and function of praise and blame inherent in the makarisms and woes could shed significant light on the meaning and function of the Sermon in its community context. Structurally, the chapter has three sections. The first section discusses epideictic rhetoric and praise and blame. The second section analyses the Greco-Roman theory of encomia. The third section examines with specific examples, the nature and function of panegyrics. The analysis is made within the context of the function of praise and blame in the Greco-Roman world and how the same offers a framework for analysing the function of the Sermon within its original context.

3.2. EPIDEICTIC RHETORIC: PRAISE AND BLAME

Praise and blame traditionally belong to the genre of epideictic rhetoric. The development of epideictic as a specific genre is associated with Aristotle. Studies, however, also demonstrate

[299] Duranti, 2001: 39.
[300] Gumperz, quoted in ibid. 39.

that the use of praise and blame goes far back into the history and culture of the Greek societies.[301] Praise and blame constituted a vital component of the victory odes as well the language of social control in the everyday life of ancient Greece.[302] Beyond the above traditional poetics, Aristotle is credited with theorising and turning praise and blame into aspects of the epideictic genre. He classified rhetoric into three different branches: deliberative, forensic and epideictic whose audiences were the *demos*, the judges, and the observer (θεωρός), respectively.[303] The subject matter of deliberative rhetoric is exhortation and advice, and that of forensic rhetoric is accusation and defence, while that of epideictic is praise and blame.[304] Each of the different branches of rhetoric also has its time and *telos*. Deliberative rhetoric deals with the future, and its *telos* is the expedient and the inexpedient. Forensic rhetoric deals with the past, and its *telos* is the just and the unjust. Finally, epideictic deals with the present (although it may include the past and future), and its *telos* is the honourable and the shameful.[305] The above differences in the *telos* of each branch of rhetoric imply the presence of different contexts in which each genre was exercised. Although allowing for some overlaps in content and context, the assembly, law court and forum represented the respective contexts of the three branches of rhetoric.

Among the three branches of rhetoric, epideictic rhetoric never occupied a place of significance. There were some reservations with the use of this genre of rhetoric. Epideictic was thought to represent "mere rhetoric" directed at spectators or observers, the θεωροί, who were only concerned with the speaker's skills.[306] Others regarded it as showy, ostentatious, declamatory and of no practical purpose in view.[307] Aristotle held that the genre's fixation with praise made it susceptible to mixing truth and falsehood and this, therefore, rendered it unable to distinguish the good men and the base men.[308] The above concerns relegated epideictic rhetoric to a third category for everything not understood to be an explicitly pragmatic or instrumental argument.[309] As a result, in Athens the genre was, for a long time, understood as the province

[301] Gallia, 2012: 4; Miller, 2018: 21-41.
[302] Pernot, 2014: 1, See also the use of νεῖκος, reproof in Aachean society, Mackie, 1996: 83.
[303] The word θεωρός has several meanings from emissaries, spectator and those present as the festival, LSJ at Perseus, θεωρός.
[304] Nightingale, 1995: 94.
[305] Ibid.
[306] Sheard, 1996: 766.
[307] Carter, 1991: 209.
[308] Nightingale, 1995: 107.
[309] Chase, 1961: 293-300.

of the non-citizen who did not enjoy the privilege of speaking in the assembly or the democratic court but only spoke at festivals or in private homes of citizens.[310]

Recent studies have, however, questioned the above poor conception of epideictic. They argue that lexically spectator/observer θεωρός means more than observing. Among other things, the meaning of θεωρός includes observing, contemplating and theorising. [311] This suggests that the epideictic audience exercised a certain level of judgement.[312] Some scholars have also observed that epideictic's complex relationship with the present makes it a more worthwhile genre than has been historically conceived. It tends to take its very subject and form from present actions or ceremonies in which it is embedded and therefore often serves to assess where people are as a community.[313] As Hauser has argued, epideictic displays honourable deeds and asks its audience to witness what appears before them.[314] All this suggests that the idea of θεωρός means more than a spectator. It means participating as a witness to a performance whose intention is to influence. By highlighting group values the performance would have practical significance for the participant's self and group understanding. The genre's interest with the present is important for this study's analysis of the meaning and function of the Sermon. It provides a parallel schema of understanding the present nature of the epideictic and the nature of the issue that form the undercurrents behind the Sermon.

3.2.1 Epideictic and Community in Athens

The rise in the influence of the epideictic genre is associated with the Athenian community. The genre became useful in several Athenian contexts; from the assembly, the forum, to the festival context.

3.2.1.1. The Assembly

Concerning the assembly, the participatory nature of Athenian democracy provided a fertile ground for the development of epideictic rhetoric. The genre provided the occasion for praising significant public acts and actors and afforded the opportunity to address the fundamental values and beliefs that made collective political action within the democracy a possibility.[315]

[310] Duffy, 1983: 80.
[311] Oravec 1976: 164.
[312] Ibid.
[313] Villadsen, 2008: 25-45.
[314]Hauser, 1999: 15.
[315] Ibid. 5-23.

Examples of epideictic function in Athenian democracy are found in Pericles' last speech before the Peloponnesian War and his funeral oration a year within the War. In the first speech, he emphasised on the blame of the Lacedaemonians and praise of Athenian superiority.[316] By highlighting the vileness of the Lacedaemonians, he justified the argument for War. On the other hand, by extolling Athenian superiority, he inspired the masses into both the demonstration and the preservation of Athenian superiority. A year later, in his funeral oration Pericles said of the war dead:

> The sacrifice which they collectively made was individually repaid to them; for they received again each one for himself a praise which grows not old, and noblest of all sepulchres-…not only are they commemorated with by columns and inscriptions in their own country, but in foreign land there dwells also unwritten memorial of them, not graven on stone, but in the hearts of men.[317]

In extolling the virtues of the war dead Pericles declares that their sacrifices had become the standard virtue capable of being celebrated and emulated.[318] In this way, Pericles both demonstrated the traditional function of praise and set the standard for future panegyric approaches in Greek society. Another example of the epideictic function in the assembly is Isocrates' *Areopagiticus*. In this panegyric Isocrates advocated for a return to a form of government where the Areopagus was the central authority.[319] He praised the glorious days of the Areopagus against the unrestricted form of democracy in the Athens of his time. By exalting the former days and demeaning the present, Isocrates aimed to help reform the politics of his day. The above examples demonstrate how praise and blame provided the context for the development of opposing viewpoints and their synthesis in Athenian democracy.

3.2.1.2. The Forum

The language of praise and blame was also useful within the Athenian public forum. The forum constituted the theatres or camps or any other public gathering of a crowd. In these public contexts, praise and blame provided the context for the education of the citizenry.[320] It became the means through which the *polis* defined what honourable and dishonourable behaviour was.

---

[316] Thucydides, I. 139-146.
[317] Blaisdell, 2014:26-27.
[318] Thucydides, *Histories,* 2:35-46.
[319] See Isocrates' *Areopagiticus*.
[320] Plato, *Rep.*, 6. 492b.

The use of praise and blame became more important with the emergence of individuality in Athens after the Peloponnesian War. Kenneth S. Rothwell and Matthew Christ describe how the post-war experience of Athens provided the context for the public significance of praise and blame. Rothwell argues that the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War ushered in a period of individual focus in Athens wherein citizens valued their private affairs over those of the city. The emphasis of the time was more on one's own autonomy, will and personality than collective responsibility.[321] According to Matthew Christ, individual focus also manifested itself through persistent avoidance of civic duties by citizens. [322] One example of individual focus in Athens was of the Thirty Tyrants (*triakonta turannoi*) who did everything from their lust of gain.[323] Removed through a stasis in 403 BCE, the tyrants had involved themselves in the confiscation of citizen property, shared it among themselves, and suppressed Athenian democratic rights. Another example of dishonourable behaviour was the practice of ὀβολοστατική, usury, which Aristotle refers to as one of the shameful deeds (αἰσχρὰ ἔργα). [324] The practice was shameful because, according to Aristotle, its gain comes from money itself and not from that for the sake of which money was invented. [325] At the core of Aristotle's pungent attack on usury is the troubled relationship between the rich and the poor epitomised in the relationship between the trader and poor buyers, lenders and the debtors. The cynical citizen in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiasuzae*, who is hesitant and, therefore, unwilling to place his goods for public service, symbolised the extent of individual focus in Athens.[326]

The above examples of individual focus challenged Athenian ideals concerning the relationship between the individual and state.[327] They presented the city with practical challenges as it sought to limit the scope for bad citizenship through its legal and administrative institutions. [328] Praise and blame, therefore, became the ideological response from the city on what was honourable and dishonourable. Oratory and drama addressed to large Athenian audiences in public contexts became the avenue for addressing the common good in the *polis*.[329] Although

---

[321] Rothwell Jnr, 1990: 13.
[322] Christ, 2006: 19.
[323] Diodorus *Siculus*, 14.2.
[324] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1258b.
[325] Ibid.
[326] At the end of the play, as the reforms unfold in Athens, one citizen remains cynical and says he will offer his goods after everyone has given up theirs. His reason for hesitancy is because he is not sure if everyone will do it and whether the whole communitarian enterprise will work. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 746-755.
[327] Christ, 2006: 19.
[328] Ibid.
[329] Ibid.

the social issues in Athens were localised, they also pointed to the wider challenges of aligning group interest to individual interest in any Greco-Roman community. The challenges could have applied to any other community including the Christian communities to which Luke would be writing centuries later.[330] These challenges are not only brought into sharp focus in Luke's makarisms and woes but are also mirrored across the Third Gospel. The stories of the rich fool, (12:16-21) the Rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31), the rich ruler (18:18-23) and Zacchaeus (19:1-10) demonstrate the social question and the problem of the rich and the poor in early Christianity in particular, and the Greco-Roman world in general.

3.2.1.3. The Festival/Cult

Epideictic was also an important component of the festivals and cultic ceremonies. Scholars have traced the origin and influence of epideictic rhetoric to its relationship with the festival ritual. Michael Carter, Samuel Johnson, and Kenneth Burke have been some of the advocates of this position.[331] Carter, for example argues that the epideictic genre grew out of ancient ritual. Citing Kennedy, he argues that epideictic came into existence when funeral orations evolved from poetic laments in the ancient rites of the dead.[332] He also notes that the historical relationship between epideictic and the rituals such as the festival orations and panegyrics had their foundation in the ritual *topoi* of praise of the festival god, the city, the festival official and the local rulers.[333] In terms of function, Johnson and Burke have argued that the purpose of epideictic oratory in a ritual context was the transmission of cultural values.[334] Burke explains how ritual achieves the transmission of cultural values. He argues that within a ritual context, epideictic helped to achieve symbolic transcendence of the sense of division among men.[335] By this he implies that the expression of praise and blame assume conflict and disunity among men and therefore helped communities to become aware of the reality of division within themselves and to find ways of dealing with this discrepancy in everyday experience.

The significance of epideictic in ritual context discussed above has implications not only for understanding the function of praise and blame in Greek society but also in specific sub-groups

[330] For example, it can be argued that reference to Barnabas' generosity (Act 4:36-37) and Ananias' and Sapphira's (Act 5:1-11) penny-pinching represent the ambiguous co-existence of both patriotic and selfish interest within the early Christian community.
[331] See Carter, 1991; Johnson, 1970; Burke, 1969.
[332] Carter, 1991: 211.
[333] Ibid.
[334] Johnson, 1970: 265. See also Burke, 1969: 127-317.
[335] Burke, 1969: 127-317.

like the Christ-groups where the ritual was an essential component of community life. The historical relationship between poetic praise and ritual, which Carter raises, also points to the probable ritual context of the makarisms and woes and, therefore, the functions of the Sermon within Luke's primary audience. The festival context of epideictic also raises the question of the nature of festivals within the practices of early Christ-followers that would have been parallel to Greek festivals and ones in which the Sermon played a significant role. The nearest Christian festival parallel to the Greek ones is the Easter Festival. As it will be argued in the next chapter, in an Easter festival context, the recital of the Sermon would have had a significant character and identity implications for both new converts and the rest of the Christian community.

3.2.2. Epideictic in the Roman Empire

Panegyric praise and blame were also an important cultural dimension of the Roman empire. Although the Roman panegyric was modelled on Greek epideictic oratory, some scholars think it developed independently.[336] The Roman honour and shame cultural framework, which they shared in its broad shape with the Greeks, allowed for the possibility of an independent development of epideictic. In her book *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones,* Carlin Barton demonstrates how honour defined every human activity in the Roman world. For example, according to her, soldiers of every status competed feverishly for commendation.[337] She summarised the Roman agonistic spirit by quoting Cicero:

> With what earnestness their rivalries! How fierce their contests! What exultation they feel when they win, and what shame when they are beaten! How they dislike reproach! How they yearn for praise! What labours they will undertake to stand for their peers! How well they remember those who have shown them kindness and how eager to repay it! (*De finibus* 5.22.61).[338]

The above Roman spirit is demonstrated by Julius Caesar who, while serving as a junior magistrate in Spain, wept upon seeing the statue of Alexander the Great, for he had done nothing

[336] Dominik and Smith, 2011: 3.
[337] Barton, 2001: 13.
[338] Quoted in Ibid. 11.

memorable while at his age Alexander had already conquered the world.[339] Although doubted by most historians, Caesar's self-blame exhibits the pervasive influence of the normative values of honour and shame culture in the Latin world and the possible independent development of Roman panegyric. It is said that the competitive mind-set of upper classes in such arenas as the senate and the court, provides further evidence for the independent development of Latin oratory and epideictic.[340] The most outspoken Latin orators, whose contribution took Latin oratory to another level were Cicero and Quintilian.

The influence of epideictic in the Roman west was also facilitated by the collapse of the Roman Republic. The role of both deliberative and forensic rhetoric became significantly eclipsed with the death of democracy after the collapse of the Republic. In the new dispensation, the Senate became negligible and all affairs pertaining to the community were no longer the subject of democratic debate. This made the place of deliberative rhetoric become ambiguous.[341] Epideictic rhetoric, therefore, survived as a repertoire of theoretical processes that could be applied to almost any topic.[342] As a result, under the empire, epideictic rhetoric became politically important for eulogies of rulers. These eulogies comprised both advice and statements of policy.[343] The approaches to panegyrics of Cicero, and later Quintilian, became the standard practice for the use of epideictic in late Republican and later imperial Rome.[344] The inclusion of advice in epideictic suggests that although the other branches of rhetoric had waned in significance, some of their elements such as advice, exhortation, and accusation found their way into epideictic genre. Thus, like in the Greek East, the combination of praise and blame and exhortation became the hallmark of Roman panegyrics. The above panegyric features have corresponding resonance with the structure of the Sermon's makarisms and woes and the exhortation that follows in its last section (vv. 27-49).

[339] Fox, 2005: 381.
[340] Dominik and Smith, 2011: 3.
[341] Vickers, 1983: 500.
[342] Vickers, 1983: 500.
[343] Ibid. According to Vickers, the importance of epideictic is underscored by the fact that, during the empire, by Roman law, orators were chosen at Athens to teach and others to listen.
[344] Cicero's *For Marcellus*, *For Ligarius*, and *For King Dieotarius* provide models of the influence of epideictic in Imperial Rome.

3.3. THE THEORY OF ENCOMIUM

3.3.1. Traditional Theory of *Encomium*

The growing influence of praise and blame both in ancient Greece and Rome led to the development of the theory of *encomium* and *psogos*,[345] with *laudatio* and *vituperatio* as their Latin equivalents. The above theory was developed as part of training in effective speaking.[346] The theory was meant to provide a framework for highlighting the good qualities of a person based on clearly defined criteria. The criteria were built from the systematic analysis of the subject matter and arrangement of demonstrative oratory which was begun by Aristotle and later developed into the preliminary exercises of the schools, the *Progymnasmata*.[347] On the Roman side, Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* became the standard Latin text for orations. The resulting *Encomium* or *Laudatio* (praise) came to be developed around the topics of origin, nurture or training, accomplishments, comparison and noble death or posthumous honours.[348] Under accomplishments, the theory defined (1) deeds of the body: beauty, strength, agility, might and health; (2) deeds of the soul: justice, wisdom, temperance, courage and piety; (3) deeds of fortune; wealth, fame, friends, and fortune.[349] On the other hand, the *psogos* or invective highlighted the negative aspects of an individual based on the same criteria. The application of the different criteria for *encomia* was made through four methods; the exaggeration or amplification of meritorious features, suppression of undesirable ones, favourable contrast with something else and the clever turning of an unpleasant fact to a pleasant one.[350] The above method of *encomia* created the unavoidable combination of praise and blame. Praising someone's virtues created a contrast that potentially blamed their opposite number's vices. [351] This underscored the inseparable relationship between praise and blame. The use of both genres of praise and blame was common, although some orators like Polybius frowned at it. [352] For example, Cicero reports how Gorgias composed *encomia* and speeches of blame on the same subject.[353] Besides, Dio Chrysostom was also known for inserting both praise and blame into his panegyrics.[354] All this underscores the integral relationship of praise and blame in *encomia*. However, as Polybius argues, although blame was a significant part of

[345] The Greek *ἐγκώμιον* -celebration.
[346] Kennedy, 2001:7. See also the work of Petersen, 2010.
[347] Vickers, 1983: 500.
[348] Kennedy, 2003: 155.
[349] Kennedy, 2003:156.
[350] Pease 1926: 27; Miguélez-Cavero, 2010: 31.
[351] Polybius, 12. 26b.5
[352] Polybius called the blame genre as useless and paradoxical verbiage. Polybius,12.26b.5.
[353] Cicero, *Brutus*, 47.
[354] Pernot, 2014: 65.

the epideictic genre, and was taught as a subject of school exercises, its significance could not be compared with that of encomia.[355]

3.3.2. Paradoxical *Encomium*

Beyond orthodox panegyrics, there was another form of *encomium* called "paradoxical *encomium*" or adoxography. This was a special species of *encomium* which involved the praise of unworthy, unexpected and trifling objects.[356] The genre applied all the legitimate methods of encomia but concerned itself with humbler topics such as lower animals, plants or inanimate objects.[357] Paradoxical *encomia* had two related functions; refuting common *doxa* and reinforcing common values. In relation to refuting the common *doxa,* Thomas Blank has argued that that *adoxology* deliberately takes up positions that contradict the common sense of *doxa*.[358] The word δόξα means, inter alia, belief. Therefore, in an epideictic context, paradoxical encomium challenges commonly held beliefs about things and reality. For example, during its time, Gorgias' *encomium* of Helen provided a new conception of Helen, who in most literature had been presented as the main cause of suffering in the Greek world. In it, Gorgias attempts to show that the beautiful Helen of Troy, whose adultery and flight with Paris were the proximate cause of the Trojan War, should suffer no unjust blame for the war, nonetheless. If either fate, the gods, logos, or *eros* (love) compelled her, she is blameless.[359]Another example is Libanius' encomia on poverty and a *psogos* on wealth in which he outlines the advantages of being poor and the disadvantages of riches and, therefore, challenges conventional conceptions of poverty and wealth.[360] In some cases, as part of the exercises in the schools, orators could extol the life of the beggar and exile as ideal stations of life for all mankind.[361]

Concerning the reinforcement values, Debra Hawhee argues that adoxography reinforces the values of novelty, surprise, and revelation, which are the very stuff of wonder.[362] As Mark Moore notes, the genre forces the reader and listener to consider something other than, or

---

[355] Polybius 12. 26b.5.
[356] Miller, 1956:145; According to Moore, the genre's name is derived from the Greek root *paradoxon,* paradox, and describes the unusual or the enigmatic, See Moore, 1988: 15.
[357] The methods are (1) the exaggeration or amplification of meritorious features, (2) suppression of undesirable one, (3) favourable contrast with something else and (3) the clever turning of an unpleasant fact to a pleasant one, See, Pease, 1926: 27.
[358] Blank, 2013:1-33.
[359] See Barney, 2016.
[360] Libanius, 2008: 277-98.
[361] Miller, 1956: 146.
[362] Hawheee, 2017: 27.

contrary to, commonly held beliefs, attitudes, and values; it forces an audience to contemplate a "new knowledge and a different reality."[363] It allows for the possibility to see things anew, bringing them up close, engaging the senses with a disposition of amazement and wonder, the Greek word for which was θαῦμα (*thauma)*.[364] It can, therefore, be argued that as a summary of its two functions, paradoxical *encomia*, to use Sheard's words, can move their audience towards a process of self-reflection. This, in turn, leads to the creation of alternative realities and possible worlds.[365]

It can be argued that the above analysis of both traditional and paradoxical encomium is very important for the present research. First, the use of praise in extolling the virtues of a person in the above analysis provides a framework for understanding the Lucan makarisms and their role in the Sermon. Also, the possibility of combining praise and blame in the same panegyric has a striking resemblance to the Lucan combination of praise and blame. Yet some differences also exist between the Sermon and the traditional *encomium*. The theory of *encomia* follows a structured formula that praises an individual based on a continuum of topics which the Sermon does not follow. However, the existence of both traditional and paradoxical *encomia* suggests that it was possible to innovate and produce new themes and ways of praising individuals suited to a particular context. It is, therefore, likely that, although poverty was not a topic of *encomia*, and wealth was, in the Sermon, Jesus twists the conventional conception of poverty and wealth. Like Libanius on poverty and wealth, Jesus probably aimed to challenge his audience to a new way of conceiving the interpersonal relationship between the poor and the rich in the community. This, therefore, suggests that the use of makarisms and woes combined with an exhortation (Lk. 6: 20-49) was not a purely Lucan innovation. It demonstrates that in the Sermon, Luke drew from a rich and flexible Greco-Roman tradition of *encomium* which was capable of application in different contexts.

3.3.3. The Function of Blame

The importance of blame as a counterpart of praise has always been part of Greco-Roman culture.[366] Usually, blame was at the service of praise.[367] It provided a negative contrast that

---

[363] Moore, 1988: 15.
[364] Hawheee, 2017: 27.
[365] Sheard, 1996: 770.
[366] Ibid, 83.
[367] Miguélez-Cavero, 2010: 24.

enhanced the image of the object of *encomia*. However, although praise and blame were integral elements of the epideictic, their combined use varied in different contexts. During the imperial age, when the *encomia* of the ruler became more prominent, blame lost its significance. However, from far back into the history of classical antiquity, like praise, blame had been useful in the reinforcement of values in the community. One such function related to the social control of interpersonal relations, especially in economic relations. Jerry Petersen has recently argued that in the Greek world, blame was also critical in honing qualities worthy of honour or dishonour, more especially within interpersonal economic relations.[368] Two examples from Greek society provide interesting cases of the function of blame in regulating economic relations. The first example comes from Crates, a late 450 BCE comic poet, who argues:

I do not want to heap up bright money-the happiness of the beetle. The riches of the ant-or to become mad for wealth, but rather would I share in justice and gather wealth, That is easy to carry, easy to acquire, and honoured for virtue. If I happen upon these, I will worship Hermes and the Muses, not with luxurious expenses, but with holy virtues. [369]	Cf. But woe to you that are rich, for you have received your consolation. "Woe to you that are full now, for you shall hunger. "Woe to you that laugh now, for you shall mourn and weep. (Lk 6:24-25, RSV)

In the above blame poem, which is juxtaposed with Luke's woes to the rich, Crates poetically illustrates the contradictions of the proximity of riches and poverty within the Greek *polis* and how this challenged the *polis*' ideals. One of the cardinal points on which the principle of the Athenian *polis* was built was that the people who made up the *polis* were equal (*isos*) no matter how different they were in origin, rank and function.[370] However, no matter how good the intentions behind this principle, social differences existed within the *polis*. The principle of reciprocity in giving, receiving and repayment resulted in a closed circuit of exchange based on

[368] Petersen, 2010: 38.
[369]Crates, *Elegy and Iambus*, Vol. II, 2.15.2., tr. J. M. Edmonds.
[370] Vernant, 1962: 60.

kinship or social equality.[371] Within this context, Crates' poetic *psogos o*n wealth and greed, reflects the rich's preoccupation with more wealth at the expense of the poor. He, therefore, advocates for justice and the need to share with the poor. The above poem also reflects the narrative indicators of the Sermon. Its *psogos* of wealth, especially, its condemnation of unnecessary acquisition without sharing resonates with the Lucan woes on the rich, the full, and those who laugh in Lk. 6:24-26. It is also depicted in the parable of the rich fool (Lk 12:13-21) and the rich ruler (Lk 18:18-30). It represents the opposite of changed attitude of Zacchaeus (Lk 19:19).

Another *psogos* on wealth and market processes in prose form comes from Aristotle's *Politics* where he argues:

> Of the two sorts of money-making one . . . is part of household management, the other is retail trade; the former is necessary and honourable, and latter a kind of exchange which is justly censured; for it is unnatural, and a mode by which men gain from one another. The most hated sort, and with reason, is usury, which makes a gain out of money itself, and not from the natural use of it. [372]

Again, like Crates above, Aristotle's statement underscores the predatory activities of the money economy and its effects on the poor. He censures the practice of usury and its enriching and impoverishing effect on the debtors and lenders, respectively. At the bottom of Aristotle's blame of usury is, to cite William Desmond's view, the Greek conception of wealth not so much as a material fact but far more as an ethical and political phenomenon with individual greed as the controlling factor.[373] The natural propensity of the rich to acquire more and more wealth at the expense of the poor and their inability to give without expecting to receive back created the connection between wealth and greed. The above use of blame, especially in relation to economic and social relations resonates significantly with the ethos of the Sermon. The examples of the *psogos* of wealth and riches provide an important framework for understanding the function of the Lucan woes to the rich in their Greco-Roman context.

[371] Kurke, 1991:92.
[372] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1.1258a, tr. Rackham.
[373] Desmond, 2006*:* 4-5.

3.4. PANEGYRIC ENCOMIA IN ITS SOCIAL CONTEXT

Greco-Roman *encomia* came in several forms. The forms included funeral orations, festival orations, and eulogies to great and good men. The forms reflected the different contexts in which oratory was performed and its functions within those contexts.

3.4.1. The Funeral Oration

The funeral oration or Greek ἐπιτάφιος λόγος (*epitaphios logos*), whose Latin designation was *laudatio funebris*, was one of the most popular forms of *encomia* in the Greco-Roman world. As Pernot has demonstrated, the funeral oration was a formal praise speech delivered on the ceremonial occasion of a funeral.[374] In ancient Greece, the funeral oration was an indispensable component of the funeral ritual. Its origin is associated with Pericles' funeral speech after the first year of the Peloponnesian War, in which he collectively extolled the exploits of the Athenian fallen soldiers.[375] As Monoson has argued, through the life of the deceased, the city displayed its achievements, as well as the civic and personal virtues to which the citizens could aspire.[376] Through the exemplary case of the deceased, the speech brought out a communal definition of what was ideal.[377] With time, as Loraux has argued, the prose of the funeral oration dedicated itself to celebrating the ideals of the democratic Athenian city.[378]

The Roman *laudatio funebris*, was, however, slightly different from its Greek counterpart. While the Greek ἐπιτάφιος was collective, the Roman *laudatio funebris* essentially involved the celebration of a man or family and their virtues delivered in the forum.[379] The praise, usually delivered by a young boy, contained both the praises of the deceased himself and an account of the careers of all his office-holding ancestors.[380] A family member or professional actor dressed in beeswax mask and costume represented the deceased while others in the procession wore beeswax masks of famous ancestors of the deceased.[381] Although it had a significant elitist tone, its ability to arouse personal devotion to virtues espoused by the deceased cannot be discounted. It can, therefore, be pointed out that the social function of the funeral oration represented the culmination of what came to be regarded as "the honourable" in the community to which the

[374] Pernot, 2014: 35.
[375] Ibid.
[376] Monoson, 2000: 202.
[377] Condit, 1985: 284-298.
[378] Loraux, 1984: 45.
[379] Loraux, 1986: 43.
[380] Flower, 2013: 3927.
[381] Flower, 1996: 37.

deceased was regarded as the moral exemplar. This again confirms the community nature of praise and its place in bringing together a community's collective aspirations.

3.4.1.1. Educational Function of Funeral Orations

Funeral orations played a significant educational role in Greco-Roman society. Their function was tied to the role *encomia* played as an avenue for addressing the common good in the *polis*.[382] A vital aspect of its educational function was in the development of a responsible citizenry. Covino, and more recently Pernot, have pointed out that the orations for great men were not usually given for the dead but for the education of the citizens and the younger generation.[383] The consolation and exhortation to honour and imitate the deceased that concluded most funeral orations confirm this educational function.[384] A case in point is Pericles, who, in his 430/31 BCE funeral speech eulogised the men killed in the first year of the war. His reference to their bravery and sacrifices for the sake of Athens, which he said, would be difficult to emulate, illustrates the educational the role of the *encomia*.[385]

The assumption behind the orations was that repeated exposure to the *encomia* of such great men created a disposition to act in accordance with the values, beliefs, and shared code of right conduct.[386] Isocrates exemplifies this understanding when, in his *Evagoras*, he declares:

> ..those who have the ability to glorify the deeds of their contemporaries, by speaking in the presence of those who knew the facts might have employed the truth concerning them, and also that the younger generation might with greater emulation have striven for virtue, knowing well that they would be praised more highly than those whom they have excelled in merit.[387]

The orations, like the one by Isocrates above, to use Pernot's words, provided the listeners with models of virtue and encouraged them to imitate. According to Pernot, since the subject of praise (the deceased) inspired admiration and emulation, the listeners were encouraged to compete with him for the love of the common good in the hope of meriting for themselves

382 Rees, 2010: 9. Christ, 2006: 19.
383 Pernot, 2014:93; Covino, 2011: 73.
384 Pernot, 2014: 93.
385 Blaisdell, 2014: 26.
386 Covino, 2011: 73.
387 Isocrates, *Evagoras*, 9.5.

comparable *encomia*.[388] Pernot's statement suggests that appeal to the agonist mindset of the listener provided the impetus for the audience to compete with the deceased in virtue. Therefore, the nation's or *polis*' collective character was forged by persuasive rhetoric, coercion, and ultimately repetition.[389] Plato's *Menexenus* best summarises the above educational and inspiring role of *encomia*. Speaking of funeral orations, he says:

> Indeed, Menexenus, to die in battle appears to be a fine thing in many ways. For the dead man gets a noble and magnificent funeral even though he happens to be poor. And when they eulogise the city in every possible way and praise those who have died in battle and all of the ancestors who lived before us and we ourselves who are living, I myself I am greatly ennobled by their praise, Menexenus, and on each occasion I am transfixed as I listen and am charmed, so that I instantly come to believe that I have become greater and nobler and more beautiful. [390]

Although Plato's statement above was made within the broader context of his disapproval of Sophistic abuse of *encomia*, it underscores the psychological and educational impact of praise on its audience. [391] Its capacity to ennoble, charm and inspire confidence in individuals has implications for how communities transmitted virtues and honourable behaviours. As Dale Sullivan argues, at the bottom of praise and blame in the community was the affirmation of shared values within a homogenous culture.[392] Through the agency of praise and blame the community celebrated shared values by magnifying the virtue of the subject being eulogised or the vice of the subject being censured. Sullivan further states that from the perspective of those inside the culture, epideictic produces consensus or orthodoxy (ortho from ὀρθός- meaning strait, and *δόξα,* meaning, inter alia*,* an appearance) which manifests itself and is apprehended by the members of the community.[393] In other words, as Cynthia Sheard has argued, praise reinforced the norms of public morality, which made the act of praising akin to asking for a course of action.[394]

---

[388] Pernot, 2014: 95.
[389] Covino, 2011: 75.
[390] Plato, *Menexenus*, 235. tr. W.R.M. Lamb.
[391] Ibid.
[392] Sullivan, 1993: 339-349.
[393] Ibid.
[394] Sheard, 1996: 770.

The above function of praise demonstrates the relationship between praise and honour. It illustrates how praise was not only useful for recognising honour but also in inculcating its values in the community. The above understanding has important implications for understanding the role of praise in building up the community, particularly of the budding Christ-groups in the Greco-Roman world. The use of praise and blame as the agency of community cohesion provides insightful perspectives on community dynamics in the Greco-Roman world and the basic commitment expected of the individual towards the *polis*. Although Luke 6:20-49 cannot be classified as funeral speech, the above discussion puts into perspective the role of praise and blame in the makarisms and woes and function of the Sermon in its original context.

3.4.2. Eulogy for Good Men

Another form of *encomia* were the eulogies for "good men" (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός) or eulogy for the contemporary man.[395] These eulogies endowed a man with attributes which rendered him marvellous in the eyes of other men.[396] Like the funeral orations, they celebrated the virtues of an individual rather than a group of the war dead. These eulogies can be classified into two categories: victory odes and general panegyrics to rulers and great men.

3.4.2.1. Victory Odes

Victory odes or *epinicia* were part of the original eulogies or panegyrics for good men. Pindar's panegyrics or victory odes, most of which were poetic, represented the earliest form of *encomia* to great men.[397] Besides Pindar, the *epinicia* of Bacchylides and Simonides, which were a genre of occasional verse, are also examples of eulogies to great men. Although victory odes were directed to the recipients rather than the readers or hearers, they were taken as models of praise of virtue.[398] Leslie Kurke has argued that the *epinikion* praised the victorious athlete as an ideal representative of both the community and the aristocratic class, linking his achievements with those of local cult heroes.[399] Beyond that, the odes also admonished the athletes against hubris, "not to seek to become Zeus"[400] One of Bacchylides' makarisms summarises the use of praise in victory odes. In his praise of Hieron's single horse victory at the 476 BCE Olympia he says:

---

[395] Or ἀνδρός ἀγαθός.
[396] Parry, 1965: 363-374.
[397] Vickers, 1983: 501.
[398] Ibid.
[399] Kurke, 2001: 64.
[400] Ibid.

Ὄλβιος ᾧτινι θεὸς
μοῖράν τε καλῶν ἔπορεν
σύν τ᾽ ἐπιζήλῳ τύχᾳ
ἀφνεὸν βιοτὰν διάγειν.[401]

Blessed is he to whom a god has given a share of fine things, and a rich life to live out with enviable luck.

The above makarism has two interesting implications. First, within the context of a victory ode, its reference to god creates the connection between victory and divine favour; that the victory is divinely inspired. Second, its reference to ἀφνεὸς βιοτά, (literary, a wealthy life) demonstrates that prestige earned through the victory in the games was not only recognised by the community but also envied.[402] The above idealisation of victory presented the victors as the epitome of 'ἀρετή to which every individual in the community was to aspire.

The structure of praise odes has interesting parallels with the structure of the Sermon. Ordinarily, an ode had a central focus around a carefully chosen myth which was preceded and followed by information about the victor alongside some exhortation for the listeners.[403] Yet the above content and structure were not watertight. Significant variations existed across Pindaric odes and other odes.[404] The essential elements of an ode were:

(1) Specific details about the victor, his background and exploits.
(2) The use of myth in one or two ways (a) telling of a mythological story of ornament or (b) providing brief mythological parallels to illustrate moral truths, and
(3) Moralising or proverbial reflections arising mostly from the consideration of athletic success.[405]

Some of the above-mentioned features of the ode show promising resonance with some features of the Sermon. For example, in the use of myth, Pindar relates the victory of Hieron (in 472

[401] Bacchylides 5.50, tr. Diane Arnson Svarlien.
[402] Diane Arnson Svarlien translation of the Odes, 1991.
[403] Gordley, 2007: 135-137.
[404] Willcock, 1995*:* 12.
[405] Ibid.

BCE) to the glory of the mythical Pelops flashing forth from Olympia (Olympian 1:93-98). Beyond the myth, sometimes Pindar's moralising comes in the form of maxims. For example, in the middle of praising his host Psaumis, Pindar offers a moralising prayer:

> May the god be gracious to his future prayers since I praise a man who is most eager in the raising of horses, who rejoices in being hospitable to all guests, and whose pure thoughts are turned towards city-loving peace.[406]

Similarly, Bacchylides in the middle of praising his host and relating his victory to the gods offers a moralising maxim which represents a veiled warning against hubris:

> Wealth keeps company with worthless men as well,
> and it tends to swell a man's thoughts;
> but he who does well to the gods cheers his heart with a more glorious hope.[407]

The contents of odes mentioned above have rough parallels with the Sermon. First, from the sequence of events leading up to Lk 6: 20-49 it possible to argue that the description of the exploits of the disciples can be understood in the context of their appointment (Lk 6:13) and the subsequent praise in Lk 6: 20-23. The idea of *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Lk 6:20) would have been similar to *epinicia*'s mythical symbolism of with its moralising role. In the Sermon, the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* forms the central motif around which the moral issues of poverty, hunger, and mourning are understood. The association of the Kingdom of God with heaven in Lk 6: 23 re-enforces its place as a moralising myth. Finally, like *epinicia,* the Sermon ends with an exhortation for the listeners. The reference to *Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν.... τοῖς ἀκούουσιν* (v. 27) marks the Sermon's transition into an exhortation to the listeners (Lk 6: 27-49). It can be argued from the above analysis that, just as central to a victory ode was the combination of praise, myth and exhortation, similar elements are evident in the Sermon's makarisms and woes and the succeeding exhortation in Lk 6:27-49. This understanding once again provides a plausible context for analysing the function of the Sermon in its original context.

[406] Pindar, *Olympiad*, 10-16, tr. Diane Arnson Svarlien.
[407] Bacchylides, *Epinicians* Ode 1:190, tr. Diane Arnson Svarlien.

3.4.2.1. a. The Function of Victory Odes

i. Recognition of Honour

One function of victory odes was the recognition of honour. This function reflected the agonistic spirit of the Greek culture in which honour was the ruling value and a daily point of reference in matters both trivial and momentous.[408] In that culture, the recognition of an individual's achievement by the community defined both their estimation of themselves and how the community valued them. The language of praise recognised the concepts of goodness, *ἀγαθός*, and excellence '*ἀρετή* which were the virtues that every Greek male endlessly pursued.[409] However, one of the best contexts in which honour was recognised through praise was in the celebration of individual victory in PanHellenic games. The praise that poets sang before banquets concerning the victor's household, his clan and city, symbolised recognition and honour. [410] Poulakos argues that Pindar commemorated the success of victors in athletic games by celebrating the significance of their victory.[411] The individual's accomplishment was glorified and made to have universal appeal. Thus, praise aimed for the highest meaning of the victory, its universal and symbolic implications for the whole human life.[412] In this way, according to Kurke, apart from satisfying the competitive mindset of the Greco-Roman culture, praise inspired others to crave for honour at par with or beyond that of the victors of the Panhellenic games.[413]

ii. Integration of the Victor

Another function of the praise odes was the integration of the victor into the community. This understanding had two dimensions. First, as Kurke demonstrates, praise was useful for re-introducing the victor into the *κοινωνία* of good men that he left behind in order to compete.[414] The victor, who had isolated himself by his achievement was to be integrated back into his community.[415] The above isolation arose from the belief that to be victorious, the patron divinity of the games had "hosted" the athlete and bestowed victory on him as a kind of guest-gift.[416] The victor's experience of θεία ξενία (*divine-xenia)* estranges him from his community. He

[408] Horden and Purcell, 2000: 489.
[409] See Barton: 2001: 13.
[410] Kurke, 1991: 6.
[411] Poulakos, 1987: 322.
[412] Ibid.
[413] Kurke, 1991: 6.
[414] Ibid. 5.
[415] Ibid.
[416] Ibid. 131.

becomes the other, and therefore, different from his peers. According to Pindar, cultural conventions required that, when a ξένος *(stranger)* fares well, the immediate community, especially those who are noble, show joy at the happy message.[417] The praise ceremony, therefore, facilitated the victor's re-entry into the community.

Beyond re-entry into the community, the praise odes also helped in integrating the victor into the *polis'* hall of fame. This integration was more particularly significant for those with no family history of victories. Since victory was generally associated with "inherited excellences", the praise ceremony helped to integrate the "lone" victor into the continuum of victors in the city. For example, in a recent essay, Peter Miller has demonstrated how in *Olympia* 9 Pindar integrates Epharmostos of Opous, who had no family history of victories, into the community of victors.[418] Pindar does this by establishing the connection between the early ethnic and civic history of Lokris and Opous, respectively. He then elevates the athletic victory of Epharmostos to the level of ethnic and civic foundations. Since society conceived citizenship in terms of family, this allowed the community to understand Epharmostos' victory as based on inherited excellences.[419] In this case, although Epharmostos' victory was contrary to social expectation, the community accepts him as part of the family of victors in the city. Thus, praise helped to integrate the victor into the polis' hall of fame.

The above functions of the victory odes have a close reference to Luke's text. This is evident in the fact that both have their contexts in the celebrations of momentous events. First, while the odes celebrate athletic victories, the Sermon directly follows Jesus' choice of the twelve disciples (v. 13). The parade down the hill in v. 17 which mirrors a victory procession culminates in Jesus' bestowal of makarisms on his disciples (vv. 20-27). This makes the Sermon's context resemble that of a praise ceremony in which the disciples' new status was recognised before the community (v. 27), and they were integrated into the symbolic family of the Kingdom of God. The above observation of the Sermon's context has so far not been recognised in scholarship. It, therefore, follows that if Theophilus and others were new converts into the Christ-groups, the Sermon with its bestowal of blessing on the disciples would have signified the recognition of honour and integration into the family of Christ-groups. Its social context, which will be discussed in the next chapter, could have been an Easter festival at which

[417] Pindar, *Olympian*, 4.4–5.
[418] Miller, 2015: 1-20
[419] Ibid.

baptism of new converts as the recognition of faith in Jesus and integration into the community of the faith would have taken place.

3.4.2.2. Eulogy for Rulers

The second category of eulogies of good men was the eulogies for rulers and emperors. According to Nightingale, this type of panegyric had an aristocratic flavour that was at odds with the democratic spirit of the Ἐπιτάφιος.[420] This trend, however, represented the growth of the taste for individual *encomia*, especially for ruler and monarchies, more especially after the death of democracy in the Greco-Roman world.[421] An example of an *encomium* to a good or contemporary man was Isocrates' *encomium* of Evagoras and Cicero's panegyrics such as *For Marcellus, For Ligarius* and *For King Deiotarus*. These eulogies for rulers extolled the virtues of great men such as Evagoras and Caesar respectively and usually ended with advice on conduct or statement of policy for which the recipient was asked to follow.[422] For example in his Evagoras, intended for the latter's son, Nicocles, Isocrates ends with admonition for the former to take on his father's virtues:

> For my part, Nicocles, I think that while effigies of the body are fine memorials, yet likenesses of deeds and of the character are of far greater value.[423]

The above examples of the combination of praise and advice, which is also evident in in Lk 6:20-26 and Lk 6:27-47, help to demonstrate the panegyric dimension of the Sermon.

3.4.2.2. a. The Function of Eulogies

i. Educational/Patronal function

In Greco-Roman society eulogies for contemporary or good men had both educational and patronal functions. This function was mainly associated with political rhetoric. Their main function was both to garner support from those praised and to make them to commit to a course of action preferred by the orator. From the Greek context, Pernot gives an example of how Isocrates in his *Panegyricus* offers an encomium of Athens in order to support the city's request

[420] Nightingale, 1995: 99.
[421] Nightingale, 1995:99, Vickers, 1983: 500.
[422] See, Isocrates' *Evagoras* and Cicero's*, For Marcellus; For Ligarius; and For King Deiotarus.*
[423] Isocrates. 9. 73 tra. George Norlin.

for hegemony. Similarly, the ambassador in *Menander Rhetor* (423-424), in order to support his city's request for help from the emperor, initially offered an *encomium* of the emperor and one for his own city.[424] Further, Manuwald argues that in Cicero's *Philippics*, praise had three main patronal functions. It was used to gain political support, commit an audience to a preferred policy, and create loyal representatives.[425] It can be observed that the above approaches to praise exploited the system of patronage and reciprocity in which the recipient was obliged to act in the giver's best interest.

ii. Political function

Eulogies of great men also had a significant political function. Gesine Manuwald notes that in Cicero's *Philippics*, where honour was bestowed by virtue of praise, it was given not only as a reward for achievement but also in order to put an obligation on the individual honoured to continue supporting a cause.[426] Susanna Braundi's example of Cicero's panegyrics on Caesar represents the best instance of the political function of praise. In *For Marcellus*, for example, Cicero showers praise on Caesar for his demonstration of mercy to Marcellus, who had supported Pompey during the civil war.[427] Cicero starts by branding Caesar's clemency as unbelievable and goes on to classify Caesar's magnanimous spirit as resembling that of the gods. However, towards the end of the speech, Cicero begins to shift in what Braundi calls, *from praise to programme*, by introducing in his speech proposals for future action. In the next phase of the speech, Cicero begins to argue that the gods have conferred all hopes of safety and prosperity upon Caesar's clemency and wisdom. He then lays a programme of action for Caesar; setting up courts of law, restoring confidence, controlling passions, promotion of population growth and binding together with stern laws everything that had disintegrated and been dismantled.[428] The same pattern is also evident in Cicero's *Ligarius* (46 BC) and *Deiotatus*. In both cases, he praised Caesar for his clemency and proceeded to raise several programmes for the future. The above use of praise to solicit future support, according to Pernot, provides the connection between praise and advice or deliberative rhetoric.[429] It makes an *encomium* principally into a request which uses praise to make the listener yield to that request.[430] It can be observed that in the above examples, offering praise before making a

[424] Pernot, 2014: 93.
[425] Manuwald, 2011: 210.
[426] Ibid.
[427] Braundi, 1998: 69.
[428] Ibid.
[429] Pernot, 2014: 93.
[430] Ibid.

request presented a positive challenge of honour to the other parties which they were obliged to reciprocate.[431] The concepts of reciprocity and honour in the context of giving and receiving, therefore, formed the dynamics of exchange in the eulogies for good men.

The above patronal and political functions of praise have implications for understanding the rhetorical significance of NT discourse. A close examination of the Sermon demonstrates a "from praise to program" structure. While the makarisms resemble the praise part, the larger body of the Sermon (Lk 6:27-49) sets out the behaviours and attitudes expected of Jesus' followers. The *eulogies* for good/great men, therefore, present a framework for interpreting the function of the Lucan beatitudes and woes in their Greco-Roman context.

3.4.3. The Festival Speech

Another form of *encomia* was the festival speech.[432] This was an oration given at Pan-Hellenic festivals or festivals for single cities.[433] In Athens and other Greek cities, such speeches were delivered at national festivals or games. One of the objectives of the speeches was to stir the citizens to emulate the glorious deeds of their ancestors.[434] The notion of the concord between citizens of the *polis* or between Greek cities was also one of the main themes of the panegyrics.[435] The emphasis on concord reflected the conflicting visions among the Greeks both in the *polis* and at Pan-Hellenic level. At the Pan-Hellenic level, the panegyrics aimed at encouraging friendliness and discouraging hostile feelings which the Greeks from different *poleis* had for each other.[436] In this case, the festival orations acted as "carriers of social memory" of what was honourable in the community.[437]

The most famous of the festival speeches were the *Olympic Orations* of Lysias and the *Panegyricus* and *Panathenaicus* of Isocrates. The distinctive feature of a festival speech was its combination of praise and blame with the rhetoric of advice found in the deliberative oratory.[438]

---

[431] See, Malina, 2001: 42.
[432]The festival speech was often called panegyric although most *encomia* were also called panegyric.
[433]For example, in his *Panegyricus*, which was addressed to all Greeks, Isocrates combines an exhortation to the Greeks to unite under the leadership of Athens against the common Persian enemies, and an invective against discordant and hostile Greek cities such as Sparta. Similarly, in his *Panathenaicus*, in which, although addressed to Athens only, Isocrates devoted himself to the praise of Athenians and the censure of the Spartans. See Nightingale, 1995: 97.
[434] Hugh, 1911: 676–677.
[435] Lysias, *Olympic Oration*, 33.4; Xenophon, 14.4.15-16; Isocrates, *Panegyricus,* 4.3.
[436] Nightingale, 1995: 97.
[437]Steinbock, 2011: 284.
[438] Nightingle, 1995: 97.

The practice of combining praise and blame was not limited to festival orations. Other orators such as Cicero, praised or censured their audience whenever they could or in some cases implicated anonymous henchmen men whom nobody could identify.[439] The above combination of praise and blame in festival orations demonstrates that it was possible to foster praise and blame towards the same audience. At the same time, it is possible to agree with Martin Jehne's assertion that it was not uncommon for an orator speaking in front of a large audience to blame only people who were absent or small minorities who were present.[440] This understanding sheds significant light on the intra-community nature of the audiences for the panegyrics. It also demonstrates that panegyrics had significant intra-community dimensions to their audience.

Another intriguing dimension of the festival speeches is that their audience and context determined both the content and orientation of speeches. As Nightingale notes, the orators tailored their speeches to the different audiences at the different kinds of festivals.[441] This dimension of festival speeches resonates with epideictic preoccupation with the present. By dealing with the present, as Walter Beale argues, the epideictic performance participates in the reality to which it refers.[442] In this way, the speeches defined their community's present circumstances, values and experiences.[443]

It can be argued from the above discussion that the nature and form of the festival oration provide interesting dimensions for understanding the nature and form of the Sermon and its place within the discourses of Jesus. The combination of praise and blame inherent in both the festival speech and the Sermon provides a plausible framework for understanding the role and function of the Lucan beatitudes and woes in their Greco-Roman context. In addition, the influence of present community issues in the panegyrics has implications for interpreting the Sermon. It creates the possibility of understanding the Sermon as dealing with specific issues within the Lucan churches.

439 See, Manuwald, 2011: 208; Bergren, 1989: 1-41.
440 Jehne, 2011: 111-125.
441 Nightingale, 1995: 89.
442 Beale, 1978: 226.
443 Villadsen, 2008: 32.

3.4.3.1. The Function of Festival Speeches.

a. The educational function

Many epideictic theorists ascribe educational functions to festival speeches.[444] One significant aspect of this educational value is related to the *telos* of epideictic rhetoric. According to Hauser, the goal of epideictic rhetoric and the function of the audience were the same, *krisis* or judgement. In an epideictic context, such *krisis* eventuates from thoughtful consideration of affairs to the achievement of the common good of εὐδαιμονία or happiness.[445] In other words, by highlighting virtue, ('ἀρετή) and vice *(*κακία) and the honourable (καλόν) and shameful (αἰσχρόν) within the community, the festival speeches not only afforded some insight into truth, but also allowed the citizens to experience the story of the golden mean as it is lived in the community.[446] Therefore, through praise and blame, the speeches educated the audience in the vocabulary of civic virtues that constituted citizens as an active public, and communicated principles on which responsible citizenship was based, and how a vibrant public sphere could thrive.[447]

Dale Sullivan provides another dimension of the educational role of epideictic. To him, by praising people, actions, and ideals that embody a culture's concept of virtue, the epideictic rhetor built an image of "who we are." [448] Conversely by blaming, actions and ideas, the rhetor creates an image of "what we are not."[449] Thus, according to him, the image of orthodoxy is a reified display of what it takes to be an insider, whereas the image of heterodoxy is a display of the excluded other.[450] Sullivan's analysis demonstrates not only the community nature of praise and blame but also their role in the formation of and maintenance of community values. It can also be argued that the above analysis of the educational function of the festival speeches provides a useful perspective to understanding the possible role of the makarisms and woes in the Sermon. It underscores how, through the makarisms and woes, the Sermon, as we will argue in detail later, defined both the community ethos that identified the members of the Christ-

[444] Carter, 1999; Hauser, 1999; Sullivan, 1999; Villadsen, 2008.
[445] Hauser, 1999: 12.
[446] Ibid. 16.
[447] Villadsen, 2008: 32.
[448] Sullivan, 1999: 53.
[449] Ibid.
[450] Ibid.

groups and those that did not. In this way, the festival speech provides a plausible framework for understanding the function of the Sermon in its original social context.

b. The ritual function of epideictic

The Greco-Roman epideictic praise and blame also had a ritual function. As Carter observes, in the ancient world the ritual was an essential part of prayers, sacrificial acts, public and family occasions and in the oracles.[451] The historical relationship between epideictic and ritual activities such as the festival orations and the panegyrics and their foundation in the ritual *topoi* of praise of the festival god, the city, the festival official and the local rulers has been established above.[452] It can also be observed that the ritual function of epideictic rhetoric goes beyond the festival speeches. Even the funeral orations and the eulogies had elements of ritual. They both represented contexts in which the community came together to celebrate their shared values. For example, concerning funeral speeches, K.R. Waters has argued that:

> The speeches shared with the locale of burial, the Kerameikos, and with the burial ceremony an important function as a boundary zone between the living and the dead, a sacred zone in which, typically, the normal and well-defined were replaced by the abnormal and the ambiguous. Indeed, for every culture, such transition areas whether geographic, social, biological or status, are deeply ambiguous, the focus of ritual, magic or taboo where cultural oppositions are both delimited and mediated.[453]

Although Walter's reference above is to the funeral orations, the ritual context of the latter also holds for the festival speeches where, according to Isocrates, common prayers and sacrifices accompanied the speeches.[454] This suggests that the epideictic contexts of both the funeral and festival speeches created for its participants a liminal context in which the individual came into contact with what is foreign, different or other.[455] William-Nightingle has this to say about the effect of festival within Greek context:

---

[451] Carter, 1991: 211.
[452] Ibid.
[453] Walters, 1980: 17.
[454] Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 4.43.
[455] William-Nightingale, 2007: 163.

> At PanHellenic festivals, people from different cities could affirm a single Greek identity based on a shared religion, language, and culture. While the traditional *theōros* (θεωρός) at a PanHellenic festival did not abandon his political identity, he participated in a religious gathering which operated above and beyond any single political ideology.[456]

William-Nightingle's statement above demonstrates that the experience of hearing or seeing within the context of θεωρία created a shared symbolic universe and meaning for the participants whose influence went beyond the cultic context. It provided the context in which individuals from different social statuses in the Greco-Roman world came together as one people, with one identity and common aspirations. Such transitory unity created the possibility of the inculcation of commonly held values.

Kenneth Burke argues that a significant function of epideictic speeches within a ritual context was to achieve symbolic transcendence of the sense of division among men.[457] He observes that identification was affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. For Burke, identification is compensatory to division, and if men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity.[458] Burke's suggestion implies that division in the community provides the context for the ritual function of the praise and blame. In a Greco-Roman context, such division could either be factional, as Lysia argues, or neglect of the vulnerable members of the community, as Isocrates and Democritus allege.[459] Burke's argument is supported by Carter, who has given three ways in which epideictic achieves its ritual function.

First, Carter argues that epideictic through praise and blame connects its participants to the cosmos by establishing some intelligible order and by connecting the participants to the ongoing creation of their culture. It shows the audience how they fit in the cosmos by establishing a transcendent principle that gives cosmic sanction to their own social order. Epideictic also engages the audience in the act of creation itself by joining them together in the founding act, the beginnings of their identity as a culture.[460]

---

[456] Ibid. 164.
[457] Burke, 1969: 127-317.
[458] Ibid.
[459] Lysias, *Olympic Oration*, 33.4; Democritus, Frag 250; Isocrates, *Areopagiticus*, 7.83.
[460] Carter, 1991: 220-21.

The second way that praise generates extraordinary knowledge is by taking its hearers out of ordinary time, by making time, in a way, sacred. Ritual theory suggests that this special conception of time creates an awareness of immortality, a sense of being outside the temporal. In doing so, it also offers its participants a different foundation of order beyond everyday perceptions.[461]

The third way that epideictic can generate extraordinary knowledge is by creating harmony among the antinomies that characterize our lives. It has the power to transfigure the world by reuniting it. He argues that ritual knowledge is based in part on the idea that life is a mystery, a confusing array of contraries whose unity defies logic. One of the functions of ritual, then, is to address the mystery, the contraries of life, by helping its participants discover harmony therein, an awareness of both opposition and unity that logic cannot offer.[462]

It can be argued that the ritual understanding of epideictic speeches provides a unique perspective to the ceremonial function of praise and blame in the Greco-Roman context. Understood within the broader context of early Christian rituals, it sheds significant light on the function of Jesus' Sermon in the life of the early communities of Christ-followers. Three decades ago, Thomas Finn, using *Hyppolytus' Apostolic tradition*, examined the role of ritual in the survival of the early Christian movement.[463] His main contention was that Christians survived in Rome because they developed a dynamic ritual process for "making Christians." This process was technically called the *catechumenate*. This process, according to him, consisted of a condition of liminality in which elaborate rites of passage involving both action and words refashioned the very being of the *catechumen*. According to Finn, at the heart of this ritual life in Rome was the *catechumen*'s journey from the Roman society to the Christian community—a journey from the centre of the city, so to speak —to its fringes where the Roman Christian dwelled, both literally and figuratively.[464] At the same time, although intended to refashion the very being of the catechumen, the rituals were also intended to reform the faithful. It is said that the very presence of the *catechumens* provided, for the rest of the members, the ever-present embodiment of Christian liminality and the impetus to renew it. Although

[461] Ibid. 223.
[462] Ibid. 224.
[463] Finn, 1989: 69-89.
[464] Ibid. 71-72.

Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* is dated at the end of the second century, around 200 CE, it demonstrates the importance of catechesis in the early Christian movement on which Luke forms the basis of his gospel (Lk 1. 4).

Finn's arguments above provide a broader perspective for understanding the ritual function of the Sermon both to the new converts like Theophilus and the rest of the members of the Lucan community. As the primary addressee of the Third Gospel, it is likely that Theophilus was a *Proto catechumen*, attempting to come to terms with implications of what he was taught (Lk 1:4). Luke builds his gospel on the instruction (κατήχησις) that Theophilus has received.[465] Although the word κατηχέω had a general sense of "telling a story", its use as technical term for Christian instruction goes back to the letters of Paul.[466] Very early in the First Century, Paul interchangeably uses κατηχέω (Rom. 2.18; 1 Cor.14:19; 2 Cor.17:1; Gal.6.6) and διδάσκω or διδάσκαλοι (1Cor. 12:28, Eph. 4.11) with reference to Christian instructions. Although the *catechumenate* emerged towards the end of the second century,[467] Paul's language demonstrates the initial development of structured instruction within the early Christian movement which is taken up in *Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition*. It, therefore, follows that Luke, writing after Paul, was probably responding to the developing practice of giving instructions to new converts as preparation for baptism,[468] an important ritual in the early Christian movement.

The importance of ritual in the integration and formation of identity in the early Christian movement is also underscored by some studies. Michael Penn, in his analysis of the "ritual kiss" in the early church, argues that Christian leaders constructed the ritual kiss as an aid in shaping the church towards their image of an ideal community and that those constructions effectively reinforced and modified social boundaries.[469] He argues that the "Christian kiss", which according to Clement of Alexander was to be "with a chaste and closed mouth" had significant implications on the level of the social body. It helped to construct a chaste and closed community, a group that was both cohesive, and at the same time hierarchical and exclusive.[470] This suggests that the kiss could include certain people in the church, exclude others, and help distinguish Christian behaviour. Similarly, in his recent study, *Ritual and Christian Origins,*

[465] LJS, κατήχησις, which means instruction through word of mouth.
[466] TDNT, 1965:639.
[467] Catechumens first appear as a distinct class during Tertullian' time which is between 155-220 CE.
[468] TDNT, 1965: 639.
[469] Penn, 2005: 9.
[470] Ibid. 3.

Risto Uro presents an analysis of the role of ritual in the formation of the Christian movement.[471] Using John's baptism, he argues that in a religious context, ritual has several functions. It can generate religious knowledge, for example, by evoking exegetical interpretation or aetiological myths. It can also create cooperation in social groups by creating social identity.[472] It is therefore likely that the performance of the Sermon within the context of epideictic could have significant identity and moral character implications for its primary audience. It helped not only to create awareness of the social divide within the community and its challenges but also, a symbolic universe, the Kingdom of God and the values it held (Lk 6:20-26). Lastly, in the exhortation (Lk 6: 27-49), the Sermon probably provided a framework of how the Kingdom values could be lived in everyday life by both the new Christians and the rest of the community.

3.5. CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the function and importance of praise and blame in the Greco-Roman world. It has demonstrated that in the Greco-Roman world the use of the paradigm of praise and blame in different contexts such as funerals, festivals and paradoxical settings had both integrative as well as value transmission significance for the communities. It has also demonstrated how the Sermon structure has substantial parallels with victory odes and panegyrics in which praise was a central feature. These parallels demonstrate one area in which the Greco-Roman world provided a likely cultural context for early Christianity. This was even more likely for Luke and his audience, given the presence of the Sermon in its present form. As most scholars agree, the majority of Luke's primary audience were probably Gentiles. Given the Hellenistic context of its audience, it is also possible that the Gospel's Judean audience was the highly Hellenised section of the Judean nation, as Acts 6 and 7 demonstrates. It was, therefore, likely that Luke's presentation of Jesus' message would be in the form that would be relevant to his audience. The message of the Sermon, as that of the Gospel, would have been cast in the language that would make sense to them. Praise and blame, therefore, provided the cultural framework through which Luke conveyed Jesus' message to his primary audience. All this validates the use of the panegyric praise and blame in interpreting Jesus' Luke's Sermon in Lk 6:20-49.

[471] Uro, 2016.
[472] Ibid. 80.

CHAPTER 4

THE GRECO-ROMAN SETTING OF THE LUCAN SERMON

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The last chapter explored the function of panegyric praise and blame in the Greco-Roman context. It examined the various concepts and contexts of panegyrics and their similarities and differences with the Sermon. Based on the similarity between the Sermon and Greco-Roman panegyrics, the chapter argued that the function of Greco-Roman panegyrics provides a methodological and theoretical framework for the interpretation of the Sermon. In this chapter, we argue for the Greco-Roman setting of the Sermon. The chapter's central task is to demonstrate that the different layers of communication in the Sermon, its conception of community and communion, and the presentation of riches and poverty reflects a Greco-Roman panegyric context. The chapter has three major sections. The first section discusses the different layers of communication in the Sermon. The second section analyses the idea of concord and community in the Greco-Roman context, in the Book of Acts, and how the same is represented in the Sermon. The third section discusses the politics of poverty in the Sermon. In discussing these aspects, the chapter aims to locate the function of the Sermon in its original context.

4.2. LAYERS OF COMMUNICATION IN THE SERMON

Like all gospels, there are two layers of communication embedded in Luke's gospel. The first level is the time of the historical Jesus within a Palestinian context where his speeches and ministry had a direct impact on those who heard and met him. The second level of communication is the recording of the Jesus event in Luke's time. This would be in the Greco-Roman communities in which Theophilus (Lk 1:3) belonged and beyond Galilee and the Messianic community of early Christ-followers. This understanding suggests that embedded in the text is both the world of Jesus and that of Luke's audience. The awareness of the literary complexity of the gospel text is significant in this research. It helps to place the text of the Sermon in its proper context, and to understand how its language both informs and is informed by the context of the writer's time.

4.2.1. The Literary Context of the Sermon

The immediate literary context of the Sermon is Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4:16-30 is believed to be Luke's redaction of Mk 6:1-6.[473] It represents Jesus' first attempt to present his vision and mission to a small Jewish audience in Nazareth, before he had appointed any of his disciples (Lk 4:28-29). In the Nazareth proclamation Jesus announced the content of the good news as salvation as well as its recipients as those who are the destitute, a perspective that went against the popular assumption of the time.[474] The physical and religious implications of Jesus' mission are evident in the way Luke uses ἄφεσις, with its possible reference to release from debt, disease (Lk 4: 18) or forgiveness from sin (Lk 4: 19).[475] By positioning the destitute as the recipient of the good news, the Nazareth proclamation becomes programmatic for the blessedness of the destitute in the Sermon and across the Gospel and Acts.[476] It emphasises Luke's interest in salvation as a holistic phenomenon, encompassing both physical healing and the inclusion of individuals into the Kingdom of God.[477]

Following the Nazareth proclamation, in Chapter 5, Jesus appoints the first disciples. The only disciples mentioned are Simon, John, James (Lk 5:1-11), and Levi (Lk 6: 27-32). The final list of the disciples is produced on the mountain after Jesus' night vigil in Lk 6:13-16 and immediately before the Sermon. The above presentation is in stark contrast with Matthew's Gospel in which, by the time of the Sermon Jesus had only chosen four disciples; Peter, John, James, and Andrew (Mat 4:18-22). Luke's presentation of the full list of the disciples just before the Sermon is interesting. Some scholars think that by this arrangement Luke ensures that the thrust of the Sermon is entrusted to the whole post-Easter church, not just the inner core of selected members.[478] In this dissertation, we argue that the arrangement reflects the importance the author of the Gospel attached to the relationship between appointment of the disciples and the message of the Sermon. In other word, the structure demonstrates the integrative and value re-enforcing functions of the Sermon in the Lucan churches.

---

[473] Marshall, 1978: 177; Nolland, 1989: 195.
[474] See Evans, 1990: 70.
[475] Tannehill, 1996: 91; Talbert, 2002: 58; Broyles, 1992: 284.
[476] Marshall, 1978: 178.
[477] Talbert, 2002: 58.
[478] Draper, 1999: 26.

4.2.1.1. Appointment of the Disciples and Apostles

The differences between Matthew and Luke go beyond the choosing of disciples. In terms of details, the Lucan and Matthean traditions significantly differ in their presentation of the context of Jesus' Sermon. In Matthew (5:1), Jesus goes onto the mountain when he sees the crowds, and from there, he delivers the Sermon on the Mount. In the Third Gospel, Jesus goes to the mountain, and it is from there that he designates his disciples, chooses his apostles whom, in a praise-like ceremony, he introduces to the crowds (Lk 6:20). It is likely that Luke's account of the choosing of the Twelve is based on Mark 13:13-19 while his healing on the level playing field is based loosely on Mark 3:7-12. According to Evans, Luke reverses the order of the Markan units to accommodate the Sermon that follows in Lk 6:20-49.[479] The above Lucan redaction makes a compelling case for understanding the Greco-Roman context of the Sermon. The NIV renders Lk 6: 13 as "he *called* his disciples to him and *chose* twelve of them." This translation is based on the lexical meaning of the two verbs used to describe Jesus' action: *προσεφώνησεν* (from *προσφωνέω*) and *ἐκλεξάμενος* (from *ἐκλέγω* (LSJ) or *ἐκλέγομαι* (NT Grk). However, most scholars put undue emphasis on *ἐκλέγομαι* rather than on *προσφωνέω* and therefore miss the importance of Jesus' first call and commissioning not of the *δώδεκα* (the twelve) but of the disciples.[480]The first verb, *προσφωνέω*, has the sense of a formal address, to call out by name, or to dedicate.[481] For example, Plutarch in *Lucullus*, (1.3) says:

> *Σύλλας τὰς αὐτοῦ πράξεις ἀναγράφων ἐκείνῳ προσεφώνησεν. ….*[482]
>
> Sulla, in writing his own memoirs, dedicated (*προσεφώνησεν*) them to him (Lucullus).

In the above example, the word *προσφωνέω* is used with the sense of dedicating or addressing as in Luke addressing or dedicating Luke-Acts to Theophilus (Lk 1:1-4, Acts 1:1). Another example comes from Acts 21:40, where the meaning of *προσφωνέω* has a sense of formal address. In the text, Paul *προσεφώνησεν τῇ Ἐβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ*, addressed them (the Judeans) in

[479] Evans, 1990: 103.
[480] Fitzmyer, 1981: 616; Green, 1997:258; Johnson, 1991: 102, perceive Jesus call of the disciples as solely for the purpose of selecting the twelve.
[481] LSJ at Perseus, *προσεφώνησεν*, tr B. Perrin. Another example comes from Acts 21:40, the meaning is one of formal address, where Paul *προσεφώνησεν τῇ Ἐβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ*, addressed them (the Judeans) in the Hebrew language.
[482] Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 1.3, tr. B. Perrin.

Hebrew dialect.[483] The above two usages of προσφωνέω suggest that on the Mount Jesus both addressed and formally nominated his disciples. The importance of this observation is underscored by the fact that the δώδεκα do not become the subject of the Sermon but the disciples (v. 19). Leon Morris rightly observes that the disciples were probably up to this stage a group who had loosely attached themselves to Jesus as his ἑταῖροι (companions).[484] Here, on the mountain, Jesus formally appoints, dedicates and addresses them as 'his disciples.' It is from this larger group that Jesus later chose the twelve Apostles. The two-tier structure to the disciples is further evident in Luke (10:1-24) where Jesus sends out seventy-two disciples as opposed to Matthew's twelve (Mt 10:5-15). The word used in Lk. 10: 1 is ἀνέδειξεν (from ἀναδείκνυμι) which mean to proclaim as elected to office.[485]

The second word used in v. 13 is ἐκλέγω. The word literally means to pick from among others or to pick something for oneself from among a number of options.[486] In its Greco-Roman usage, the word was also used with the sense of singling out, especially of best oarsmen or leaders.[487] For example, in his *Hellenica*, Xenophon, reports how, when the Athenian General Conon found himself blockaded by land and sea and could not get help from Athens, he:

> ...καθελκύσας τῶν νεῶν τὰς ἄριστα πλεούσας δύο ἐπλήρωσε πρὸ ἡμέρας, ἐξ ἁπασῶν τῶν νεῶν τοὺς ἀρίστους ἐρέτας ἐκλέξας καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβάτας εἰς κοίλην ναῦν μεταβιβάσας καὶ τὰ παραρύματα παραβαλών.[488]
> …he launched two of his fastest ships and manned them before daybreak, picking out (ἐκλέξας) the best oarsmen from his whole fleet, shifting the marines to the hold of the ships, and setting up the side screens.

483 Probably Aramaic.
484 Morris, 1988:137. It was also possible for Greco-Roman philosophers to have a loose following from which they drew their disciples. It is said of Plotinus (204-270 CE) that he tried to democratize philosophy. As a result, several non-philosophers became his ardent disciples and "anyone who so wished could attend his classes." This suggests that, in addition to his official disciples, Jesus also had many other unofficial disciples. See Markus, 2016:17.
485 LSJ at Perseus, ἀναδείκνυμι.
486 LSJ at Perseus, ἐκλέγω; BDAG, 2000:305; Fitzmyer, 1981: 616; Green, 1997: 258; Johnson, 1991: 102; TDNT, 1964: 169.
487 Xenophon, *Hellenica*, 1.6.19, ἐκλέξας; Plato, *Republic*, 535a.
488 Ibid. 1.6.19, tra. Carleton L. Brownson.

Second, an excerpt from Plato's *Republic* on the selection of leaders demonstrates the contextual meaning of *ἐκλεξάμενος* in Lk 6:13:

> *μέμνησαι οὖν τὴν προτέραν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ἀρχόντων, οἵους ἐξελέξαμεν.... τούς τε γὰρ βεβαιοτάτους καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρειοτάτους προαιρετέον, καὶ κατὰ δύναμιν τοὺς εὐειδεστάτους.*[489]
>
> Do you remember, then, the kind of man we chose in our former selection (*ἐξελέξαμεν*) of rulers?.The most stable, the most brave and enterprising are to be preferred, and, so far as practicable, the most comely (sic).

In both two usages above, the word *ἐκλέγω* is used in relation to the making of a specific choice. It entails picking out, singling out, and making a specific choice among many options.

The above meanings of the two words *προσεφώνησεν* and *ἐκλεξάμενος* have two implications for understanding the Greco-Roman context of the Sermon. Firstly, they suggest that in Luke's gospel, although Jesus individually chose his disciples, (and these were more than the Twelve), their formal appointment took place on the mountain. The designation and appointment of disciples and apostles, respectively (v. 13) was therefore not an inevitable undertaking. In Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts rabbis and philosopher-teachers were often chosen by their disciples. An interesting example of philosophers' relationship with their disciples can be gleaned from Plotinus' story. It is said that Plotinus searched for a philosopher mentor until he was depressed with his failure to find one. A friend of his referred him to one Ammonius. When he went to hear him, Plotinus went back to his friend and said: "This is the man I was looking for."[490] However, unlike the conventional Greco-Roman practice, Jesus chose his disciples from among those willing to become his disciples.[491]

[489] Plato, *Republic* 535a, tr, John Burnet.
[490] See, Scharfstein, 1980:7.
[491] TDNT, 1967: 444.

Considering the amazement and respect Jesus commanded as teacher, and the probable attraction he had (Mk 1:22; Lk 2:47), the process of being a disciple and apostle, therefore, resembled a kind of ἀγών, a contest, in which several individuals participated, but only a few emerged as victors. Understood within an honour and shame culture, the appointment of the disciples and apostles placed them within the realm of victors of a Greco-Roman contest. The celebration of victory through victory odes and the bestowal of the declaration of being μακάριος upon victors was a common phenomenon in the Greco-Roman world. Pindar would declare his athletic victor μακάριος:

> μακάριος,
> ὃς ἔχεις καὶ πεδὰ μέγαν κάματον λόγων φερτάτων μναμήϊ.[492]
> Blessed are you, who have, even after great hardship, a memorial of the best words.

Similarly, Odysseus in Homer refers to Achilles as the as "a man more blessed (μακάρτατος) before and no shall there be ever after."[493] Therefore, the closeness between Greco-Roman victory odes and the bestowal of μακάριος, and Jesus' designation and choice of disciples and Apostles and the ensuing makarisms, provide interesting perspectives for understanding the literary and social context of the Sermon.

4.2.1.2. The March down the Hill

The second implication of the meaning of Lk 6:13 is that it portrays everything that happens on the mountain as a preparation for the Sermon. Topel rightly thinks that the whole passage vv.12-16 is a bridge serving as the first gathering of the audience before the Sermon.[494] After the dedication ceremony on the mountain, Jesus comes down to the level place. For many scholars, the question of with whom Jesus comes down from the mountain remains vague. Is it just the Twelve or all the disciples or both? Marshall and Nolland, Tannehill and Topel think that Jesus descends with only the Twelve.[495] However, the aorist participle καταβὰς, with the dative

---

[492] Pindar, *Pythian*, 5.60.
[493] Homer, *Odyssey*, 11: 485.
[494] Topel, 2001: 55.
[495] Marshall, 1978: 241, Nolland, 1989: 275 and Tannehill, 1996: 113, Topel, 2001: 55.

construction μετ' αὐτῶν, understood against Luke's recent designation and choosing of the disciples and the Twelve, respectively, in vv. 13-16, suggests the disciples and the apostles come with him from the mountain. This position finds support in Green who conceives three groups in v. 17; apostles and the disciples from whom he chooses apostles, the considerable number of disciples and the multitudes of people.[496] Luke's designation of the second group down at the level place as μαθηταὶ is problematic given the reference to the same in v. 13. It is probable that the use of μαθηταὶ for the third group reflects the circumstances of the early days of Jesus' activity when people flocked to him from all sides.[497] These could probably have been the τῶν πιστευόντων "those who believed" (cf Matt 18:6) in Jesus but were not his disciples in the full sense of the word. It is also likely that the use of μαθηταὶ in v. 17 for the third group was influenced by Luke's context and time when being a μαθητής took on a general meaning to refer to all those who believed in Jesus.

It is, therefore, reasonable to say that in v. 17 Jesus and the newly designated and appointed disciples/apostles come down to meet the waiting crowd below.[498] The picture is that of a victory procession from the mountainside to the level place where the disciples as the chosen victors are recognized and integrated into the community. A. Farrer finds in v. 17 a priestly symbolism as well as allusion to the giving of the law by Moses.[499] Farrer's argument would, however, make significant sense within a Jewish context. However, for Luke's Hellenistic audience, the picture of a victory procession would be the most immediate impression. The aura of victory in being chosen among many and the ensuing ceremony of praise parallels victory ceremonies after the Greco-Roman games. The fact that makarisms were often found in victory odes reinforces the parallel.[500] The above understanding also demonstrates the different levels of communication in the Sermon. The basic outline of the contents, such as the mountain setting, crowds, and the actual sermon reflects the time of Jesus. However, to a Hellenistic audience, the structure of events from the appointment of the disciples and the Apostles and the ensuing procession to the level place including the praise found in the makarisms echoed Greek agonistic contexts and their praise ceremonies.

---

[496] Marshall envisages two groups only: (a) the apostles; (b) the wider group of disciples and the crowds. See Marshall, 1978: 242.
[497] TDNT, 1967: 444-445.
[498] Nolland, 1989: 275.
[499] Cited in E. Ellis, 1973: 112.
[500] TDNT, 1967:363. Cf. Pindar, *Pythian* 5.60, *Olympiad* 7.10.

In Greek context, victory parades or *eiselasis (Grk. εἰσελαστικός)* constituted momentous occasion after agonistic competitions.[501] As the athletes arrived home, they were met by their families and fellow citizens and given a hero's welcome. The welcome included a banquet and a symposium. To ensure that the news of the Olympic victory travelled far and wide, the family or the city commissioned a victory ode from a poet to extol the virtues of the athlete and his city.[502] In Luke's context, Jesus' declaration of the disciples as μακάριος (Lk 6: 20-24) would have been akin to a re-performance of an earlier victory in Jesus' time but re-enacted at a new victory celebration. The re-performance not only helped to reactivate and preserve the prestige of earlier victories but also to create and maintain a family's symbolic capital, as a family of victors.[503] Thus, the continued re-enactment of the triumphalism with which the first disciples were appointed would have significant implications for the integration of new Christians and the rekindling of the values associated with such for older members in Luke's communities.

4.2.2. Jesus' Sermon Audience: Mono-Ethnic or Multi-ethnic?

It can be argued that the structure of Jesus' audience in the Sermon represents further evidence of the different layers of communication in the Sermon. For example, in Lk: 6:17, Jesus' audience come from Judea, Jerusalem and the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon. The presence, during the Sermon, of the people from Tyre and Sidon suggests that Jesus' audience was Jewish-Gentile right from the beginning.[504] The reference in Lk 5:15 to the report about Jesus διήρχετο (3rd sg imperf ind. of διέρχομαι), "spreading all over"[505] can be used to support this audience structure. However, although Judeans were sometimes known to be open to Gentiles,[506] Jewish exclusiveness towards Gentiles makes the conception of Jesus' multi-ethnic audience at the

---

[501] The ἀγῶνες εἰσελαστικός or triumphal entry (LSJ at Perseus), represented the victor's victorious entry into their city where their victory was celebrated and they were rewarded for putting their cities on the map (Slater, 2013: 139). See also Spawforth, 1989: 193–197; Prichard, 2012: 210.

[502] See, Spawforth, 1989: 193–197.

[503] See, Morrison, 2012: 113-114.

[504] The Gospel of Matthew 4.24 adds the Decapolis. The reference to "the region across the Jordan" seen as opposite to the Decapolis could refer to Phoenician Coast. All this confirms the diversity of Jesus' audience.

[505] or *spread abroad* as the NIV renders it. However, the word διέρχομαι can also mean to pass through, to shoot through, to be complete, or go through in detail without referring to cross border diffusion or influx of Jesus' hearers. LSJ, Διέρχομαι.

[506] This was evident from the presence of the Court of Gentiles in the Temple.

Sermon a difficult one.[507] Other scholars like David Garland note that the mention of Tyre and Sidon is surprising given the troubled history between the Judeans and the Gentiles from the Phoenician region.[508] He argues that the OT calls the region "godless oppressor of Israel" (Isa 23; Jer. 47:4; Ezek. 26-28; Joel 3:4; Amos 1:9-10; Zech. 8:2-4). Josephus calls the people of the region "our bitterest enemies", and concerning the rest of the Gentiles, he said the Jews "did not come into contact with them because of their separateness."[509] If Luke is writing a record of the history of Jesus, it would have been strange for a Judean teacher to attract such a big foreign crowd at once. Also, Judean reluctance to engage in Gentile fellowship is reflected in Jesus' attitude towards Gentiles. He rarely travelled to Gentile lands.[510] In one trip recorded by Luke, in which Jesus sent evil spirits into a herd of pigs, he was asked to leave (Lk 8:26 cf Mk 5:1-20) the area.

Therefore, considering the troubled relationship between Judeans and Gentiles, it can be argued that Luke's description of Jesus' mixed audience reflects more of the social and ethnic situation of his time than that of Jesus' time. Philip Esler has given an extensive analysis of the function of Luke's Judean-Gentile table fellowship in Luke-Acts. He argues that the narratives served a legitimating function; they form a vital arch in the symbolic universe that Luke creates for his community.[511] It likely that the multi-ethnic nature of Jesus' audience in the Sermon served a similar purpose. The above analysis resonates with the function of Greek panegyrics in dealing with the ethnic and social composition of Greek festivals where people from different Greek cities with conflicting interests came together. In his *Panegyricus*, Isocrates argues:

> having proclaimed a truce and resolved our pending quarrels, we come together in one place, where, as we make our prayers and sacrifices in common, we are reminded of the kinship which exists among us and are made to feel more kindly towards each other for the future, reviving our old friendships and establishing new ties.[512]

---

[507] It is said that the incorporation of Galilee into the Judean temple state, which happened mainly as a result of the Hasmonean rise to power, facilitated openness towards Gentiles amongst its 'Judean' population. See, Freyne, 2002:171, 249; Horsley, 1995: 39.
[508] Garland, 2011: 275.
[509] Josephus, *Antiq*. 13: 245-247; Josephus, *Aga. Apion*, 2.210.
[510] Freyne, 1988: 92-93.
[511] Esler, 1987: 109.
[512] Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 4.43, tra. George Norlin.

The above statement from Isocrates underscores how festivals were important in Greek society. The festival brought together rival and warring Greek *poleis* to reflect upon their shared values and destiny. In this way, the festivals interacted with the social and political organisation of Greek society. The importance of speeches during the Greek festivals and their functions in reinforcing community values present a model for understanding the Greco-Roman context of the Sermon.

By the Roman imperial times, the audiences of Greek festivals had become more diverse. This is evident in the fact that before Emperor Theodosius 1 suppressed the games in 394 CE, the last overall Olympic victor was an Armenian.[513] This suggests that many Christ-followers were aware of these festivals and even participated in them before they became Christ-followers. In a recent study, Yonder Gillian has demonstrated that as a result of Greco-Roman associations' tendency to replicate state activities at a private level, numerous groups, particularly cult associations, also observed their own private festivals.[514] Hudson McLean through a comparative study of the cult and Christian churches on Delos Island has demonstrated that through their activities cult associations reinforced a sense of kinship and national identity in an island where disparate nationalities abounded.[515] Therefore, in view of the relationship between associations and Christ-groups, it is probable that the social setting of the Sermon could have been a local Christ-followers festival similar to those of cultic associations which had festivals for special gods.

4.2.2.1. The Easter Festival and the Sermon

The actual context in which Christ-followers listened to the performance of Jesus' Sermon is difficult to establish with certainty. However, this dissertation argues that the Sermon had its probable context in an Easter Festival. This assumption is based on the importance that was attached to festivals in the Greco-Roman world and the later evidence for the Christian Easter festival. Through festivals, communities dialogued with the deities to secure protection and

[513] See Perrottet, 2010*:* 190.
[514] Gillihan, 2012: 295.
[515] McLean, 1996: 198.

growth.[516]During the festivals, local deities were celebrated, and the community defined its identity; whoever was included was considered important to the *polis* or community. Thus, during the festival, the whole community, including men, women and even slaves participated in common rituals.[517]

The basic ritual activities of Greek festivals included, among other things, panegyrics, ἀγῶνες, drama, tragedies and comedies. [518] It is said that Herodotus recited his *Histories* at festivals in Athens in connection with the quadrennial games.[519] Also, as already pointed out, orators such as Gorgias and Isocrates offered their panegyric at Olympic festivals or local festivals of local cities. Synnove de Bouvre provides an interesting symbolic function of the different festival activities.[520] She argues that the different activities visually and verbally reassessed the normative values of the polis.[521] For example, in pouring extreme honour upon concrete winners, the festive community transformed the victors into liminal beings, as vehicles of the key summarising symbol of Hellenic ethnicity.[522] The tragic theatre while representing reality also artistically attacked its audience's values. [523] Even the comedy and drama while evoking a sense of humour highlighted human weakness in society.[524] According to Bouvre, in the festival, the “transcendental ground” of the community was interwoven with the entertaining performances. This suggests that the different activities in the festival represented subliminal contexts in which the community’s values were either reinforced or challenged.

It can be argued from the above discussion that a critical reading of the Sermon demonstrates that it also shares the characteristic traits of the Greek festival rituals. The Sermon’s lavish praise of the poor and torrid attack on the rich would only be acceptable in a context in which the participants were in a state of θεωρία. Furthermore, the Sermon not only manipulates commonly held values of honour in society but also through antitypes (the woes) challenges

---

[516] Brandt, 2012: 131-198.
[517] Neils, 2012: 199-216.
[518] De Bouvre, 2012: 253-293.
[519] It was expected that the historian would write something interesting, persuasive, and usually with a lesson. Grant, 1957: 119.
[520] De Bouvre, 2012: 253-293.
[521] Ibid. 273.
[522] Ibid. 275.
[523] Ibid. 274.
[524] Ibid. 274.

the general conceptions of wealth and poverty. Such a free spirit (which was unlikely to be challenged) could only be expressed in a festival context. Within the early Christ-followers' movement, such a festival was likely to be the Easter Festival.

4.2.2.2. The Origins of the Easter Festival

The origin of the Easter festival remains shrouded in mystery. Paul's reference to the Corinthians "to keep the festival" (ἑορτάζωμεν), (1 Cor. 5:7-8) around the 50's CE is probably the earliest reference to the Easter festival outside the church tradition. The first records of the annual commemoration of Jesus' death in church records appear in the second century CE around 155 CE.[525] Yet, as Daise argues, its practitioners at the time claimed that the festival had been observed much earlier.[526] For example, in the Quartodeciman controversy, Eusebius' reference to the practice of the Asia Minor churches as being not according to "the custom of the churches in the rest of the world" suggests a continuing practice.[527] This would make Paul's reference to the festival in 1 Cor. 5:7-8 to be probably the earliest reference to an actual Easter festival. The statement, however, raises the question of whether Paul was speaking metaphorically or he was referring to an actual festival. Most scholars hold onto the symbolic view of Paul's language.[528] Thiselton, however, goes beyond the symbolic meaning of the two verses.[529] Using J. Jeremias' assertion that 1Cor. 5:7-8 is based on Christian Passover Haggadah, Thiselton argues that in the text Paul combines eschatological interpretation side by side with the historical interpretation and that which relates it to the present. Jeremiah's basis for associating vv. 7-8 with Christian Passover Haggadah is the correspondence between the interpretation of the lamb, the bitter herbs and the unleavened bread with the Christian Passover ritual in early Christian Passover meditation.[530]

Despite the above argument, owing to the difficulty in establishing the dating of this early Christian tradition, it is still not easy to determine which tradition, either 1 Cor. 5:7-8 or the Christian Passover Haggadah, influenced the other. However, as Gerlach has argued, even if Paul's statement was metaphorical, it is possible that his directive developed into a prototype

[525] TDNT, 1964: 905. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica,*5.24, 16.
[526] Daise, 2016: 508.
[527] Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesia*stica, 5.25.
[528] Conzelman,1975:98-99; Hays, 1997: 83; Morris, 1998: 88.
[529] Thiselton, 2000: 404.
[530] Jeremias, 1966: 60.

of the later Quartodeciman Pascha festival.[531] This could have been reflected in the Christian Passover meditation. Thus, Paul's reference to Exodus 12 became the founding narrative for early Christianity's only annual festival.[532] Given the importance of festivals in the Greco-Roman world and their role in the formation of civic ideology, it is likely that the Christian movement would have developed its own festivals as early as possible. Moreover, since festivals were also an important aspect of voluntary associations and cults, it is likely that Easter became a vital festival in the early Christian movement.[533] Like in Greco-Roman associations, the festival could have provided ceremonial contexts for the integration of new members and the reinforcement of community values.[534] However, the determination of when and how the Easter festival was actually born remains an open debate.

On the actual origins of the Easter, several related views exist. Most scholars in Jewish history, however, agree that the development of the Easter Festival was very much related to the development of the identity of Christ groups versus the Synagogue. Israel Yuv argues that after the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, two competing interpretations of the Passover emerged, one Jewish, the other Christian. In order to replace the ritual of the defunct paschal sacrifice, each religion adopted the strategy of re-telling of the story. While Jews adhered to the original meaning of the festival as deriving from the redemption in Egypt, Christians narrated the story from the death and resurrection of Jesus.[535] Yuval's argument is supported by some prominent scholars in Jewish history such as Joshua Kulp, Eviatar Zerubavel, Kenneth Clark, and Calum Carmichael.[536]

Further, in his analysis of the development of both the Easter and Jewish Seder and Haggadic festival, Kulp notes the polemical traits of the Haggadah as indicating Judaism's response to early Christianity's Easter. According to him, the Seder and Haggadah were Jewish rabbinic innovations of the post 70 CE period. The two rites, according to him, provided respective meaning to the Passover festival after the Destruction of the Temple and Jesus' death respectively. Kulp further argued that the distinctive polemical traits of the Seder and Haggadah

[531] Cited in Daise, 2016: 513.
[532] Daise, 2016: 513.
[533] Ascough, 2002: 4-19.
[534] Ibid. 10.
[535] Yuval, 1999: 98-124.
[536] Kulp, 2005:109-134; Zerubavel, 1982: 284-289; Clark, 1960: 269-80; Carmichael, 2006: 343-357.

were meant to re-enforce Jewish identity vis-à-vis the identity of Christ-followers. On the same question of identity, Eviatar Zerubavel, after his analysis of the Pachal/Easter controversy, argues that the early paschal controversies can be understood within the context of the church's attempt to establish its own unique identity as distinct from the Synagogue. He claims that the temporal segregation of Easter from its Jewish precursors was part of the general effort to emancipate the ecclesiastical calendar from the Jewish calendar, and thus, promote the social segregation of Christians from Jews.[537]

In addition, while agreeing on the mutual origins of the Haggadah with Easter, Calum Carmichael, however, argues that the Haggadic polemics demonstrates that its development is attributable to the deteriorating relationship between Judeans and Christians.[538] On the same topic, Lawrence T. Geraty and Kenneth Strand in their analysis of the origins of the Sunday worship argued that the Easter Festival started as the annual day of the Lord modelled on the Jewish Paschal.[539] According to them, it is from this annual day of the Lord that Sunday worship developed. Although no precise date is given for this transition, it makes sense that the Annual Day of the Lord modelled on the Jewish *pascha* became a weekly celebration. This could have been especially true when the Christian movement lost its Jewish status and could not worship on the Sabbath.

Underlying the above views of the origin of the Easter is the troubled relationship between Judaism and early Christianity on the one hand, and the latter's interest in retelling the Jewish Pascha using its internal categories, on the other. The Jewish re-invention of the Pascha event into Haggadah and Seder is supported by other studies. Kenneth Clarke, in his study of the worship in the Jerusalem Temple after 70 CE empirically demonstrates that Jewish religious rituals and practices continued even after 70 CE.[540] Clarke's study supports the parallel development of the Easter festival and the Passover Seder and Haggadah. It can also be observed that some similarity exists between the Sermon and Haggadah, which, in a way, supports the latter's connection to the Easter festival. For example, the recital of makarisms to

[537] Zerubavel, 1982: 284-289.
[538] Carmichael, 2006: 344.
[539] Geraty, 1965: 85-96; Strand, 1990: 127-136.
[540] Clark, 1960: 269-80. He argues that it is the 132-5 CE Jewish revolt that brought the Jewish political and religious establishment to a complete end.

the Lord in the Seder for his provision of food and sustenance resonates with the spirit of the makarisms in Luke 6:20-24 where hunger and deprivation are the central motifs.[541] Some of the makarisms to the Lord over the Matzah during the Seder are:

> Blessed are You, Lord our God, King of the Universe, who creates the fruit of the earth. Blessed are You, Lord our God, King of the Universe, who brings bread from the earth.[542]

Jesus' promise of the Kingdom to the poor and food to the hungry echoes the spirit of the Haggadah. Douglas Oakman also thinks the Sermon alludes to the Passover Haggadah. He posits that it refers to the concern for liberation at the very earliest phase of the Jesus movement.[543] All this supports the parallel development of the Haggadah and Seder and the Easter festival. The above details also demonstrate that the Easter festival probably goes back significantly early into the history of the early Christian movement. If the separate development between the Jewish and Christian *pascha* can be traced to around 70 CE after the destruction of the temple, it suggests that by Luke's time in the early to late 80's CE the Easter festival would have been a regular practice in some churches.

It can also be observed that the different versions of the origins of the Easter festival also demonstrate the separate development in the origins of the Easter in different regions of the early church.[544] The Quartodeciman controversy between the Jerusalem and Asia Minor churches points to the different contexts in which the Easter festival developed. It is also likely that due to the diversity within the early Christian movement, different groups of Christ-followers developed their own Easter festivals in line with their local environment. It is, therefore, likely that for the predominantly Gentile Lucan churches, Paul's directive to get away from "the old yeast"[545]resulted in the Easter festival taking on Hellenistic characteristics. Luke's depiction of Paul's contention with the Judaisers in Acts 15:2 supports Luke's awareness of or concern for the old yeast teaching in the early Christian movement. This

[541] The Passover Haggadah, 2019: 12-15.
[542] Ibid.
[543] Oakman, 2014: 101.
[544] Spinks, 2001: 338-340.
[545] 1 Cor. 5.7, ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην. "Cleanse out the old yeast."

concern becomes more pronounced in Paul's letter to the Galatians. One characteristic of the Easter festival, demonstrating Hellenistic influence would have been the importance of speeches (panegyrics) in the reinforcement of community values.

The Easter festival may also have provided the critical occasion for the integration of new members through baptism ceremonies in which the reinforcement of community values was also emphasised. The relationship between the Easter festival and baptism is supported by some studies. For example, P.F. Bradshaw and Thomas Finn demonstrate how in the early church new converts started catechesis in Lent in readiness for baptism at Easter.[546] In addition, J. Jeremias, who views the Lucan Sermon as an early version of the Sermon on the Mount, views the latter as an early Christian catechism.[547] It is, therefore, probable that the Sermon served as an earlier version of the baptismal Sermon in a Greco-Roman Easter setting. It can be observed that the appointment of the disciples (Lk 6:13) and their inauguration and praise (Lk 6: 20-26) followed by exhortation (Lk 6: 27-49) suits a baptismal context. The structure betrays elements of new appointees being integrated into the values of a new community followed by general admonition to both the new members and the rest of the audience present.

The shape of the Easter festival is not easy to determine with precision. From the Quartodeciman controversy, it is likely that the structure of the Easter festival differed from one geographic locations of the early Christian movement to another.[548] It is, however, likely that the basic activities of the festival were similar. In Greek festivals, the main activities were panegyrics, ἀγῶνες, drama, tragedies and comedies.[549] Other activities included sacrifice, prayer, banquet, display/ treatment of cult objects, procession and other pageants.[550]The Easter festival probably comprised the vicarious fasting,[551]the sacred meal, apostolic teaching, and the baptism of the catechumen (Acts 2:42).[552] It is likely that the baptism of the catechumen represented the culmination of the Easter festival, when, as G.R. Beasley-Murry argues, those who desired to be numbered with the people of God by invoking the name of Jesus were

[546] Bradshaw, 1995: 139–40; Finn, 1967: 50–54. It is also possible that in some churches like, the Lucan churches, the Sermon represented an important part of the apostolic teaching.
[547] Quoted in Ellis, 1973: 111.
[548] Eusebius, 23.1-3.
[549] De Bouvre, 2012: 253-293.
[550] Iddeng, 2012: 1.
[551] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 23.1-3. TDNT, 1965: 902.
[552]Bradshaw, 1995: 139–40; Finn, 1967: 50–54.

graciously incorporated into those who inherited the Kingdom.[553] For the *catechumens*, the baptism and the Sermon with its identity-determining message represented the passage from the unbelieving world to the believing people of the Christ. For the rest of the participants at the festival, it provided the opportunity for the re-evaluation of the values that defined the community of those who call upon the name of the Lord.

There are ways of establishing the probable presence of new members in the Lucan churches. The starting point is Theophilus (Lk 1:4). Scholars, however, differ on the status of Theophilus within the Lucan churches. Views range from whether he was a new convert and, therefore, under instruction, or had only expressed interest in Christianity.[554] Evans, Green and Tannehill believe that the word κατηχέω could refer to formal instruction and that having undergone instruction Theophilus needed additional instruction.[555] It can be argued that the fact that the whole of the Third gospel is founded on the κατήχησις received by Theophilus (Lk 1:4) is a pointer to the presence of new converts, including Theophilus in the Lucan churches. If, as already demonstrated in chapter three, the use of catechesis as a technical term for Christian instruction is traceable back to the letters of Paul,[556] then Luke was probably responding to the developing practice of giving instructions to new converts as preparation for baptism. This presents Theophilus as a *catechumen* who needed to be integrated into the founding story of the community.[557] The aorist passive verb, κατηχήθης (Lk 1:4) implies he had been or was still under instruction. In the Greco-Roman context, integration into foundation stories involved the presentation of an encomium of the founder, the community's succeeding heroes and the community's values.[558]

Furthermore, it can also be observed that Luke's retelling of the Jesus' story and early Christ-followers' community values echo other Greco-Roman orators. For examples, Luke is determined to retell the story of Jesus to his new Christ-followers (represented by Theophilus) even after others had already written (Lk 1:1-4). Similarly, Isocrates, in his *Panegyricus* argues against shunning the subjects upon which others have spoken before, but instead trying to speak

553 Beasley-Murray, 1972: 103.
554 Green, 1997: 45; Evans, 1990: 20; Nolland, 1989: 12; Tannehill, 1996: 35.
555 Green, 1997: 45; Evans, 1990:20; Tannehill, 1996: 35.
556 TDNT, 1965: 639.
557 Johnson, 1992: 62.
558 See, Wilson 2001: 77-99.

better than them.[559] Although Luke does not intend to surpass the other written traditions, the similarity in thought between Isocrates' statements in 4.8 and Lk 1:1-3 suggests the Greco-Roman context of the Third Gospel and the Sermon in particular. It can, therefore, be argued that within the larger framework of Luke's retelling of the Jesus story, the Sermon served a dual purpose. First, using the paradigm of Jesus' appointment and inauguration of his disciples, the Sermon helped to integrate new believers represented by personages like Theophilus into the community.[560] Second, at a general level, particularly from Lk 6:27-49, the Sermon reinforced the community's values to all those present. All this supports the different levels of communication latent in the Sermon and the idea that the Greco-Roman context provided the context for the development of this tradition of Jesus.

4.3. COMMUNITY AND ΚΟΙΝΩΝΊΑ IN THE SERMON

It can be argued that a critical reading of Luke 6:20-49 demonstrates that an important aspect of the Sermon is its emphasis on the idea of community and its implications for human relationships. The Sermon promises a new community to the poor in the form of the Kingdom of God (v. 20). In this new community, the hungry will be fed, while those who mourn will laugh. Although the word κοινωνία does not appear in the Sermon but is used in Acts 2:42, its ethical values, which are underscored in vv. 27-49, reinforce the above attributes of the new community. In this way, the Sermon demonstrates a strong resemblance to the ethos of the early Christian community in Acts 2:42-47. Although not explicitly mentioned, the ideal picture of a community of Christ-followers that emerges from an analytical reading of the Sermon is one of unity and communion summarised by the words ὁμοθυμαδὸν or ὁμόνοια (Acts 1:14; 2:46). Although ὁμονοία does not appear in the NT, these two words not only define the core ethos of the early Christian community in the book of Acts but are also the recurring terms in Greco-Roman Panegyrics. In its Greek context, ὁμόνοια meant oneness of mind, and unanimity while ὁμοθυμαδὸν (used in Acts 2:46) from ὁμο-θυμος, meant "one accord".[561] The Latin equivalent of ὁμόνοια was *concordia,* which meant agreeing together, union, and harmony.[562]

[559] Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 4.8.
[560] The question of whether Theophilus was a historical figure was a representative name remains an open debate. However, the presence of real-life figures name Theophilus such as Theophilus son of Ananus (the High Priest in 31-41 CE) and Theophilus of Alexandria (d. 412 CE) suggests the possibility of a real figure behind the name in the Third Gospel.
[561] LSJ at Perseus, ὁμόνοια; Liddell and Scott, 2007: 487, 488.
[562] LS, *concordia*; Liddell and Scott, 2007: 488.

Within its Greek context ὁμόνοια was also associated with the idea of κοινόν. The latter had several connotations from society, community, to government.[563] It also had the sense of "common thing" or "commonwealth."[564] Even city-states like Athens and its satellite *poleis* were also understood as κοινὸν.[565] Mclnerney says that for Plato and Aristotle, in a city like Athens, the most basic bonds of social life were the common interests of the community called κοινωνία.[566] However, politically, a Greek κοινὸν (plu. κοινά) originally comprised *poleis* belonging to a single ethnic group and usually driven by the myths of common origins.[567] This suggests that the city and its related towns were conceived of in terms of communion. The adjective κοινά meaning "in common" is also used in Acts 2:44 to imply the idea of "having things in common." This suggests that Luke conceived the early community of Christ-groups as a community of the one-minded, a communion of those united in purpose. In keeping with the spirit of the common origins of the Greek κοινὸν, the Christ-followers and their different groupings could also trace their common origins. Their communities arose out of their common commitment to follow Jesus as savior and moral exemplar.

4.3.1. Ὁμόνοία in Greco-Roman Panegyrics

First, it is important that we underscore the importance of using the ὁμόνοια, a word which does not appear in the NT, to understand the ethos of the Sermon. The reason for its use is derived from the fact that the word ὁμόνοια is similar in meaning to the word ὁμοθυμαδὸν (Acts 1:14; 2:46). The prevalence of ὁμόνοια in Greek literature creates an entry point for understanding the oft-longed-for idea of community in a Greek context. The concept of ὁμόνοια was a significant theme in Greek social and political organisation. Elias Thermos traces the emergence of the concept in Greek political life to Alexander the Great's response to his soldiers' mutiny at Opis in 324 BCE.[568] In Alexander's unity speech, the phrase ὁμόνοιάν τε καὶ κοινωνίαν τῆς ἀρχῆς Μακεδόσι καὶ Πέρσαις, demonstrates the relationship between ὁμόνοια and κοινωνία.[569] It reflected Alexander's desire to unite the world he had conquered as a unified whole.[570] This

[563] BDAG, 2000: 551.
[564] McInerney, 2013: 466.
[565] Anatouglou, 1998: 68-83.
[566] McInerney, 2013: 466.
[567] Mackil, 2013: 401.
[568] His Macedonian soldiers were unhappy with Alexander's magnanimity towards the Persians and his inclusion of Persian forces into the Greek army.
[569] Arrian, *Anabasis*, 7.11.9.
[570] Thermos, 1974: 164

was to be achieved through cultural fusion in which the Hellenic-speaking people and the peoples of the Orient were to become of one mind, ψυχή, and body, and to live permanently in peace, harmony and ὁμόνοια.[571] The term later came to define how individuals, including city-states, cooperated to achieve common goals both at a community and national level.[572] In Athens, the word ὁμόνοια took on particular significance following the troubled years of the Peloponnesian wars which saw continued infighting between the oligarchs and the democratic parties in the city.[573] The period also saw increasing self-interest among the citizenry.[574] The situation called for the development of a civic ideology through oratory aimed at inculcating a spirit of concord among the citizenry.[575]

From its exclusive use in the community, ὁμόνοια later come to be used as a rallying point for Pan-Hellenic unity. Thucydides, through his *Histories of the Peloponnesian Wars,* is credited with popularizing the use of the concept as a symbol of unity of purpose within the community.[576] This meaning was later taken up as a theme of panegyrics. Plutarch mentions how Gorgias gave an oration on ὁμόνοια at the Olympia in 408 BCE. Later, Isocrates calls his *Panegyricus* and *Panathenaecus* as 'counsel for concord' among the Greek.[577] Lysias in his Olympian oration refers to στάσις and φιλονικία, faction and mutual rivalry, the opposite of ὁμόνοια, as the main reason for the weakness and affliction faced by the Hellenic communities of his time.[578] The importance of ὁμόνοια is also emphasized by Democritus who asserts that "the greatest undertakings are carried through by means of ὁμόνοια, concord, including wars between City-States: there is no other way.[579] Xenophon also praised leaders who encouraged ὁμόνοια among citizens of the polis.[580] During the Roman imperial period, the Athenian conception of ὁμόνοια became the standard for the unity of purpose even in the most difficult of times. Cicero demonstrates this when, following the death of Caesar, he persuaded the Senate to imitate the Athenian spirit of ὁμόνοια and decree an amnesty for what had been done to

[571] Ibid. 163.
[572] Lyons, 2011: 4.
[573]Rhodes, 2004: 102
[574] Christ, 2006: 19.
[575]Christ, 2012: 56.
[576] Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 8.75, 93.
[577] Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 4.3, trans. G. Norlin; Isocrates, *Panathenaicus*, 12.13, tr., G. Norlin.
[578] Lysias, *Olympic Oration*, 33.4.
[579] Democritus Frag 250.
[580] Xenophon, 14.4.15-16.

Caesar.[581] It can, therefore, be observed from its usage above that although ὁμόνοια was a general term for unity, its popularization and application was done within a community context.

4.3.2. Ὁμόνοια among Christ-followers in Acts

A close study of the development of the early Christian movement in the book of Acts reveals the practical importance that was attached to the idea of ὁμόνοια. We are told in Acts 2:44 that the believers "were together and had everything in common (*κοινά).*" This camaraderie would not have been possible without ὁμόνοια. The word used in v. 46 is a non-declinable adverb ὁμοθυμαδὸν which means with one mind, purpose or impulse.[582] In the NT the word appears ten times in Luke-Acts and once in Roman 15:6.[583] In these appearances, it expresses the sense of togetherness and unity of purpose. Ben Witherington argues that Luke is the only NT author to use ὁμοθυμαδὸν to illustrate the spiritual unity of the early community of believers.[584] He further argues that Luke often describes oppositional unity with the same word but with a different connotation (Acts 7:57; 12:20; 18:12; 19:29). It is interesting to note that although ὁμοθυμαδὸν is not a common NT word, it appears twelve times in the LXX as the Greek rendering of יַחְדָּו. (together, united). However, at the same time, ὁμοθυμαδὸν was also commonly used in Greco-Roman literature and expressed the same meaning as the above. Demosthenes said of those who supported Philip that:

> .. ἡγοῦνται γάρ, ἂν μὲν ὑμεῖς ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης Φίλιππον ἀμύνησθε, [585]
> for they are convinced that if you offer a whole-hearted and unanimous (ὁμοθυμαδὸν) opposition to Philip, you will beat him.

In his play, *Birds*, Aristophanes also uses the word ὁμοθυμαδὸν to imply unity of purpose and common resolve. In response to Meton's inquiry on the city's lockdown towards strangers, Pisthetaerus answers:

> ὁμοθυμαδὸν

---

[581] Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*, C.57.
[582] BDAG, 2000: 706.
[583] Romans 15:6 ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. "That with one accord you may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."
[584] Witherington III, 1998: 113.
[585] Demosthenes, *Philippic* 4, 10.59.

σποδεῖν ἅπαντας τοὺς ἀλαζόνας δοκεῖ.[586]

We are agreed to sweep all quacks and impostors far from our borders.

Similarly, Plato using ὁμοθυμαδὸν advises that:

τὸ μὴ πάσῃ ῥώμῃ πάντας ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπιτηδεύειν ἄνδρας γυναιξὶν ταὐτά,[587]

… men and women should not all follow the same pursuits with one accord and with all their might…

Finally, Josephus also makes use of ὁμοθυμαδὸν. In his description of the Jewish revulsion against Herod's desecration of the temple with trophies he records of the Jews:

ἀλλ' ὑπὸ δυσχερείας ὧν ἐδόκουν ἐκεῖνον πλημμελεῖν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐξεβόων…[588]

…. but they cried out with one accord, out of their great uneasiness at the offences they thought he had been guilty of.

Underlying all the above usages of ὁμοθυμαδὸν is the idea of one mind, unanimity and unity of purpose. The above usage of the word reveals that although ὁμοθυμαδὸν is not a common NT concept, it is related in meaning to the concept of ὁμόνοία as Luke, Septuagint (LXX) and other Greco-Roman literature demonstrate.[589]

The early chapters of the Book of Acts, particularly Chapters 2 and 4, demonstrate how the reality encompassed by the concept of ὁμόνοια was worked out in the early Christian movement. First, the Christ-followers continued the practice of meeting together in the temple courts and breaking bread in their homes with glad and sincere hearts (Acts 2:46). The reference to ἐν ἀφελότητι καρδίας (traditionally translated "with sincere hearts) it very telling about the implications of unity and purpose in the community. The word ἀφελότης, which is related to the word ἁπλότης (liberality), has the sense of simplicity or generosity.[590] This suggests that essential to the community of the early Christian movement was the spirit of harmony and

[586] Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1015-1020, tr. Eugene O'Neill.
[587] Plato, *Laws*, 805a, tr. R.G. Bury.
[588] Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, 277.
[589] Liddel and Scott (2007:487, 488), the two words are shown to have similar meaning.
[590] Conzelmann, 1987: 24; Bruce, 1998: 74; Johnson, 1992: 62.

liberality.

Second, the above spirit of harmony and liberality became self-evident at the interpersonal level when no one among them was in need (Acts 4:34). Although the challenge of self-interest would, from time to time, rear its ugly head as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11), the spirit of κοινωνία through individual willingness to put their possessions at the disposal of the community demonstrated the ethos of ὁμόνοια. It is possible as Bruce asserts, that the community was organized along the lines of a voluntary type of organisation called *habura*, a central feature of which was a communal meal.[591]Johnson argues that for Luke's Hellenistic readers, the Acts story would be similar to the foundation stories widespread in Hellenistic literature at the time.[592] Among such stories would be Plato's *Critia* which demonstrates how in the early days of Athens, its citizens possessed no private property, and everything was held in common. Another of such stories was Ovidius' *Metamorphoses*.[593]

The above similarities with foundation stories not only place the Acts of the Apostles within the Greco-Roman context but also the whole of Luke-Acts. Also, as Johnson argues, in using the *topos* of foundation stories, Luke communicates with his readers that the early Christian community realised the highest aspirations of human longing; peace, joy and praise of God.[594] Such an ideal community must have been a striking contrast to the community that Luke was writing for, as the content of the Sermon depicts. Nevertheless, for Luke, the ethos of the community in Acts satisfied the basic aspirations of those for whom he was writing.

4.3.3. Ὁμόνοια in the Sermon

Neither the word ὁμόνοια nor ὁμοθυμαδὸν appears in the Sermon. It can, however, be observed that the meaning of the two words and their implications form the basis of the Sermon. The contrasting imagery of poverty/riches hunger/filled, praised/despised reflects a society divided between the poor and the rich, and one in which social harmony was in short supply. The context of the Sermon, therefore, reflects that of Greek panegyrics in which the idea of harmony both in the *polis* and among the Hellenes was a major challenge. Just as praising (or blaming) a person was akin to urging a course of action, so too the Sermon probably demonstrates the

591 See, Bruce, 198: 74.
592 See Johnson, 1992: 62.
593 Ovid, *Metamorphoses,* 1:88-111.
594 Ibid. 59.

failure of ὁμόνοια, and therefore of κοινωνία, and the need to address the situation.[595] The contrasting imagery in the Sermon betrays the challenge of *philia* and *philanthropy* within the Lucan churches.[596] The sudden transition from praise and blame in vv. 20-26 to paraenesis in vv. 27-49 with its encouragement to love enemies (v. 27), to give to beggars (v. 31) and not to judge others (v. 37) echoes a socially broken community in which ὁμόνοια had become elusive.

A probable major problem in the Lucan churches was the challenge of Greco-Roman kinship and reciprocity. This is evident from the way the problems of riches and poverty and social acceptance form a key component of Luke's teaching. Jesus' parables in the travel narrative take up this issue significantly (Lk 9:51-19:48). It is probable that, like other Greco-Roman voluntary associations, the Jesus movement had created new relationships between different social groups. From the Acts of the Apostles, we can see how the new movement banded together both "propertied" individuals like Barnabas (Acts 4:36) and poor widows (Acts 6:1). As the early Christian movement transitioned from its Jewish milieu into the heartland of the Greco-Roman communities, its social dynamics are likely to have significantly changed. The spiritual bonds of unity that held the early Jewish Christ-followers together in Jerusalem (who were mostly of Jewish ethnicity) would have sagged under the influence of Greco-Roman kinship, friendships and reciprocity. Wayne Meeks' and Todd Penner's studies support this view. In his *First Urban Christians,* Meeks observes that for the Christian movement, the conservatism of the villages had preserved their diversity. However, as the movement spread into the cities, changes, which included manners, attitudes, and status were in the direction of the common Greco-Roman culture.[597] This was likely going to create problems in the new communities. According to him, the development of fictive kinship terms with strong language of affection and re-unification patterns, such as brother and sisters, (1 Cor. 2:1), holy people (2 Cor. 1.1) and the elect, was meant to maintain fellowship and its boundaries.[598] Furthermore, in his book *In Praise of Christian Origins*, Penner argues that the narrative of the early chapters of Acts, which depicts the lack of *philia* and *philanthropy* and its resolutions, served as the basis for comparison and *syncrisis* in the community Luke was writing for.[599] Thus, by praising the past, the narratives provided models on how best to live the Christian life in Luke's time and place.

[595] Sheard, 1996: 780.
[596] Penner, 2004: 264.
[597] Meeks, 1983: 16.
[598] Ibid, 85.
[599] Penner, 2004: 264.

The above problem of social differences within the communities of Christ-groups was already noticeable early in Acts 6 but was contained by the Apostles' swift action. From Acts 6 it is evident that although the early Christians were all Judeans, their division into Hebraic and Hellenistic groups was bound to create the "in-group" and "outgroup" syndrome in social identity terms.[600] This, therefore, was bound to cause internal struggles between the Hebraic and the Hellenistic Judeans. Such social differences would intensify as the movement spread further afield into the larger Greco-Roman world.

The social problems experienced by the Christ-groups in the Lucan churches were, however, not unique to them. Similar problems existed in the other Greco-Roman associations. Ilias Anaoutoglou has demonstrated the presence of tensions and competitions for honour among associates in religious associations. Some of the tensions arose from the allocation of tasks and the presence of hierarchies of wealth and prestige.[601] Others resulted from the presence of the εὐεργέται (benefactors), who due to their benevolence, formed an inner circle that controlled the affairs of the association.[602] The inner circles were the breeding ground for social stratification and group rivalry and marginalization.[603] This would be similar to what we find in Acts 6 between the Hebraic and Hellenistic Jews. If early Christian communities were similar to the Greco-Roman associations, as Last, and recently, Kloppenborg have argued,[604] they could not have been immune from the generic challenges experienced by Greco-Roman voluntary groups. All the above problems help to locate Luke 6:20-49 in the Greco-Roman context.

4.4. THE POLITICS OF POVERTY AND RICHES IN THE SERMON

An analysis of the Sermon demonstrates that poverty and riches are its controlling narrative agents. Luke's juxtaposition of the two terms is the primary factor that differentiates the Sermon from its counterpart in Matthew's Gospel. In what follows, the dissertation examines the Sermon's presentation of poverty and riches in light of its Greco-Roman context. The analysis is made in the context of the social and power dynamics of poverty and riches in Greco-Roman communities and how the same is reflected in the Sermon.

---

600 See Tajfel, 1981: 143-161.
601 Anatouglou, 1998: 80.
602 Ibid. 78.
603 Ibid. 78.
604 See, Last, 2012; Kloppenborg, 2019.

4.4.1. Social Stratification in the Greco-Roman World

For a long time, there was no scholarly consensus on the extent of social stratification in the Greco-Roman world and its relationship to early Christianity. However, drawing from social science theoretical perspectives, scholars such as Wayne Meeks and Gerd Theissen have been able to achieve the so-called new consensus that Pauline churches reflected the structure of Greco-Roman social stratification.[605] However, the nature of this Greco-Roman social stratification has been open to debate. For example, Justin Meggitt, in his challenge of the new consensus, describes the Roman society in binary terms: wide-scale destitution, and a small super-wealthy elite, with the Pauline churches as churches of the poor.[606] Meggitt's classifications reflects some classical conception of Greco-Roman society in which the poor included all who fell short of the minimum property qualification for senatorial and equestrian status.[607] This classification of society represented a simplistic aggregation of individuals worth based on how well within or off the mark to reach a set social bar one was. Yet it can be observed that within the Greco-Roman world itself there were different terminologies for different levels of status demonstrating the existence of a broader scale of social differences and possessions. Terms such as πένης, (from πένομαι, to work or toil), πενιχρός (needy), πτωχὸς (destitute) and πλούσιος (rich) support a more than binary classification of social and economic differences in the Greco-Roman world.

Stephen Friesen and later Bruce Longenecker have come up with poverty or economic scales that go beyond the above binary classification of social status in the Greco-Roman world.[608] Based on an analysis of Pauline assemblies, Friesen developed a Greco-Roman poverty scale with seven levels and approximate percentages of each group. The classifications are: (1) imperial elites; (2) regional or provincial elites; (3) municipal elites; (4) people with moderate surplus resources (who do not include any farmers); (5) people living at a stable near subsistence level (who inter alia, include some farm families); (6) people living at subsistence level and often below the needed level to sustain life (who include small farm families); and (7) people living below subsistence level (which include the unattached widows, orphans, the

---

605 See Meeks, 1983. Thiessen, 2004.
606 Meggitt, 1998: 1-7.
607 Fitzgerald, 1996: 389.
608 Friesen, 2004: 36-59; Longenecker, 2009: 243-278.

disabled, unskilled labourers and prisoners).[609] The approximate distribution of the population on the poverty scales, according to Friesen, was as indicated in the Table below:

Table 4:1: Poverty scale with estimated percentages of urban population in larger cities.[610]

PS1 Imperial elites	0.04%
PS2 Regional elites	1.00%
PS3 Municipal elites	1.76%
PS4 Moderate surplus	7%
PS5 Stable near subsistence	22%?
PS6 At subsistence	40%
PS7 Below subsistence	28%

Friesen's Poverty Scale has been criticised for its lack of precision in its use of moderate, or near subsistence levels of economic statuses and for plucking percentages out from the air using generalised conclusions drawn from pre-industrial societies.[611] Esler, also notes on the need to include those peasants who did have a reasonably large amounts of cash, which the scale does not accommodate.[612] Yet in spite of its weaknesses, Friesen's scale continues to provide a comprehensive approximation of the different levels of wealth and poverty in the Greco-Roman beyond the traditional binary approach. Friesen's Poverty Scale has also been enhanced by Longenecker's Economic Scale (ES). Longenecker argues that those in the middle of the continuum—i.e., people falling beneath the levels of the rarefied elite yet able to amass moderate (or even significant) levels of wealth—need to be accorded greater percentages than generally recognised.[613] In this way, Longenecker presents a more nuanced understanding of levels 5, 6, 7 of the Friesen Poverty scale.[614] It can be argued that the above poverty and economic scales provide a basic skeletal framework for analysing the question of poverty in the Sermon.

609 Ibid. 341.
610 Ibid. 347.
611 Oak, 2004: 368; Barclay, 2004: 365.
612 Esler, 2017: 80.
613 Jones, 2011: 394-395.
614 Esler, 2017: 80.

4.4.2. Poverty in the Greco-Roman World

From Friesen's and Longenecker's poverty/e-scale, it can be observed that 40% of the Greco-Roman populations were the πένητες (sing. πένης). PS6 included small farm families, labourers (skilled and unskilled), artisans (esp. those employed by others), wage earners, most merchants and traders, small shop/tavern owners.[615] The πένητες (from πένομαι, to work or toil) were the people who had to work or toil for their daily subsistence.[616] A whole host of professions fell into this category of the poor. For example, Xenophon mentions merchants, fullers and shoe-makers, builders, metal workers and peasants as among the πένητες.[617] At the same time, agricultural labourers, artisans[618] including in-keepers were, for Plato, among the objectionable jobs for the uncultured.[619] Sometimes even court officers and secretaries were also classified as πένης. For example, Demosthenes calls Strato, his appointed arbitrator against Midias, as the ἄνθρωπος πένης, "a man of small means."[620] Considering that Strato was a court official and, therefore, skilled in the law and Athenian litigation system, the designation implied that he had a minimal income and therefore classified as a labourer. The connection between income and poverty is summarised by Aristotle, who argues that a πένης cannot lead a magnificent life due to inadequate resources.[621] The annual income of this group has been calculated differently by different scholars. Friesen places them at 250-300 denarii a year. Alan Bowman and Andrew Wilson place the income at 289 grams of silver a year with the annual cost of maintaining a family at 516.352 grams.[622] This suggests that the labourer did not have enough for a healthy existence. The result was poor nutrition for most people leading to a short lifespan; an average of 30 years and infant mortality of about 30%, with very few people reaching the age of 50 or 60.[623] The income levels of the labourers also suggest that the labourer was always on the verge of destitution.

---

[615] Friesen cited in Longenecker 2009: 245.
[616] See BDAG, 2000:795.
[617] Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 111. 7, 6.
[618] Aristophanes, *Plutus*, 904.
[619] Plato, *Laws*, 918, 919.
[620] Demosthenes, *Against Midias,* 21 83.
[621] Aristot. Nic. Eth. 1122b, says πένης, μὲν οὐκ ἂν εἴη μεγαλοπρεπής. "the poor cannot be magnificent." tr. by J. Bywater.
[622]Bowman and Wilson, 2009: 337.
[623] Pagola, 2009: 61.

From the Friesen poverty scale, it can also be observed that 28% of the population were the πτωχοί, (sing. πτωχὸς) destitute.[624] Lexically, the word πτωχὸς originally referred to the one who crouches or cringes, suggesting a begging position.[625] The word later came to be associated with beggary, mendicancy and homelessness, and therefore dependence on others for provisions.[626] Several factors were responsible for the status of destitution in the Greco-Roman world. As Arthur Pomeroy has argued, in the Greco-Roman world, the maintenance of social status was not an easy undertaking. It was always possible for the rich and powerful to lose everything and become destitute.[627] This could be a result of outcomes of political failure or difficulties in maintaining the level of wealth, which was a core-requisite for success.[628] Debt was also a central factor in rendering individuals destitute.[629] Debt also defined the power of the rich over the poor through the debt trap. Wars were also another cause of destitution.[630] For those who lived on a daily wage, ill-health would likely result in a lack of basic needs. This would result in destitution if they did not go into a debt trap that would spiral them into slavery. Also, the death of a breadwinner in the household certainly resulted in destitution for the widow and the orphaned children. It can, therefore, be concluded that the status of destitution resulted from material and social deprivation. As Esler has demonstrated, the major problem with the urban poor was that they were employed on a daily basis and failure to obtain work meant the labourer and his family went hungry the next day.[631] Persistent lack of work (livelihood) would inevitably drive people into debt, which, if they failed to repay led them into debt-bondage or slavery.

It can further be argued that the problem of being πτωχὸς or πένης was not only because of the personal tragedy it represented. The status also carried with it a stigma that resulted in the alienation of the poor in society. For example, in his *Against Lochites*, Isocrates protests that despite the equality of the rich and poor before the Athenian law, in the administration of justice,

[624] Longenecker, 2009: 245.
[625] BDAG, 2000: 896.
[626] Mounce, 1993: 404.
[627] "Pomeroy, 1991: 51.
[628] Ibid.
[629] Oakman, 2014: 18-21.
[630] Herodotus, *Histories* 3.14. In addition, Cassandra's reference to her experience of destitution as a captive from Troy re-enforces the role of wars in individual's experience of destitution. See Aeschylus, *Agamemno*n, 2070-75.
[631] Esler, 1987: 175.

the πένητες were often treated as second class.[632] The relationship between πτωχεία and ostracism is also evident in Euripides' *Helen*. In the play, Menelaus, upon his return from Troy under disguise, recalls ὥσπερ πτωχὸς ἐξηλαυνόμην,[633] "like a beggar I was driven out…" from the gate. Such ostracism may also have been influenced by the perception of the destitute as hungry and suffering, therefore, in a state of dishonour. For example, in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Cassandra laments how Apollo had made her bear being called a πτωχή (beggar), τάλαινα (suffering), λιμοθνὴς (dying of hunger), and ἠνεσχόμην, (starveling).[634]

The above association of poverty with destitution, hunger and ostracism puts into perspective Jesus' designation of his disciples as those who hunger, mourn, and are hated (Lk 6:20-24). It demonstrates that the latter three terms represented different aspects of the experience of πτωχεία.[635] Some NT scholars rightly agree that hunger, mourning and ostracism reflect the experience of πτωχεία.[636] Earl Ellis, in his analysis of Lk 6:20-26, also supports this position when he argues that the poor, the hungry, and the cast out describe one type of person.[637] Betz also argues that hunger, weeping and ostracism are concrete situations also echoed in other NT references such as Lk. 16:19-31; James 2:1-7.[638] It can also be argued that the apparent neglect of Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31) by the rich man and the discrimination of the destitute in James 2:17 supports the relationship between poverty and ostracism. The above understanding, therefore, suggests that in the Greco-Roman world, being poor or destitute, whether as a πένης or πτωχὸς, was more than mere statistics. Poverty symbolised powerlessness, insecurity and dependence on others, and, therefore, vulnerability. Thus, powerlessness arising from poverty and destitution had an identity claim to it. The above understanding of destitution helps to put into perspective the way Luke uses destitution vis-à-vis riches in the Sermon.

[632] Isocrates, *Against Lochites*, 20 19.
[633] Euripides, *Helen*, 790, tr. Gilbert Murray.
[634] Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 1270-75, tr. Robert Browning.
[635] Similarly, being rich implied being powerful. As Tannehill has demonstrated, unlike the modern world, economic status in the ancient world was valued less for its own sake than as a factor in honour status. Therefore, the rich stood out not because they had possessions but because they had power and honour in society. Tannehill, 1996: 115
[636] Ibid. 114.
[637] Ellis, 1973: 113. Tannehill, (p.114) associates hungering, mourning with poverty. He separates ostracism from the rest.
[638] Betz, 1995: 572.

4.4.3. The Rich in the Greco-Roman World

From the Friesen/Longenecker poverty/e-scale, it can be observed that the πλούσιοι represented different levels of the significant few who had more than enough to live on and did not have to work. In some of his parables (Lk. 12: 19; 16:1-15, 19-31) Jesus presents a picture of what it meant to be rich in the Greco-Roman world. He presents the rich as those able to hire stewards to manage their business (Lk. 16:1), who have enough resources to last for years even without working, and who are, therefore, able to enjoy life with significant ease; resting, eating, drinking and making merry (Lk 12:19; 16:19.[639]

There were several ways in which people could become rich in the Greco-Roman world. Aristotle mentions hard work, family inheritance, and a good name.[640] Family inheritance was the most common way in which individuals acquired wealth. As a result of having abundant resources, the rich had access to many opportunities that provided them with security and power. For example, the rich could afford ἄποινα, compensation for wrongdoing or ransom to save their life or those of a loved one.[641]This gave them the privilege of a relatively safe life in the turbulent times of classical antiquity. Beyond comfort and security, the rich, unlike the poor, could become the εὐεργέται, benefactors.[642] As benefactors, they provided money for the games, temples, sacrifices, public dinners or provisions of wheat during a famine.[643] In exchange, they expected to receive honour through praise, statues or political support when needed.[644]To reflect their position of power and influence in society the rich were also called οἱ γνώριμοι,[645]the notables, the οἱ διωνομάσμενοι, the distinguished by name[646], and οἱ δυνάμενοι,[647]the powerful. The power and influence of the rich were buttressed by the fact that they could afford the ξενία, the gift of friendship or entertainment to visitors. Through this, they created networks of

[639] In order to make more wealth, they employed the πένητες to work for them. See Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution*, 2.1-3.

[640] Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution*, 2:1-3; The idea of riches through a good name is alluded to in Pindar's *Olympiad*, 7.10. ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν φᾶμαι κατέχοντ' ἀγαθαί. ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλον ἐποπτεύει Χάρις ζωθάλμιος. "That man is prosperous, who is encompassed by good reports. Grace, which causes life to flourish, looks with favour now on one man." Thus, the experience of Athletic champions and the bestowal of gifts upon them by society partly explains the importance of a good name.

[641] See Homer Iliad 1.1-25, where the word ἄποινα is consistently used in relations to the act of saving or the ransom itself.

[642] Aristotle (*Nic. Eth*. 1122b. 20) argues that only the rich can become benefactors.

[643] Anaoutoglou, 1998: 77–78.

[644] Ibid.

[645] Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution*, 1.

[646] Isocrates, *Against Lochites*, 20:19.

[647] Democritus Frag. 255.

friendships and maintained those networks through offering expensive funeral gifts[648] or paying huge sums of ἕδνα, the marriage gift (the dowry)[649] to ensure that their daughters were married off to their fellow rich.

Another characteristic trait of the rich was their practice of reciprocity in giving, receiving and repayment in a closed circuit of exchange based on kinship or social equality.[650] The display of wealth as a sign of accomplishment in weddings and funerals was the means of gaining honour and creating guest-friendships, marriages and other social connections.[651] These closed circuits of exchange helped the aristocrats to define themselves to themselves and therefore differentiate themselves from the rest of the citizens.[652] However, more often than not, this pattern of behaviour threatened the cohesive force of the *polis*. Plutarch records that the problem of lavish display and extravagance of wealth at the expense of the poor became so acute in Sparta that the King had to act upon it. Plutarch reports that:

> When Cleomenes became King of Sparta in 241 BCE he sent 80 rich senators into exile, charging them with subverting the ancient form of government. He wanted to rid Sparta of imported curses namely, luxury and extravagance, debts and usury- and evils older than those namely, poverty and wealth.[653]

Plutarch's reference above to the evils of "poverty and wealth" demonstrate the perplexing irony of the co-existence of poverty and riches within the *polis* and the interclass challenges it potentially posed. Cleomenes' action demonstrated his understanding of the natural propensity of the rich to acquire more and more wealth at the expense of the poor and their inability to give without expecting to give back. This attitude created the connection between wealth and greed. According to William Desmond, the attitude of the rich influenced the Greeks' conception of wealth not so much as a material fact but far more as an ethical and political phenomenon with

---

[648] Euripides, *Trojan Women*, 1249.
[649] Homer, *Odyssey*, be 1.277 and 2.196 οἱ δὲ γάμον τεύξουσι (will make ready) καὶ ἀρτυνέουσιν (putting in place) ἕεδνα πολλὰ (many marriage gifts).
[650] Kurke, 1991: 92.
[651] Ibid. 92.
[652] Ibid. 89.
[653] Plutarch, *Cleomenes*, 10.1-4.

individual greed as the controlling factor.[654] In the Roman republic, a comparable situation existed between the plebeians and the patricians. Reflecting on this problem, Brutus one of the leaders of the Plebeian cession (394-393 BCE), on the eve of the humble poor abandoning Rome, had this to say:

> Of this let many Greeks and many barbarians serve us as example, particularly the ancestors of both these men and ourselves; some of whom, leaving Asia with Aeneas, came into Europe and built a city in the country of the Latins, and others, coming as colonists from Alba under the leadership of Romulus, built in these parts of the city we are now leaving. Those who removed from Troy were driven out by enemies, but we are driven hence by friends. But fare you well and lead the life you choose, you who are so unwilling to associate as fellow-citizens and share your possessions with those of humbler estate. [655]

Brutus' language of blame illustrates the problematic relationship between the rich and the poor in the Early Roman Republic and the former's reluctance to share with others. By the NT times, with the emergence of a landed aristocracy at the service of the empire, this problematic relationship had reached a critical level.[656] Taking advantage of their imperial connections, the aristocrats established trans-regional property portfolios and thereby created absentee landlords whose land was worked by poor tenants.[657] For the landed peasant, the agrarian debt which required them to pay a sixth of their crop in tax, either pushed them completely out of the land or into a client-dependency relationship.[658] This meant that the peasants' life constituted bare survival.[659] They had to subsist after paying all taxes and fees, without falling into a spiral of debts and being able to feed the family including keeping the seed back for the next season.[660] This led to widespread poverty leading to an increase in beggary and brigandage.[661] All this suggests that to be rich in the Greco-Roman world was synonymous with being powerful, secure, independent and capable of treating one's poorer dependents with an arbitrariness

[654] Desmond, 2006: 4-5.
[655] Dionysius, 2017: V1, 80:1-4.
[656] Sarris, 2013: 177.
[657] Ibid. 167-88.
[658] Oakman, 2014: 71.
[659] Pagola, 2009: 61.
[660] Ibid.
[661] Oakman, 2014:71.

consummate with their power. Therefore, being rich, like being poor, had an identity claim ascribed to it. The above understanding presents significant insight into Luke's perception of poverty and riches in the Sermon. It suggests that poverty and riches represented contradictory values which in the community of Christ-followers needed to be realigned.

4.4.4. The Rhetoric of Poverty and Riches in the Sermon

The above discussion of poverty and riches in the Greco-Roman world has demonstrated that being rich and being poor in the Greco-Roman world was more than a measure of personal abundance or lack, respectively. The two standings represented the polar ends of power and powerlessness, independence and dependence, and security and vulnerability. This suggests that a community of Christ-followers comprising the rich and poor would likely be a community of conflicting philosophies and identities. To achieve social cohesion in such a community would require a radical realignment of identity and social orientation, especially on the part of the rich. Yet this demand is not only confined to the Sermon. The concern for poverty and riches is a pervasive motif in the Third Gospel.[662] The Magnificat (Lk 1:52-53), Jesus' parables (Lk 12:13-21; 16:19-31; 14:7-14; 16: 9-12) and other teachings and encounters (Lk 19: 1-10; 21:1-4) depict Luke's pre-occupation with poverty and riches. However, in the Sermon, Luke presents Jesus' message as a radical demand for change in his followers' identity, which is further explicated across the gospel. In the Sermon, the Christ-followers are confronted with a new reality of what it means to be a disciple of Jesus. The juxtaposition of riches and destitution was, therefore, much more than a mere description of the status of the disciples. It was a call to the re-orientation of identity for Theophilus and his fellow converts. It was also a constant reminder to the rest of the membership of the need to keep stock of their values and identity in the community of the faithful.

The ideological function of Jesus' juxtaposition of poverty and riches is demonstrable from the different ways the social and economic status of the disciples is represented across the gospel tradition and in the Sermon. Although the gospels do not provide specific details about the occupation of all of Jesus' disciples, it is evident that some of them had occupations such as fishermen (Mk 1:16-20) or as tax collectors (Lk 5:27-29). Some like Peter, however, had families (Lk 4:38-41) and therefore had access to social structures on which to depend in times

[662] Green, 2014: 173-179; See also Esler, 1987: 164-197.

of need. It is also evident that after their appointment as disciples, most of them gave up their livelihood and lived on charity (Lk 8:1-3; 9:4). Nevertheless, some of them would return to their former professions in times of need (Jn 21:3). In the Friesen poverty scale, most of the disciples would fall in the PS6 level, subsistence level. This indicates they were the *πένητες*, who laboured for their daily existence. Although there were instances in which the two terms *πτωχός* and *πένης* were interchangeable, it makes it difficult to classify the disciples as the *πτωχοί* strictly.[663] Evaluated against the different levels of poverty in the Greco-Roman world, the economic status of Jesus' disciples could rightly be described as *πένητες* or labourers; they were neither rich nor beggars.

It is, therefore, possible that the destitute Christ-followers referred to in the Sermon, were part of the Lucan communities.[664] This understanding is evident in both the initial Nazareth proclamation (Lk 4:16-30) and the Lucan preoccupation with generosity to the poor across the gospel (Lk 10:29-37; 15:11-32; 19:1-10). Beyond the gospel, further evidence for the presence of the destitute is found in the reference in Acts 6:1 to widows who needed daily provisions. This, therefore, suggests that the reference to the disciples as destitute vis-à-vis the affluence of the rich understood within a panegyric setting was an amplification typical of conventional *encomia*.[665] The two statuses of poverty and riches serve as narrative agents aimed at creating a rhetorical force to Jesus' message of radical *κοινωνία* between the rich and the poor. They serve to highlight the economic and social contradictions in the community and the need to deal with them. Similar instances of amplification were not uncommon in Greco-Roman panegyrics. For example, Isocrates uses amplification to emphasise the challenges of the relationship between the poor and rich in Athens. He says:

> But the greatest difference lies in the fact that "in that day" no one of the citizens lacked the necessaries of life nor shamed the city by begging from passers-by, whereas today those who are destitute of means outnumber those who possess them. And we may well

[663] Longenecker (2009: 246) refers to instances in which πτωχὸς or πένης were used interchangeably. He points out, for example, that in his play, *Dyskolos*, Menander applies the *πτωχὸς* to the land-owning and slave-owning character Gorgias (*ll*.284-86). Conversely, Philo uses the term *πένης* of destitute people without land (e.g., Virt. 90; 97; *Laws* 2.85, 105; Gaius 123). According to him, within the ancient records, the two terms are not stable.
[664] Esler, 1987: 185.
[665] Miguélez-Cavero, 2010: 31.

be patient with people in such circumstances if they care nothing for the public welfare but consider only how they may live from day today.[666]

In the above statement, Isocrates expresses the nostalgia of an old Athens that was devoid of the destitute. This reminiscence was, however, certainly an exaggeration, as it is unlikely there was ever a perfect society in Athens. Yet by projecting a blissful image of an unverified past, Isocrates generates for both himself and his audience the possibility of a future in which the relationship between the poor and rich could be harmonious. As Fuks has demonstrated, the relationship between the poor and the rich was one of the most vexing issues in ancient Greece and the major cause of stasis.[667] Several Greek rhetoricians and philosophers wrestled with the issue of power dynamics between the rich and the poor in the Greek *polis*. Some like Democritus imagined the conditions under which the rich and the poor could live amicably. Democritus' proposal was that:

> When the powerful prevail upon themselves to lend to the indigent, and help them, and benefit them, herein at last is pity, and an end to isolation, and friendship, and mutual aid, and harmony among the citizens; and other blessings such as no man could enumerate.[668]

For Democritus, if the rich shared with the poor, the result would be a social camaraderie expressed through numerous good things such as fellowship, friendship, mutual aid, and harmony. Democritus here projects an image of an ideal community in which the rich and poor lived in an economic *κοινωνία* that led to social bliss. It can, therefore, be contended that like Isocrates and Democritus above, Luke in the Sermon mulls over his community's lost paradise in Acts 2:42-47 and provides solutions on how to restore it. The near-perfect picture of a community in which *κοινωνία* prevailed in Acts 2:42-47 is a significant contrast to a socially broken community of Christ-followers in Lk 6:20-49. The paraenesis to love, (v. 27) to bless (v. 28) and the imperative construction *μὴ κρίνετε*, "do not judge" (6:37) point to a community

[666] Isocrates, *Areopagiticus*.7.83. tr. George Norlin.
[667] Fuks, 1984: 40.
[668] Democritus, *Frag*, 255. tr. Hellenic Library.

lacking in social camaraderie. The paraenesis also serves as Luke's prescription for the inherent problems in the community. The juxtaposition of destitution with abundance was therefore meant to help Luke's audience to become aware of the social challenges amidst them. It further helped them to identify the root of the problems in the community in terms of power dynamics between the poor and the rich and its implications for group identity and the conception of kinship and friendship in the Greco-Roman context. In the Sermon's makarisms and woes, therefore, Luke interrogates and puts into question the idea of power and security emanating from wealth as a source of identity for Christ-followers. Instead, weakness, vulnerability, and dependency, which were the hallmarks of destitution, were to be the guiding principles of Christ-followers. The adoption of this identity would make loving, giving, and not judging others, not only possible and easy but would also make the same as the defining values of the community. Besides, with these values, the community of the Christ-followers would challenge the established ways of thinking and living in their Greco-Roman context and therefore serve as a catalyst for change across the world of their time.

The above rhetorical force of the Sermon could not have been without some broader connotations for the different members of the community. If the Sermon was recited at the annual Easter festival, for the new converts like Theophilus, it represented an integration and socialisation into the community of Christ-followers. Anatouglou has demonstrated how Greco-Roman religious associations integrated new members through a process which might be called "symbolic violence."[669] According to him, "symbolic violence" was an imposition of systems of symbolism and meaning upon a group in such a way that they were experienced as legitimate. The values promoted in cult associations were excellence ('ἀρετή) righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) piety (εὐσέβεια) and love of honour (φιλοτιμία).[670] Similarly, it can be argued that through epideictic symbolism, Jesus in Luke integrates the new converts into the Kingdom values of weaknesses, vulnerability, and dependency. Although these values portray inherent weaknesses repugnant to Greco-Roman sensitivities, a measure of triumphalism also accompanies the disciple's new identity. The values qualified the Christ-followers for the privileges of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ: satisfaction, laughter and rewards. The values thus gave them parity with Greco-Roman victors who enjoyed similar privileges from their community.

[669] Anaoutoglou, 1998: 79.
[670] Ibid.

For the rest of the community, the annual recital of the Sermon, with its *topos* of praise and blame, would have been understood within the context of a Greco-Roman panegyric. As Bernard Duffy has demonstrated, epideictic oratory, of which panegyrics were part, served as the re-kindling of settled values through a process of "steady inculcation"[671] In this case, the annual Easter festivals presented a forum for reinforcing the virtues of *κοινωνία* that the Lucan communities commonly shared but which were always subject to the challenge of self-interest.[672] The above discussion, therefore, places the Sermon in a Greco-Roman context.

4. 5. CONCLUSION

The chapter has argued for the Greco-Roman context of the Sermon. It has demonstrated that the different layers of communication in the Sermon, its conception of community and communion and the presentation of riches and poverty reflect its Greco-Roman context. The above discussion, therefore, provides a plausible context for a detailed reading of the Sermon from the perspective of praise and blame.

[671] Duffy, 1983: 81.

[672] Cf. Act 4:36-37; Acts 5:1-11; The story of Barnabas' generosity probably represents the spirit of *κοινωνία* while that of Ananias and Sapphira's represents the challenge of self-interest in the communities associated with Luke-Acts.

CHAPTER 5

A PANEGYRIC READING OF LUKE 6:20-49

5.1. INTRODUCTION

The last chapter argued for the Greco-Roman setting of the Sermon. It argued that in its different layers of communication, the concern for unity and community, and its presentation of poverty and riches, the Sermon bears a strong resemblance to Greco-Roman panegyrics. This chapter presents an exegesis of Luke 6:20-49 from the perspective of Greco-Roman panegyrics. Its central argument is that in the Sermon Jesus draws upon the panegyric's praise and blame *topos* to both integrate new members of the Christ-groups and evoke civic responsibility and action within the community of Christ-followers. Luke depicts Jesus as a Greco-Roman orator who employs the agency of praise and blame as a pedagogical tool to re-enforce commonly held values in the community. In his exaltation of destitution, Jesus appeals to the values of weakness, dependency, and vulnerability as the identity of the Christ-followers. The adoption of these values by the members of the Christ-Groups would be vital to the community's realignment of their understanding of kinship, friendship, and *κοινωνία*. The practical outworking of this new understanding is further clarified in the rest of the Sermon vv. 27-49. Structurally, the chapter has three main sections. The first section offers a brief analysis of the structure of the Sermon. The second section analyses the integrative function of the Sermon to new Christ-followers. The third section examines how, as a general panegyric, the Sermon reinforced the commonly held values of *κοινωνία* for the other members of the Lucan churches.

5.2. THE STRUCTURE OF THE SERMON

Due to its continuous flow and the variety of its themes, there is no scholarly unanimity on the structure of the Sermon. All scholars, however, agree that vv. 20-26 form the initial unit of the Sermon.[673] There is, however, no unanimity on the structure of the second part of the Sermon. Some scholars dividing it into two parts: life of love (vv. 27-38), and a collection of parables (vv. 39-49)[674]. Others give it a threefold structure: love of enemies vv. 27-36, not judging, vv. 37-42, and concluding exhortation vv. 43-49.[675] In spite of the above differences, the general

[673] Topel, 2001: 58.
[674] Garland, 2011: 271; Green, 1997: 263-280; Marshall, 1978: 243; Fitzmyer, 1981: 628.
[675] Tannehill, 1996: 114-122.

structure of the Sermon is generally two-fold: makarisms and woes vv. 20-26 and exhortation vv. 27-49. Topel calls vv. 20-26 the exordium and vv. 27-49 the Love Command.[676] This understanding finds support in Fitzmyer's observation that from a form critical point of view the Sermon is made up of dominical sayings and other unstructured sayings that include parables.[677] The dissertation follows Topel's two-fold division but understands it as praise and blame vv. 20-26 and exhortation, vv. 27-49. This division resembles the structure of Greco-Roman panegyrics which was usually "from praise to program", where praise often was followed by paraenesis.[678] A similar structure is evident in the Sermon where praise and blame (vv. 20-26) is followed by paraenesis in vv. 27-49.

5.3. INTEGRATING NEW BELIEVERS: NEW CONVERTS AS VICTORS

The purpose for which Luke claimed to have written the gospel was to ensure Theophilus was certain of the things which he had been taught (Lk 1:4). As the gospel demonstrates, such *ἀσφάλεια* included both understanding Jesus as the Christ (Lk 9:20) and living out the implications of his ethical directives. The presentation of God's generosity in the infancy narratives (Lk 1:46-55, 65-78) and Jesus' praise of generosity (Lk 10: 25-37; 14:12-24; 15:11-32; Lk 16:1-9; 19:1-10; 21:1-4) and blame of stinginess (Lk 12:13-21; 16:19-31; 18:18-30) testifies to Luke's commitment to ensuring that Theophilus understood the ethical implications of the decision he had made to follow Jesus. However, the application of such ethical demands would not be possible without a radical shift in the new converts' value system. Therefore, the Sermon, in a typical epideictic fashion, calls into question the whole Greco-Roman social and economic system whose basis was power, independence, and security.[679] In the Kingdom of God, Theophilus' new identity would be defined in terms of powerlessness, dependency, and vulnerability. Yet this radical transformation would not be without its triumphalism. From the sequence of events from 6:13-17, the disciples are integrated with a tone reminiscent of Panhellenic victory parade: (a) Jesus appoints the disciples and apostles (v. 13) (b) and in v. 17 they proceed to a praise ceremony downhill (vv. 20-24). It is interesting to note that by the time of Luke's writing, the designation *μαθητής* was no longer tied to the twelve or seventy-two, but applied to all believers.[680] Thus, it became possible for the new converts in Luke's communities

[676] Topel, 2001: 58.
[677] Fitzmyer, 1981: 629.
[678] Braundi, 1998: 69. See also Penort, 2014: 93; Poulakos, 1987: 317-28.
[679] See also Esler, 1987: 189.
[680] See the broader meaning of *μαθητής* in Acts 14: 20,22; 15:10;19:30.

to identify with and appropriate the triumphalism latent in Jesus' reception of his disciples in 6:20-49.

It is also interesting to note that in vv. 20-26, Jesus substitutes the reference to his disciples with the designations destitute, hungry, mourning and ostracised (vv. 20-23), and their corresponding opposites of rich, filled, laughing and praise (vv. 24-26). The substitution and the consequent designation place the contradictory values of power and powerlessness in the Greco-Roman world, which were both available among the communities of Christ-followers, into sharp focus. This confirms the intra-community nature of the Sermon. Given the social status of the destitute in the Greco-Roman world, the substitution not only augments the humble state of the disciples but also provides a framework through which the disciples both in the time of Jesus and that of Luke were to identify themselves: powerless, dependent and vulnerable. The substitution also potentially offers a timeless element to the makarisms. It makes them applicable to all believers of all time.

5.3.1. Praising the Destitute

Most commentators emphasise the prophetic nature of Luke's makarisms and woes with reversal as the major thrust of the Sermon.[681] However, while the theme of reversal is evident in the Sermon's makarisms and woes and across the gospel, in a Hellenistic context, the aural experience of Jesus' first words (v. 20b) to his disciples would have been understood in the Lucan communities as celebratory. The general sequence of the tradition from the appointment and inaugural of the disciples represented a declaration of honour which in the Greek context, among other things, was reserved for the athletic victors. To a Hellenistic ear the first makarism would have thus sounded like:

> How happy (lucky) like the gods you are you who are destitute![682] Or
>
> How honourable (or praised) are you who are destitute. [683]

[681] Johnson, 2010: 202; Ellis, 1973: 112; Byrne, 2000: 77.
[682] Sullivan, 1961: 395.
[683] Hanson, 1996: 104.

In a Greco-Roman context, praise was bestowed as a result of achievement of 'ἀρετή (excellence) usually defined in terms of strength, agility and bravery and wealth, wisdom or magnanimity.[684] Understood from the context of the Sermon, for Jesus' disciples, their honour was derived from their being appointed and designated on the mountain. It was from there that they attained the status of official disciples of Jesus. By becoming Christ-followers, their status became comparable to that of Mary, who was similarly blessed among women (Lk 1:42). The word used for Mary is εὐλογημένη (pass. of εὐλογέω) meaning blessed, honoured, and or well-spoken of.[685] While Mary was blessed for being chosen of all women to be the mother of Jesus, the disciples were blessed for being invited, from among many others, to become disciples of Jesus.[686]

It can also be observed that like all Greco-Roman conditional makarisms, the implications of being honoured had a life-changing impact. For some, it meant immeasurable favour from the gods in the form of wealth[687]or a flourishing life.[688] However, for Jesus' disciples, their blessedness leads to their possession of an element of immeasurable value, the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. The present construction ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, "for (because) to you is the Kingdom of God" (v. 20b) highlights the new and present status of the destitute Christ-followers. However, for Jesus' disciples and Luke's audience*,* destitution was not the criterion for membership in the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Their membership was derived from their appointment into Jesus' discipleship on the mountain or believing in Jesus, respectively.

The above conception of membership into the Kingdom has parallels with Peter Brown's description of the Greco-Roman understanding of the "civic community" and its implications for civic privileges for both the rich and the poor.[689] Brown demonstrates that during the

[684] Kennedy, 2003: 51, 52.
[685] LSJ at Perseus εὐλογέω. In the NT and Septuagint (LXX), the word is used when praising or giving thanks to God. Nolland, 1989:67; Marshall, 1978: 81.
[686] It is also interesting to note that the designation of the disciples as destitute, by implication, identifies them with the masses. In this way, the Sermon brings in the crowds as direct addressees at the same level as the disciples.
[687] *Hymn to Demeter*, 485-9.
[688] Pindar, *Olympian* 7.10.
[689] Brown, 2002: 5.

imperial period, with its free distribution of food in Rome in difficult times, the poor received bread, not because they were poor but because they could produce a *tessera*, a token that proved that they were citizens.[690] The above imagery suggests that despite their status in the community, once appointed as Jesus' disciples, they belong to the Kingdom of God. In this case, just like Pindar constructs a family for his victor Epharmostos, who has no family history of victors,[691] Jesus creates for the new converts a new kinship which is not only wider than the present community to which they belong but also, by its association with God, eternal. For the new Christ-followers within the Lucan communities, many of whom would be destitute, the bestowal of blessings would have far-reaching implications.[692] It assured them that despite their status, they had a special place and value within the community of which the Lord God himself was the guardian. For the rich it would have been a call to a new conception of reality and one that would lead to the transformation of their values. It was a call to be like Zacchaeus (Lk 19:1-9) or like the poor widow (Lk 21:1-4). It was a call to depend on the Lord not material things.

Theologically, the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* was a Jewish religious concept.[693] As Mary Beavis has argued, together with Matthew's *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, the Kingdom of God reflects the development of the notion that God is King over Israel and the world, to the apocalyptic idea that God's reign will be eschatologically established when he will judge the nations and reward his people accordingly.[694] This understanding suggests that, except for those Gentiles formerly associated with the Synagogue, the concept of the Kingdom of God would have been a foreign one to many new converts. There were, however, Greco-Roman religious metaphors that had significant affinities with the idea of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ; the concepts of "being-God-loved" (θεοφιλής) and "god-loving" (θεόφιλοs).[695] The emphasis of these concepts on piety, relationship, and friendship with the gods and their physical and spiritual benefits resonates with the attributes of the Kingdom of God. Menander Rhetor summarises the idea of "being god-loved and god-loving":

[690] Even the rich possessed identical *tesserae* and received the same amount of bread as the more impoverished citizens. The image of the Roman civic community helps us to understand that the significant issue in the Sermon is not the salvation of the poor vs that of the rich, but how the two groups can co-exist.
[691] Pindar, *Olympiad*, 9.
[692] Friesen/Longenecker Greco-Roman Poverty/Economic scales suggests that most people were poor. This structure would also have been replicated within the Christ-groups. See, Friesen, 2004: 36-59.
[693] J. Squires, 1993: 25.
[694] Beavis, 2004: 93.
[695] Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 4.29; Plato, *Alcibiades* 1, 134.d.

Piety to the gods consists of two elements: being god-loved and god-loving. The former means being loved by the gods and receiving many blessings from them, and the latter consists of loving the gods and having a relationship of friendship with them.[696]

Menander's statement above underscores the relationship between piety and "being god-loved" and how the same piety expressed the idea of loving the gods. Therefore, although the meaning of *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* in Jewish theology had a deeper meaning beyond just being "god-loved", a Hellenistic audience would easily connect the first makarism with the idea of θεοφιλής and its implications on the god-loved. The *Hymn to Demeter* provides an example of a makarism that resonates with the implications of the blessedness of the destitute. The Hymn says:

.... *μέγ᾽ ὄλβιος, ὅν τιν᾽ ἐκεῖναι*
προφρονέως φίλωνται ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων:
αἶψα δέ οἱ πέμπουσιν ἐφέστιον ἐς μέγα δῶμα
Πλοῦτον, ὃς ἀνθρώποις ἄφενος θνητοῖσι δίδωσιν.[697]
Right blessed is he among men on earth whom they (the gods) freely love: soon they do send Plutus as a guest to his great house, Plutus who gives wealth to mortal men.

If being a *θεοφιλής* had such transformative powers, as in the above makarism, for the new Christ-followers entering the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* the same would have far richer implications. In the above makarisms in *Demeter* 485. 9, the material benefits accruing from "being god-loved" echo the privileges the poor would enjoy in the Kingdom of God in Luke 6: 20. These privileges, which Jesus promises in his Nazareth manifesto in 4:18-18, are reflected in the results of the succeeding makarisms: being filled and laughing (vv. 20-21). All this demonstrates that possessing the Kingdom was spiritually and physically transformative.

[696] Menander Rhetor, I. 361.17-25.
[697] *Hymn to Demeter*, 485-9.

It can also be observed that a conspicuous correspondence exists between being θεοφιλής and victory in the games on the one hand, and Jesus' appointment of the disciples and their reception into *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, on the other. This correspondence provides a framework for understanding the integrative function of the makarisms. As J.W. Slater has demonstrated, Greek victors attributed their victory to "divine hosting" in which one was awarded divine *ξενία* (hospitality) in the form of victory.[698] The divine hosting and its resulting victory estranged the victor from the community and made him a *ξένος* even among his people. Re-integration, therefore, involved among other things, the community celebrating the victor's success.[699] Similarly, through their appointment on the mountain, Jesus' disciples experience divine *ξενία*, and they are integrated into the Kingdom of God through the ceremony of praise thereafter. However, their experience of divine hosting surpasses that of Hellenistic victors. By the possession of the Kingdom of God, the disciples are assured of continuous "divine hosting." This Kingdom to which they belong is both realised and eschatological. Their triumphalism therefore, comes from the fact that because they have God himself, they will now have support from the structures of the life in the Kingdom of God.[700] Beyond that, with the ultimate divine victory over all, they will continue to enjoy the divine presence and all that it entails (Lk 22:29-30). Thus, as in Lk 13:29, the place of origin or status will no longer be a determinant of acceptance into the divine banquet but being known by the divine host (Lk 13:27). Jesus' role, in this case, is two-fold: by appointing the disciples on the mountain, he is the divine host responsible for the disciples' victory; and, beyond divine-hosting, Jesus is also the praise poet who before the multitudes (Lk 6:17) showers special honours of praise onto the new victors and recipients of the Kingdom of God.

5.3.2. Praising the Hungry

In continuing to extol the experience of vulnerability as the identity of his disciples, in v. 21a Jesus turns to the praise of those who hunger. He announces the οἱ *πεινῶντες*, those who are hungry as *μακάριοι*. The participle *πεινῶντες* from the verb *πεινάω* means to be hungry. According to Liddell and Scott, the cognate of *πεινάω*, *πίνακες* when used of household goods, implies empty dishes.[701] In Aristophanes' *Prometheus,* after humans stop offering sacrifices,

---

[698] Slater, 1969b: 67.
[699] Pindar, *Olympian*, 4.4–5.
[700] Talbert, 1886: 72.
[701] Liddell and Scott, 1996: 1168.

the gods are described as οἱ θεοὶ πεινῶντες, "the gods who are dying of hunger."[702] Plato, who combines πτωχοὶ with πεινῶντες, also uses the later with the sense of starving.[703] Thus, both lexically, and in its classical usage, the word πεινάω not only means those who hunger but those who suffer hunger, those who are starving, and famished.[704] In the OT, the term also indicated a desire for spiritual satisfaction (Isa 55:1; Amos 8:11; cf Sir 24; 21). According to Marshall, this spiritual sense cannot be excluded here.[705] However, in the Hellenistic context, the physical meaning of the word would have been the most immediate sense. It would, therefore, have represented not only the worst expression of destitution in the Greco-Roman world but also the most extreme condition in which any human can find themselves. Thus, to Jesus' and Luke's primary audience, and indeed any age, making such individuals as objects of honour was paradoxical.[706] Here Jesus enters the realm of adoxography whose object was to challenge conventional thinking.

It is, however, important to note that, like the destitute, the οἱ πεινῶντες are not honourable because they are hungry. They are blessed because they are θεοφιλής (god-loved). [707] They are, therefore, uniquely favoured to be recipients of good news in Lk 4:16-18 whose practical outworking becomes evident in their being chosen as disciples of Jesus from among many. They had experienced divine ξενία (v. 13) on the mountain and therefore, like Greek victors, were being recognised and received into the community. The implications of this blessedness, which is satisfaction, not only change their status but also define the nature of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. The verb used for satisfaction is χορτασθήσεσθε (verb 2nd pl. fut. ind. pass.) from χορτάζω, which means to feed or fatten.[708] In a few of its classical contexts, the word is used with the sense of feeding animals.[709] This understanding suggests the privilege of not toiling for daily existence but having everything provided. The use of the future passive, χορτασθήσεσθε, "you will be fed" confirms the sense of Kingdom provisions for those who are blessed.

---

[702] Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1520, tr. Eugene O'Neill.
[703] Plato, *Republic*, 7.521a, tr. John Burnet.
[704] Liddell and Scott, 1996: 1168.
[705] Marshall, 1978: 250.
[706] Byrne, 2002: 76.
[707] This can be understood as in *Hymn to Demeter*, 485-9, tr. Hugh G. Evelyn-White.
[708] LSJ at Perseus, χορτάζω.
[709] Liddell and Scott, 1996: 1735; Hesiod also uses the word with the sense of feeding oxen. Hesiod, *Work and Days*, 452; Plato uses the ἐχόρταζες to refer to the feeding of pigs. Plato, *Republic*, 372d.

The above meaning of *χορτάζω* echoes the experience of later Greek professional athletes. Although some of them came from a class of low-born, uneducated, and vulgar men,[710] they received special honours from their cities on account of their victory in the games. One of the highest honours which a Greek city could give a citizen was σίτησις or 'free dining' in the Prytaneion.[711] This honour was a life-long grant of maintenance from the city for gaining an athletic or equestrian victory in the games.[712] In his *Olympian Ode* 7 Pindar exemplifies the bleesedness of being praised for winning in the games as resulting in Χάρις ζωθάλμιος,[713] "Grace, which causes life to flourish."

Similarly, Jesus announces satisfaction to the disciples arising out of their appointment into his discipleship and subsequent possession of the Kingdom of God. In this new relationship, the disciples will no longer toil as their basic needs will be provided for. Most scholars project this satisfaction into the eschaton.[714] While the eschatological banquet cannot be ruled out, understood in light of Lk 4: 18-19, it is likely that a present aspect is also in view. Some scholars like Nolland and Tannehill give room to a realised element to the makarisms above.[715] It is, therefore, possible that in the above makarism, Luke was projecting back a nostalgic image of the ideal community of Christ-followers in Acts where, through *κοινωνία*, everyone's needs were supplied (Acts 4:34-35). Understood from the perspective of Acts 4:34-35, 42, it is likely that by Luke's time, the community had been marred by a lack of philanthropy. In the above makarism, Jesus looks beyond the present suffering of the disciples to a time of their restoration. Since the Kingdom of God, to which the disciples now belonged was both temporal and eschatological, the provision of satisfaction will take the same dimensions: present and future. Jesus' acts of generosity in Lk 9:17 mirrors the present manifestation of the makarisms whose ultimate consummation lies into the future. Thus, the imagery in the makarisms brings to the audience the awareness of penury and hunger among them as product of dysfunctional relationships and the need to address the problem.

---

[710] Smith, Wayte, and Marindin, at Perseus, *ἀθληταί*.
[711] Salazar, Brill online, URL. 2019.
[712] Prichard, 2012: 19-22.
[713] Pindar, *Olympia*n 7.10.
[714] Marshall, 1978: 251; Green, 1997: 267; Fitzmyer, 1981:634.
[715] Nolland, 1989: 285; Tannehill, 1996:116.

Hilary Mackie has demonstrated that one general function of the victory odes was to locate and interpret the significance of the victory, not only concerning the present concerns and events of long ago but also in the light of the future time that is to come.[716] Praise, therefore, mapped out a possible future course for the individual arising out of their victory.[717] Correspondingly, for the new Christ-followers, Jesus' bestowal of satisfaction paints a positive picture of the disciples' destiny; they will be filled. However, Jesus does not explain the way this satisfaction will be provided. It can be argued that Jesus' "deliberate failure" to outline how the hungry will be fed had rhetorical significance in the community. It was meant to create suspense and surprise in his audience. By leaving the audience wondering how this would be possible, Jesus both challenges and stretches his audience's imagination on the possibility of an inclusive and harmonious community beyond the present broken one. Stephen Witetschek, after a comparative analysis of social fasting in support for others in Gospel of Thomas 69 and its parallel in Origen, argues that this makarism encourages the need for social support for the poor within the community. Thus, the hungry will be filled not sometime in the future but by the support of others who, if need be, may even make a genuine sacrifice for that purpose.[718] Witetschek's argument underscores the underlying motif behind the Sermon: communion between the rich and the destitute. The problem with the argument, however, is that it makes it difficult to establish the actual recipients of the second makarism; are they the actual hungry/destitute or those who are fasting (hungry) in order to help the poor? Nevertheless, Witetschek's point underscores the fact that whenever the rich, such as Barnabas (Acts 4:36-37), made sacrifices on behalf of the destitute, they conformed to the values of the new community: weakness; dependency; vulnerability and its corresponding freedom to give. In the latter part of the Sermon (Lk 6: 27-49) these values become part of the bigger question of building a harmonious community.

5.3.3. Praising those who Mourn

In v. 21b, Jesus designates his disciples as the *κλαίοντες* "those who cry." The word *κλαίω* means "to cry, wail, lament" and is related to any loud expression of pain or sorrow.[719] It could

[716] See, Mackie, 2003: 77.
[717] Ibid.
[718] Witetschek, 2010: 390.
[719] LSJ at Perseus, *κλαίω*; Marshall, 1978:251.

also refer to any expression of sadness and care or anxiety[720] or the mourning of the dead. Weeping can also arise from rejection, ridicule, and loss.[721] As Brown has shown, the *plebs* of Rome included many who were chronically undernourished and vulnerable to disease.[722] Thus, apart from lamenting the dead, crying, wailing and lamenting were the physical expression of the destitute and the labourer who had to endure daily physical exhaustion and hunger and disease.[723] This position also finds support from Nolland who notes that hunger and weeping are all expressions of poverty.[724] Yet even in this deplorable condition, Jesus announces to the weepers that they are honoured. The good news from the above makarism is that they will no longer cry or wail, but instead, they will laugh, *γελάσετε* (fut. plu. of *γελάω*). Except in Lk 6:21, 25, laughing does not appear in the NT, and in the LXX, it is usually superficial and scornful.[725] Green sees the laughter here in v. 21b as a celebration of divine restoration.[726] Marshall holds that the meaning of *γελάω* reflects the neutral sense of the word in the Hellenistic world.

Marshall's conception of the meaning of *γελάω* agrees with Stephen Halliwell's insightful analysis of the uses of laughter in Greek culture. Halliwell argued that there are two uses of laughter in Greek culture.[727] The first was playful laughter which was indicated by the language of *παιδιά* (childhood), *παίζειν* (to play a sport like a child) or *παιγνία*, (playful),[728] and the other was consequential laughter which was associated with scorn or derision.[729] A close study of playful laughter in Greek literature reveals an intriguing association with meals or banquets. For example, in Aristophanes' play, *Frogs,* the context of *παίζων* (playfulness) suggests the state of being *ἐξαρκούντως* (indecl. adv.), "sufficiently filled."[730] In another play, the *Birds,* Aristophanes further connects laughter with youthfulness, choruses, banquets, and feasts as the gift of the gods.[731] The relationship between laughter and banqueting is also evident in the *Iliad*,

---

720 BDAG, 2000: 545.
721 Green, 1997: 268.
722 Brown, 2002: 5.
723 Ibid. It could also refer to the act of lamenting of the dead (cf. Rom. 12:15).
724 Nolland, 1989: 283.
725 Green, 1997: 267; Marshall, 1978: 251.
726 Ibid.
727 Halliwell, 1991: 279-296. Halliwell's findings are supported by Mary Beard's recent book, *Laughter in Ancient Rome,*2014.
728 Ibid. 280, Theognis 1211, *παίζουσα*, Aristophanes, *Frogs,* 375, *παίζων*.
729 Ibid. 286. As in *Iliad* 2.211-77, where Thersites taunts Agamemnon.
730 Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 375.
731 Aristophanes, *Birds*, 732, *πλουθυγιεία* (wealth and health) *εὐδαιμονία βίος* (long life) *εἰρήνη* (peace) *νεότης* (youth) *γέλως* (laughter) *χορόι* (dance) *θαλία* (good cheer/feast).

wherein, after a long period of strained divine relationships, a great γέλως, (laughter) emerges at Mount Olympus, as the gods feast together again.[732] The above context suggests that the laughter of those who mourn is connected to the idea of the Kingdom of God and its implications for the provisions of its members. It echoed athletic victors laughing and banqueting with the leaders of the *polis* and Athenian ambassadors in the Prytaneion. In his table-fellowship with sinners (Lk 5:29-32) and the poor (Lk 9:10-17), Jesus manifests the immediate aspect to the fulfilment of this makarism. Beyond its realised aspects, the laughter of those who mourn also foretells the eschatological, δεῖπνον, banquet (Lk 14:16) in which the τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπείρους καὶ τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς (Lk 12: 21) partake by invitation.[733]

5.3.4. Praising the Ostracised

In the last makarism (v. 22) Jesus pronounces honour on those who, on account of the son of man, are hated, excluded, insulted and will have their names rejected as evil. This is the only makarism that describes the experience of the disciples in the future. Scholars like Betz, Fitzmyer, Tannehill, Neyrey and Nolland have different views on the relationship of this makarism with the previous three makarisms.[734] They hold that this makarism reflects a different context from that of the first three makarisms. This view has contributed to the argument that this makarism was never part of the original three. However, the separation of the fourth makarism from the rest is not necessary. As already previously demonstrated in chapter 4 and above, there is a strong relationship between destitution, hunger, mourning, and ostracism. Marshall also argues that there is nothing strange about ostracism being coupled with the other makarisms.[735] As it comes to us, the makarism reflects a logical social response to the experience of poverty in the Greco-Roman world.

The reference to the υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "the son of man", as the basis for the social ostracism of the disciples has led many to think about the οἱ ἄνθρωποι in v. 22 as outsiders.[736] While this

[732] Homer, *Iliad*, 1.595-600.
[733]The word מִשְׁתֶּה (feast/banquet) appears 43 times in the OT. Although the word is not mentioned in Ex. 24:11, the context of the covenant meal with God at Sinai (Ex. 24.11) conveys the idea of a banquet. In Isaiah 25:6 the eschatological banquet is envisaged.
[734] Betz, 1995: 2, 25; Marshall, 1978:247; Fitzmyer, 1981: 634; Tannehill, 1996:115; Neyrey, 1995: 139-157; Nolland, 1989: 284.
[735] Marshall, 1978: 252.
[736] Danker, 1988:141; Nolland, 1989: 284; Topel, 2001: 103-104.

is true when understood from the historical persecution of the early Christian movement, a lexical and contextual analysis of vv. 22-23 reveals that the envisaged persecution was probably also internal. There is a group of four lexically related verbs that describe the future experience of the disciples. The first verb used is *μισέω* which means "to become detestable to", or "to dislike."[737] The second verb is *ἀφορίσωσιν* (fut. Indic. Plur.) from *ἀφορίζω* meaning "to mark off by boundaries."[738] It can also mean to distinguish, determine, define and therefore, exclude.[739] The third verb is *ὀνειδίσωσιν* from *ὀνειδίζω*, which means to throw a reproach or an insult upon one.[740] Lastly, the disciples are described as those who are subject to others who *ἐκβάλωσιν* (from *ἐκβάλλω*) them, meaning to cast out, remove or got rid of as *πονηρὸς*, evil (v. 22). In an honour and shame culture, the above references would be among the most demeaning experiences for the disciples. For the rich, it would imply the loss of prestige and connections and a possible loss of fortune.

From the perspective of external persecution, Neyrey thinks that all the makarisms describe the composite fate of a disciple who has been ostracised as a rebellious son for his loyalty to Jesus.[741] Thus, loss of livelihood resulting from disinheritance has led to their present desperate situation. Neyrey's position could be correct given the period in which the Third Gospel was written when external persecution of followers of Jesus was beginning to take shape. On the other hand, to agree with Neyrey, some believers could have been disowned by their families and therefore become destitute due to lack of support in times of need. It is also possible that Jesus' claim to bringing *διαμερισμός*, "division" (Lk 12:51-52), within families could be an allusion to how conversion undermined family kinship bonds. This was bound to have economic implications for some of the Christ-followers. In this case, as Braun argues, such ostracism would have been experienced even by a wealthy patron who invited destitute Christians for table fellowship and was consequently ostracised for it.[742] Braun's point makes sense in the context of Jesus' call to the rich to be generous to the poor (Lk 14:12-24). For converted patrons, undermining the culture of reciprocity would have had significant implications on their relationship with their peers, both internal and external. Thus, the

[737] Mounce, 1993: 321; See also Homer, *Iliad*. 17.272.
[738]LSJ at Perseus *ἀφορ-ίζω*.
[739]Ibid.
[740] LSJ at Perseus, *ὀνειδίζω*.
[741] Neyrey, 1995: 139-157.
[742] Braun in Balch, 2003: 1116.

makarism in question, among other things, probably prepares Theophilus for what he might face for choosing to become a follower of Jesus and associating with those outside his class within the Christ-groups. The parable of the banquet therefore reinforces this understanding of interclass association (Lk 14:12-24) and its implications for those of the rich who took such a bold step.

It also possible that the persecution was internal to the community. For example, Luke's reference to διασπαρέντες, ("being scattered") of the disciples in Acts 8:4, suggests social displacement and possible loss of livelihood for those without a roving trade like that of Paul. This could have resulted in destitution. In the new towns to which they had been scattered, these Christ-followers would have been ostracised by fellow Christians for being poor. Their poverty would not be caused by their laziness but from their association with the Son of Man. A close parallel can be drawn from the problem of idleness in Paul's Thessalonian correspondence (1 Thes. 4:9-12; 2 Thes. 3:6-16). We do not know whether all members of the church were foreigners or were indigenous to Thessalonica. While we also do not know why some of them were idle, it also likely that foreigners with no mobile trade like Paul would have struggled to find work in a new context. It is also possible that, given the eschatological context of the discussion, some of them could given up work in order to preach the gospel and, therefore, became a burden to the rest of the membership.[743] In such contexts internal marginalisation could have been possible. This marginalisation could indirectly be attributed to the name of Jesus for whom they had given up everything.

The evidence of social marginalisation in Greco-Roman voluntary associations supports the presence of social ostracism within Luke's Christ-groups.[744] Although the Christ-groups were in some ways different from Greco-Roman voluntary associations, the significant affinities between the two suggest the possibility of internal strife based on social ostracism within the Christ-groups. Marginalisation was also already noticeable very early in Acts 6:1-5. It was therefore probable that some of Christ-followers were experiencing internal ostracism. That some had their names cast out as evil could be related to the idea of judging (κρίνω, 6:37) from which the Christ-followers are advised to desist. The word κρίνω has the sense of separating,

[743] Morris, 1884: 87; Furnish, 2007: 97.
[744] Anatouglou, 1998: 82.

putting asunder, and distinguishing,[745] which makes it close in meaning to ἀφορίζω. Paul uses the word κρίνω extensively in his discourse against his detractors (I Cor. 3) where he urges them not to judge him but to let God be the judge (1 Cor. 4:5). It can be contended that the detractors' attitude towards Paul has the same pattern of social ostracism as that of Lk 6. 22. They did not like Paul's style of ministry (i.e. they hated him) and were, therefore, bent on undermining (demonising) him and his ministry and making him irrelevant (cast out) to the Corinthians. Incidentally, those committed to putting Paul's person and ministry (2 Cor. 10:7) into disrepute are not outsiders but fellow Christ-followers. The above example from Paul provides a community context in which one's name could probably have been "cast out as evil."

It is also to be observed that although Jesus may seem to extol the disciples' ostracism, it is not just their suffering that is at issue but also their ability to endure these experiences. It is this endurance to follow Jesus, despite social exclusion, which makes them more than Greco-Roman heroes. The theme of endurance and perseverance is further developed in the parables of persistence in prayer in Lk 11:5-13, the parable of the persistent widow in Lk 18:1-8 and the shrewd steward in Lk 16:1-8a. The importance of this endurance was underlined by the promise of μισθός, (reward), which lies ahead (Lk 6. 23). The word μισθός had both physical and spiritual meaning.[746] The underlying meaning of the word μισθός is "hire", and it refers to recompense or reward for work done.[747] It can also mean recognition by the gods for the moral quality of an action.[748] Plato mentions μισθός together with ἆθλον, as the prize of a contest, and δῶρον as both the gift of honour, one which the just man will receive from both gods and men even before their death.[749] For victors of games, aspects of the reward included a seat of honour, an extra-share of meat at the festival, and various other prizes including land.[750]

[745] LSJ at Perseus, κρίνω.

[746] The basic New Testament designation for a prize is βραβεῖον, cf 1 Cor. 9.24; Phil 3:14, or στέφανος, a crown of victory in 2 Tim 4:8.

[747] BDAG, 2000: 653.

[748] Plato, *Republic*, 10:614a.

[749] Plato says: "While he lives, the just man receives from god and men the prizes, (ἆθλα) the wages, (μισθοί) and the gifts, (δῶρα) in addition to those blessings which justice herself bestowed." For the winners of the athletic games, the grand ἆθλον was usually wreath made from a sacred olive branch. The wreath whose value was symbolic, not monetary, represented honour. Plato, *Republic*, 10:614a, tr. John Burnet. See also Herodotus, in 8.26 who reports, "they fight οὐ περὶ χρημάτων ... ἀλλὰ περὶ ἀρετῆς."

[750] Pomeroy, Burstein, Donlan and Roberts, 1999: 61.

Within the above context of Greek rewards, Jesus promised a much greater reward in heaven for those who endure suffering for his name's sake (v. 23). While the location of the reward in heaven makes the disciples' triumph over persecution futuristic, a realised dimension to the heavenly reward is also conspicuous behind the text. The present construction *γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, "for your reward is great in heaven*",* contemporises the reward. The present construction presents the picture of the prize as already won, by virtue of the disciples' relationship with Jesus, only to be acquired at the end of the battle. In the Greek context, *οὐρανός* denoted the skies above and beyond the *αἰθήρ* (ether) penetrated by the peaks of Mount Olympus, the home of the gods.[751] It is from there that the gods sent blessings to mortals.[752] To Luke's Hellenistic audience, Jesus' promises of a final triumph for the persecuted disciples would have significant implications on how they would face their social challenges. It made their daily physical existence as the arena or stadium in which to play out the heroic agonistic feats capable of qualifying for the great heavenly prize, this time, not from Mount Olympus but from God who dwells beyond Olympus, the father of Jesus.

In the last part of the final makarism, Jesus compares the experience of the persecuted disciples with that of ancient prophets. From Luke's reference to the killing of Zechariah (Lk 11:51), the *πατέρες* and *προφῆται* refer to Judean ancestors and OT prophets, respectively.[753]Although Luke's audience had an adequate working knowledge of Israelite tradition,[754] yet in a Hellenistic context, the reference to *γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν*, could also evoke reminiscences of the suffering of classical prophets.[755] It would evoke the memory of the blind seer Tiresias who was thrown out by Oedipus when he revealed that he (Oedipus) was the one who had killed King Laius of Thebes, only to learn the truth later.[756] It reminded them of

---

751 Homer, *Iliad*, 2.455-58.
752 *Hymn to Demeter*, 485-9.
753 Fitzmyer, 1981: 636.
754 According to Esler (1987:45) this would probably come from their previous association with the synagogue and Septuagintal Greek.
755 See, Homer, *Iliad*. 4.405, Ody. 8.245. In classical texts, the word *πατέρες* referred to fathers, or forefathers, or ancestors. In this case, the terms *οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν*, "their fathers" in v. 23 could refer to either Judean or Greco-Roman ancestry of the audience in question. The word *προφήτης* was the standard New Testament designation for prophets, seers and diviners. In the Greek world, the word *μάντις* was another common designation for prophets. See, Aeschylus, A*gamemnon*, 195-200; Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 25-30, *ἔπειτα μάντις ἐς θρόνους καθιζάνω*, "I take my seat on the throne as a prophetess"; Aristophanes, *Plutus*, 10-15 *ἰατρὸς ὢν καὶ μάντις*, prophet and diviner.
756 Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 430. *οὐκ εἰς ὄλεθρον; οὐχὶ θᾶσσον; οὐ πάλιν ἄψορρος οἴκων τῶνδ᾽ ἀποστραφεὶς ἄπει*, "Begone, to your ruin; be gone this instant! Will you not turn your back and leave this house?" tr. F. Storr.

Bacchus who, although he was both a prophet and god, was rejected by his family.[757] They would also not only remember how the prophetess Cassandra, daughter of Priam, was carried off to Greece as a captive and slain by Clytaemnestra,[758] but also how she was known as a prophetess whose prophecies though always true, none believed.[759] It can be argued that by relating the experience of the disciples to that of the old prophets, the disciples join the continuum of great personalities. Thus, like Greco-Roman victors, they enter the family of victors across time. The appeal to social-cultural categories of honour and shame would have created a useful transition of the Christ-followers from "paganism" to the Christian faith in the Greco-Roman context.

It can also further be argued that the future orientation of the fourth makarism and its promise of reward was very important for new converts. It prepared them for their everyday experience both in the community and society at large. Apart from reinforcing the idea of the Christ-followers as Greco-Roman victors who deserved praise and honour, the idea of the reward from heaven also served to emphasize that the new life in Christ represented an *ἀγών*, a contest. That the Christian life was not only a struggle fought in the daily exigencies of life but also one through which victory will be realised.

The integrative power of the above imagery of praising the unpraisable could have had far-reaching implications on the new Gentile Christ-followers, whether poor or rich. By starting with the praise of those least regarded in the community and associating them with the Kingdom of God, the Sermon was transformative. The praise of the poor reinforced weakness, powerlessness, and vulnerability as the new identity of those coming into the community. In this way, the Sermon challenged the popular perception of and attitude towards destitution in the community. For the destitute new Christ-followers, the association with *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* conferred value on their individual lives and inspired them not to waver despite the physical and social challenges affecting their daily life. For the rich converts, the praise of destitution represented symbolic integration into the Kingdom values of weakness, vulnerability, and dependency on the Lord. In the fashion of "symbolic violence" characteristic of Greco-Roman

[757] But this god is also prophet—for Bacchic revelry and madness have in them much prophetic skill. See Euripides, *Bacchae*, 298.
[758] Iliad, 13.366, 24.699; *Odyssey*, 11.422.
[759] Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2.46-48.

voluntary associations,[760] it challenged their misguided conception of themselves and their fellow Christi-followers who were destitute.

The praise of destitution also shook the conventional understanding of kinship for both the poor and rich. As Esler and Byrne argued, by questioning the propriety and, therefore, the legitimacy of the entire system of social stratification in Hellenistic cities, Luke relativises what most people hold as advantages and disadvantages.[761]This relativisation, therefore, provided a starting point for the conception of an inclusive community among Christ-followers. Within the context of this understanding, it can be argued that Jesus' latter call on the rich to sell their possessions and share with the destitute (Lk 18:22; 19:2) was not to be understood as a call to destitution. It was instead a call to the rich to repudiate their notion of kinship and friendship which confined their practice of κοινωνία within their immediate circles. It is a call to finding security not in transient wealth but in their relationship with God. Understanding Jesus' demand in this way gave the rich the freedom to give without expecting to receive (Lk 6:32-36; 14:12-14), believing that their security lies not in the material wealth but in their being part of the Kingdom.

5.3.5. The Woes (vv. 24-26) and the Transformation of Social Reality

The woes section of the makarisms and woes Lk 6: 24-26 presents a surprising contrast to the blessedness of the disciples in Lk 6: 20-23. As a result of this difference, some scholars think that the woes were not originally part of Q; that the church composed them as a commentary on the makarisms.[762] However, as we have already demonstrated, the panegyric orientation of the Sermon suggests that the makarisms as praise and woes blame form the essential constituents of its panegyric function. Tannehill holds that the underlying conviction behind the woes is that those who hoard what the poor need are held responsible before God.[763] Fitzmyer further argues that the woes are aimed at the privileged listeners of Jesus and emphasize the ephemeral nature of such privilege.[764] As already pointed out in chapter 3, in a praise context,

760 Anatouglou, 1998: 79.
761 Esler, 1987:189; Byrne, 2002: 77.
762 Nolland (1989:118) thinks vv. 25-38 were not part of Luke's first edition; that they lack strong links with vv. 22-24 and, therefore, probably came as a separate tradition.
763 Tannehill, 1996: 115.
764 Fitzmyer; 1981: 636.

blame helped in admonishing the victor against *hubris*, "not to seek to become Zeus."[765] This blame was necessary because, due to the personal honour they acquired as a result of the victory, the Νικητές (victors), like the rich, were often prone to pride. As Nolland observes, riches ensnare those who possess them into a false set of values and loyalties (Lk 12:13-12).[766] It makes them, as Plummer describes the rich in v. 25, "sated with the good things of this life."[767] In a community context, preoccupation with satisfaction would potentially lead to arrogance and the neglect of the destitute. Thus, because of the victors' propensity for *hubris,* praise poets often warned their victors. Thus, in the middle of his praise of Khromios of Aetna for his victory in the four-horse chariot race Pindar has this to say:

> Son of Hagesidamus, your way of life grants you the enjoyment of many things. I take no pleasure in keeping great wealth hidden away in my hall, but in using what I have to be successful and to win a good name by helping my friends.[768]

In another instance, Bacchylides offers a tirade of wealth in the middle of praising his victor. He argues:

> Wealth keeps company with worthless men as well,
> and it tends to swell a man's thoughts;
> but he who does well to the gods cheers his heart with a more glorious hope.[769]

By drawing attention to the corrupting power of wealth, which their hosts should avoid, both poets underscore the importance of blame in praise context. Bacchylides also indirectly urges his host to do well to the gods, which in Greek context implied loving the gods and treating other human beings kindly, as Pindar also admonishes.[770]

---

765 See, Kurke, 2001: 64. The word hubris referred to arrogance arising from pride of strength or passion. LSJ, ὕβρις.
766 Nolland, 1989: 287.
767 Plummer, 1989:182. The participle ἐμπεπλησμένοι (v. 25) means "to fill to the full".
768 Pindar, *Nemean* 1:30-31 tr., Diane Arnson Svarlien.
769 Bacchylides*, Epinicion Ode* 1:190, tr., Diane Arnson Svarlien.
770 Menander, 1.361; Crates, *Elegy and Iambus*, Vol. II, 2.15.2

It can, therefore, be argued that just as praise poets both praised and blamed their victors, in vv. 20-26, Luke's Jesus both praises and warns the new Christ-followers to be vigilant and to know the limits of their privileges in the Kingdom of God. The use of the blame *topos* in vv. 24-26 presents a two-dimensional picture of reality for the new Christ-followers. By pronouncing woes on the rich, after praising the destitute, Jesus reveals not only the transitory nature of material wealth and social prestige but also the final *telos* of worldly riches. The phrase "they have received their *παράκλησις*" (v. 24) demonstrates the finite nature of material wealth. This nature significantly contrasts with the fate of the destitute in v. 20, whose inheritance is the Kingdom of God.[771] Therefore, within the Lucan communities, Jesus' denigration of the rich served to discourage exclusive dependence on riches at the expense of *κοινωνία*. Jesus clarifies this motif against greed later in his teachings and parables. It becomes explicit in his warning to guard against all kinds of greed since the abundance of possessions (Lk 12:15) does not constitute life. The parable of the rich fool (12:13-21), the parable of destitute Lazarus and the rich man (16:19-31), and the later generosity of Zacchaeus (19:1-10) demonstrate the importance of responsible use of wealth.[772]

Jesus' blame of the rich also offered an alternative reality to living a fulfilled life for Jesus' disciples and those embracing the new faith in Luke's community. It underscores the fact that it was possible for the Christ-followers to be satisfied, to laugh, and be accepted without being rich. This is because, like victors of the games, within the Kingdom of God, the disciples' physical and social needs are provided for. And beyond that, the Christ-followers would also endure social persecution and eventually receive their greater rewards as victors. In this case, the ancient games and the victory odes not only provided a significant framework for the integration of the new Christ-followers in the community but also for the formation of their identity in Christ. This framework gave new converts certainty (Lk 1:4) and direction for the new spiritual journey upon which they were embarking.

[771] LSJ at Perseus, παρακαλέω, "to call to one's side ... summon to one's aid, call upon for help."
[772] See also Danker, 1988: 284.

5.4. THE SERMON AS AN EARLY CHRIST-FOLLOWERS' EASTER PANEGYRIC

As already argued in the previous chapter, the aural experience of the Sermon for Theophilus and his fellow new converts would have been slightly different from that of the rest of Christ-followers. While the Sermon had an integrative function for the new converts, for the other members of the communities it represented the ever-present reminder of the brokenness of their communities and the constant need to renew them. Green observes that in rhetorical situations an individual group could serve as the formal addressee even though in fact, the speaker is addressing all.[773] Thus, as with the broader festival audience, the Sermon's praise and blame combined with exhortation had several panegyric functions; educational, patronal and ritual. These functions served to reinforce the conception of powerlessness, dependency, and vulnerability as the identity of the Christ-followers.

5.4.1. Educational Function

From the Sermon's thrust, and from the initial proclamation in Luke 4:16-30, it can be observed that the major challenge affecting the Lucan churches was the relationship between the rich and the destitute. This thrust is also evident in the whole Gospel's preoccupation with poverty and riches. The Easter festival, therefore, provided the proper context of θεωρία in which social differences between the rich and poor were suspended and replaced with a community-generated identity. It is difficult to determine whether the rich were there during Jesus' delivery of the Sermon. However, from Jesus' praise of the destitute and denigration of the rich, it is inevitable that both the rich and poor were part of the Lucan communities. In Greco-Roman oratory, one factor that determined the direction of praise and blame was the size of the divergent group, and in most cases, praise often went towards the majority in the audience.[774] This suggests that the poor were probably the majority in the Lucan community.

A critical analysis of Luke-Acts demonstrates that the rich were also part of the Lucan churches. The reference to Theophilus as *κράτιστος*, excellent, distinguished (Lk 1:4; Acts 1:1) suggests a status commensurate with being rich.[775] However, Levine and Witherington argue that the

[773] Green, 1997: 266.
[774] In some instances, orators tended to castigate those who were absent (Jehne, 2011: 111). In Luke's churches, however, the sermon was probably directed at the whole group-both poor and rich.
[775] LSJ at Perseus, *κρατιστ-ος*.

term does not entail someone rich but a patron who can pay Luke.[776] This observation is a contradiction in terms because, in the Greco-Roman world, the ability to sponsor an art project by itself suggested someone of no small means. The word κράτιστος is sometimes used with reference to the landed gentry.[777] It can also be argued, as Levine and Witherington observe, that the generic nature of the name Theophilus could imply that there was more than one person with the status of κράτιστος within the Lucan churches.[778] There are also several indicators in the gospel that point to the presence of the rich in Lucan communities. In fact, as some scholars hold, most of Luke's parables dealing with wealth, such as that of the rich fool (Lk 12:13-21) and the parable of the lost coins and sheep (Lk 15:1-10), would make sense to a community with a significant number of the rich. The presence of the women from Herod's household (Lk 8:3) and property owners like Barnabas (Acts 4:37) suggests the presence of individuals above the level of subsistence within Lucan churches. Luke's favourable reference to ἑκατόνταρχοι (*centurions*) (Lk 7:2; 23:27, Acts 10:22; 27:43) who were often seen as benefactors demonstrates the presence of the rich in Lucan communities.[779]

Thus, from the above data, a certain level of social differences existed within the Lucan communities. Understood from the perspective of epideictic theory, the Sermon's praise of the poor and blame for the rich suggests that something was wrong within the community that needed to be addressed. As Sheard has demonstrated, in conventional *encomia* to praise (or blame) a man was akin to urging a course of action.[780] It is therefore likely that the Sermon's use of the corresponding pairs of poverty-riches, hunger-satisfaction, mourning-laughing, and ostracism-reward suggests that the poor were at the receiving end of marginalisation in the community. The reference in Acts 6:1 to the neglect of the χῆραι, widows, (Acts 6:1) is also a probable indication of marginalisation of the poor in the community.

From Lk 6: 27-49, it is possible to draw out some of the issues that rocked the fictive community of Christ-followers built from socially differentiated individuals. Given that the Sermon is addressed to the disciples (Lk 6: 20a), the exhortation not to hinder someone from taking one's

---

776 Levine and Witherington, 1918: 23.
777 Xenophone, *Hellenica*, 7.1.42.
778 Levine and Witherington, 2018: 23.
779 See, Howell, 2008: 25-51.
780 Sheard, 1996: 780.

cloak (v. 29) and to give to everyone who asks (v. 30) demonstrates the presence of those who had and those who did not have and also the problem of exchange and sharing between two socially differentiated groups. The above injunctions not only echoes the period when the Christ-followers had everything in κοινά (Acts 2:44) but also looks forward to a time when the broken κοινωνία, evident from individuality of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-10) and social marginalisation of widows (Acts 6:1-5), would no longer define the interpersonal relationships among Christ-followers.

In view of the above understanding, Jesus' bestowal of honour on the destitute, the hungry, the mourning, and the ostracised would have had important pedagogical effects. It represented both an encouragement and a challenge to the conception of riches and poverty in the community, and a call to a renewed relationship between the rich and the poor. First, the *encomium* on the poor would have reinvigorated those who kept the spirit of κοινωνία in the community alive. It is likely that unlike the rich, the poor would have found it easier to engage in fellowship with anyone in the community. For example, the poor widow's giving in Lk 21:1-4 provides a Lucan parallel to the magnanimity of the poor. Her ability to put in πάς ὁ βίος (v. 4) "all her livelihood," confirms this spirit. Athenagoras' *Legatio* provides a further example of the spirit of κοινωνία among the poor when he says:

> But among us you find uneducated persons and artisans, and old women, who, if they are unable to prove the benefits of doctrine, yet their deeds exhibit the benefits arising from the benefits of its truth; they do not rehearse speeches, but exhibit good works; when struck, they do not strike again, when robbed, they do not go to the law; they give to those that ask of them, and love their neighbours as themselves.[781]

Athenagoras' poor Christians come from late second century CE and therefore are far removed from Luke's time. Yet their description, which reflects the language of the gospel, partly resonated with the liberal spirit of the poor widow in Lk 21:1-4.[782] In epideictic terms, the

[781] Legatio 11.4.
[782] It is also possible that some of the rich Christians like Barnabas (Acts 4:36) would have been the beacons of hope for κοινωνία in the Lucan communities.

praising of the poor would have been part of the regular socialisation and inculcation of individuals into the time-honoured ethos of the community. Constant exposure to the Sermon would have helped to reinforce the community's values and accustomed the Christ-followers both as individuals and as a group to the standards of behaviour and public conduct acceptable in the community.

Second, Jesus' promise of the Kingdom of God to the poor and its corresponding attributes of satisfaction, laughter (Lk 6:20-24) and rewards (v. 23) also represented a social indictment of the rich who neglected their responsibility to their fellow Christ-followers. The social indictment had significant pedagogical import. By praising the unpraisable and bestowing honour on the destitute with its promises, Luke demonstrates that the rich are not eternally better than the poor. It was only a matter of time before the destitute enjoy the same privileges as the rich (16:19-31).[783] In this way, Jesus relativized the unique status of the rich. The relativisation of status understood in light of the reversal in (vv. 24-26) must have created "status dissonance" for the rich which they had to deal with to maintain their status. John Bodel defines status dissonance as the discrepancy that occurs when a person is ranked higher in one or more categories but low in others.[784] Failure to maintain social prestige was one of the most shameful things for any Greco-Roman male. Status discrepancy was also a significant catalyst for mobility in highly stratified societies. Therefore, the praise of the destitute combined with a tirade against the rich (vv. 24-26) signified a low rating for the latter in the community and would have had life-changing pedagogical implications against the rich.[785] The fear of status loss and prestige would have provided the rich with the impetus to work for an inclusive understanding of kinship and friendship and more responsible and pragmatic use of wealth.[786]

[783] The promises accorded the poor, satisfaction, laughter and rewards, echo the Lucan conception of the fate of the poor and the rich in the afterlife, where everyone will be equal. See Lucian, *Mortuorum Dialogue*, 1.4.
[784] See Bodel, 2015: 29-44.
[785] Status dissonance is a branch of Cognitive Dissonance Theory in Psychology which has also been used in the social-scientific analysis of NT texts and other extra-biblical texts. Cognitive consistency theories are based on the assumption that the preferred state of an individual's cognitive universe is that of consistency or non-contradiction between cognitions. Dissonance reduction can be achieved in several ways, one of which is changing behaviour to accord with environmental cognition. See Aune, 2007: 12-13; Esler, 1994: 110-130.
[786] The new attitude to wealth would reflect Pindar's statement "I take no pleasure in keeping great wealth hidden away in my hall, but in using what I have to be successful and to win a good name by helping my friends." Pindar, *Nemean* 1.30-31, tra. D. Svarlien.

It needs to be pointed out, as Bock has also argued, that Jesus' praise of the destitute and denigration of the rich does not imply that rich Christ-followers were disqualified from the Kingdom.[787] Understood from a panegyric and community context, the praise of the poor was meant to highlight the commonly held values which, influenced by the prevailing conceptions of kinship and friendship, were continuously challenged by self-interest in the community. It emphasised that the poor, even in their destitution, are not to be undervalued as useless. They are as valuable members of the community of Christ-followers as are the rich. The above approach suggests that praise was directed to both the poor and the rich in the community. This practice was common in panegyric speeches. For example, Isocrates, in his call for Athens to return to rule by the Areopagus, argues:

> But let no one think that this eulogy is appropriate to those who compose the present government—far from it; for such words are a tribute to those who show themselves worthy of the valour of their forefathers, but a reproach to those who disgrace their noble origin by their slackness and their cowardice.[788]

Isocrates's designation of his panegyric as both a praise and a reproach provide an interesting perspective to understanding the role of praise and blame in the Sermon. Tannehill also makes a similar observation in relation to the function of the makarisms and woes in the Sermon when he says:

> The Lucan audience who were poor may have been comforted by the beatitudes. In so far as they had already experienced acceptance and received material support through the community of Jesus, the beatitudes would ring true not only for the future but also for the present. Those in the community who were relatively wealthy could hardly be comfortable while hearing these words. Their reaction might range from anger to anxiety about their place in the Kingdom of God.[789]

---

787 Bock, 1994: 583.
788 Isocrates, *Areopagiticus,* 7.76, tra. G. Norlin.
789 Tannehill, 1996: 116.

It is, therefore, likely that in the Sermon Luke depicts Jesus employing the conventional methods of his time to provide models of virtue required to construct a community that transcended the prevailing interpersonal challenges in the community. The new community envisaged (Lk 6: 27-49), is one of love and deep sharing reminiscent of the original community of Christ-followers in Acts 2:42-47. Byrne argues that Jesus' call to love enemies (v. 27), not withholding one's shirt from a person who has taken one's coat (v. 29b), pushes vulnerability to fresh extremes.[790] Apart from defining their identity, the adoption of Jesus' values associated with vulnerability on the part of every Christ-follower would constitute the essence of the good news to the poor that he had promised in 4:18-19. These values would create a community in which the rich and the poor lived in harmony and one in which no one had any lack (Acts 4:32-36).

5.4.2. Patronal Function

The Sermon can also be understood as serving a patronal function. The patronal function of praise relates to the use of praise in order to solicit support for a particular course.[791] As already presented in chapter two (p. 27), the use of makarisms or words of praise as *exordium* was common in Greco-Roman orations and panegyrics.[792] Fitzmyer and other scholars also regard the makarisms and woes vv. 20-26 as the *exordium* of the Sermon.[793] The function of the *exordium* was two-fold. First, it created *pathos* between the speaker and his audience and, therefore, facilitated the delivery of the speech and its implications. [794] Second, in an honour and shame culture, the felicitation in the *exordium* created an obligation on the part of the audience to take the message of the speaker seriously and therefore act upon it.

5.4.2.1. Speaker and Audience Pathos and its Implications

The importance of Jesus connecting with his audience is evident from the very beginning of the Sermon. In v. 13 Jesus had just appointed his disciples, with the Twelve chosen as apostles. These individuals had the responsibility to not only understand Jesus' mission but also to carry

[790] Byrne, 2002: 78.
[791] Manuwald, 2011: 199-215.
[792] Some useful examples are the makarisms from Gorgias' *encomia* to the city of Elis, (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*. 3.14.12) and the *Encomium* of Doscoros. See, Cribiore, 2008: 96.
[793] Fitzmyer, 1981: 629.
[794] In v. 20a, Jesus' raising of his eyes on his disciples demonstrates Luke's awareness of epideictic oratorical conventions of the time.

it on (Acts 2:8). Beyond this group were the multitudes, most of whom did not yet believe in him. The set up suggests that in the Sermon Jesus is not only sharing his vision and the uniqueness of his disciples but also seeking commitment to his message. Therefore, a proper speaker-audience rapport would be fundamental to the effective delivery of his vision. Accordingly, Jesus' declaration of the destitute as *μακάριος* connected him with most of his audience both at the mountain and those within Luke's communities. The declaration enabled them to understand that Jesus was not only aware of their situation of hunger, mourning, and ostracism (vv. 20-24) but was also able to correct their situation. Jesus' ability to correct social wrongs become manifest later in his life and ministry. This is seen in the feeding of the multitudes (Lk 9:12-17), healings and exorcisms (Lk 4:31-37; 4:38-41; 5:12-15; 5:17:-26; 6:6-11; 7:11-16; 8:40-53; 9:37-42; 13:10-17; 14:1-5; 17:11-19; 18:35-42), and in the unconditional acceptance of tax collectors (Lk 5:27-23; 19:1-10) and sinners (Lk 7:36-50). The use of the adverb *νῦν* (now) with reference to those who hunger, and mourn, filled and laugh (Lk 6: 21, 25) demonstrated Jesus' first-hand knowledge of the situation of the audience both rich and poor. This understanding allowed him to not only challenge the prevailing worldviews through parables and teaching but also offer an alternative worldview based on the Kingdom of God (vv. 27-49).

In the Greco-Roman culture, the bestowal of honour represented a challenge that required a response. In a speaker-audience context, this implied that those who had received the honour of praise were obliged to reciprocate the challenge by either continuing to listen to what the speaker had to say or heeding to his advice and putting his words into action.[795] This approach took advantage of the psychology of praise in oratory and its implications on the audience's reception of a speaker and his message.[796] Understood within the context of reciprocity, it can be argued that Jesus' declaration of honour on his audience must have had patronal implications. It created an obligation on the audience to not only listen to him but also take his message seriously. This spirit of obligation is exemplified in Lk 7:47 where the woman who is forgiven much, *ἠγάπησεν πολύ*, loved much. At a basic level, reciprocity, therefore, provided the framework for understanding the function of the Sermon's makarisms and woes.

[795] Isocrates refers to the tendency of audiences to drive off orators who did not support their desires. See *On the Peace*, 8.3.
[796] Manuwald, 2011: 210.

5.4.2.2. From Praise to Program: Speaker-Audience Reciprocity

Having praised and blamed his audience in vv. 20-26, Jesus turned to paraenesis in vv. 27-49. Scholars usually recognise the hortatory nature of vv. 27-49. Most, however, do not adequately demonstrate how this section is seamlessly built from vv. 20-26. A panegyric reading of the Sermon demonstrates this trend. Like Cicero and other Greco-Roman orators, in vv. 27-49 Jesus sets out a program of action that would redefine his audience's community and conform it to the aspirations set out in the makarisms and woes.[797] The program takes on the approach that clarifies not only human relationships but also the meaning of fundamental issues affecting everyday life in the community. Franklin argues the Sermon outlines the nature of the community that Jesus is bringing in as one characterised by love, toleration, and acceptance.[798] According to him, the addressees of the Sermon are the hungry, the weepers, and the excluded. While not all are these, but all share in the attitude that characterises these groups—they all look for God's future and the lack of satisfaction with the present.[799] In order to make this a reality, Jesus provided specific instructions that would eventuate this reality.

It can be observed that the injunctions to love enemies, to love those who hate you (v. 27), to bless those of curse you or abuse you (v. 28), or the one who strikes you (v. 29), reflect the existence of the boundaries of "in-groups" and "out-groups." These intra-community challenges required a program of action to reverse them. The word ἐχθρός, although generally translated as "enemy", lexically refers to the existence of hostilities between individuals who know each other.[800] In some cases an ἐχθρός was someone who had been a φίλος, but had become alienated.[801] It was a differentiation from the word πολέμιος which was often used of conflict with reference to an external enemy.[802] In this case, ἐχθρός was more related to the term δυσμενής or "one who has long been alienated and refuses to be reconciled."[803] The use of ἐχθρός in the context of the Sermon, therefore, implied the existence of intra-community hostilities among members of Lucan communities.

797 See, *For Marcellus*, 24
798 Franklin, 2001: 935.
799 Ibid.
800 BDAG, 2000: 419.
801 LSJ at Perseus, ἐχθρός.
802 Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon*, 3.172.
803 LSJ at Perseus, ἐχθρός.

The above hostility was probably the root of all other challenges in the communities; judging, not giving, and fighting back. As Nolland has argued, to love, which was the primary focus of the Lucan paraenesis in vv. 27-49, was to rise above one's personal animosities in the interest of the community.[804] It can be observed that the behaviours Jesus prescribes in this section (vv. 27-49) as a remedy to the above problem were utterly inconsistent with the prevailing Greco-Roman morality. The cultural conventions of the time prescribed the philosophy of helping one's friends and harming one's enemies.[805] Instead, as Robert Bellar argues, Jesus' ethics aimed to upend the norm of love of family and friend— do harm to enemies by erasing the boundary between family and stranger (Lk 10:30-35) and offering generalised reciprocity to strangers (Q LK 6:32-36.)[806] In a community of Christ-followers, these strangers or the socially different others, are now fictive kin, created out of their common calling as disciples of Jesus. Thus, according to Bellar, the principle of contrast between in-group and out-group has been abandoned, and the principle of reciprocity has been absolutised. It can further be observed that while Jesus extends the principle of reciprocity beyond kinship and friendship, as Bellar argues, he also transforms the concept. This is evident from the way Jesus advocates the principle of "non-reciprocal generosity" especially between the rich and the poor (Lk 6:29-30; 14:12-14). Thus, Jesus' recommendations envisaged a community that would be both counter-cultural to its Greco-Roman context and one that conformed to the standards of the Kingdom. It would be a community, as imagined by Plutarch's Cleomenes in Sparta,[807] where there would be neither destitution nor riches and the interpersonal challenges associated with them.

5.4.3. The Ritual Function

Another way to establish the meaning of the Sermon is to understand it from the function of epideictic praise and blame in a ritual context. Ritual usually contains some symbolism that has implications for the participants' construction of meaning. In the previous chapter, we argued that the social setting of the Sermon was the Easter festival. Based on the strong relationship between baptisms and Easter in the literature,[808] we also argued that the Easter festival provided

[804] Nolland, 1989: 295.
[805]For understanding some Greco-Roman references to the principle of "helping a friend and harming the enemy" see, Blundell, 1989; Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 1.26; Euripides, *Electra*, 66.
[806] Robert Bellar cited in Oakman, 2014: 121.
[807] For Cleomenes, poverty and wealth were the older evils of society. Plutarch, *Cleomenes*, 10.1-4.
[808]Bradshaw, 1995:139–40; Finn, 1967: 50–54.

the critical occasion for the integration of new members through the baptism ceremonies in which the re-enforcement of community values was also emphasised. Also building on J. Jeremias, who views the Sermon as an early Christian catechism,[809] we argued that the Sermon was probably an earlier version of the baptismal sermon in a Greco-Roman context. Most studies also agree that in a ritual context the purpose of epideictic oratory was the transmission of cultural values.[810] Such transmission was achieved in the context of θεωρία which, in a festival setting, implied being a spectator to a performance or a state of contemplation, respectively.[811] It is, therefore, probable that in an Easter festival context, the aural experience of the Sermon for the rest of the participants would have taken on ritualistic symbolism. At this stage, we should ask: What function did the Sermon play in the Easter festival ceremony beyond the new converts? How did repeated annual exposure to the Sermon affect its audience? The answer to these questions can best be understood in the context of the ritual setting of the Easter festival and the function of epideictic oratory in a ritual context. By coming together in the festival context both the poor and the rich, either as *catechumens* or members of the community, enter the presence of the sacred and therefore go into the state of θεωρία. In this liminal state, individuality, including social status, disappeared giving way to a cult-generated identity.[812] Walters has shown that in a ritual context, speeches shared in the sacred zone in which the normal and the well-defined were replaced by the abnormal and ambiguous.[813] In relation to the function of epideictic in ritual context, Carter's three ways in which epideictic reinforced commonly held values provide a framework for understanding the ritual function of the Sermon.[814]

First, Carter argues that epideictic rhetoric connects its participants to the cosmos by establishing some intelligible order and by linking the participants to the ongoing creation of their culture. It shows the audience how they fit in the *cosmos* by establishing a transcendent principle that gives cosmic sanction to their own social order. Moreover, it engages the audience in the act of creation itself by joining them together in the founding act, the beginnings of their

[809] Cited in Ellis, 1973: 111.
[810] Among the most pioneering works are Johnson, 1970:265; Gibson, 2014: 1-30; Oravec, 1976: 162-174; Carter 1991: 209-23; Villadsen, 2008: 25-45; Beale, 1978: 221-246.
[811] LSJ at Perseus, θεωρ-ία.
[812] See Petridou, 2013: 310.
[813] Walters, 1980: 18.
[814] Carter, 1991:220-21.

identity as a culture.[815] It can be argued that, in relation to the Sermon, the connection of *πτωχεία* and *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* in Lk 6: 20 provides a framework for understanding how Jesus connects his audience to a new cosmos and the values that were either associated with it (Lk 6: 20-24) or antagonistic to it (Lk 6: 25-26). The importance of the Kingdom of God as an overarching cosmos is a characteristic Lucan emphasis. The concept is mentioned 44 times in Luke and 52 times across Luke-Acts.[816] This makes the concept a central motif in the Gospel. The reference to the Kingdom of God in v. 20b represents Jesus' second reference to the Kingdom of God directly from his mouth. The first instance is in 4:43 where Jesus, crowded out by the multitudes, announced that he must preach the "good news of the Kingdom" to other places. As Squires argues, the Kingdom of God provides the providential dimension to Luke's understanding of the sovereignty of God.[817] This providential understanding of the Kingdom of God is demonstrable in two ways across the Third Gospel: the use of familial relations and the pervasiveness of hospitality as a key feature of the Kingdom. John Elliot, for example, argues that Luke uses familial relations, domestic crises and responsibilities of household management (Lk 9:46-48; 11:14-23; 12:22-34, 35-48; 13:20-21; 18:15-17) as a basis for illuminating major features of life in the Kingdom of God.[818] In this Kingdom/Household, God is experienced as a merciful, generous, and the forgiving "father" (Lk 2:49; 6:36; 9:36; 10:21-22; 11:1, 13; 12:30, 32; 33:29, 42; 23:34, 46; 24:49; Ac 1:4, 7; 2:33).[819] Further, Danaux, Moxnes and Elliot argue that Luke uses hospitality as a metaphor for the Kingdom of God.[820] Elliot, for example, argues that, in contrast to the Temple and the exclusivist purity and legal system it represented, Luke uses occasions of domestic dining and hospitality to depict an inclusive form of social relations.[821] These depicted relations transcend previous Jewish purity regulations and this in turn gives concrete social expression to the inclusive character of the gospel, the Kingdom of God, and the Christian community.[822] Moxnes argues that throughout the Gospel, Luke demonstrates that those disciples ostracised from their households find in the Kingdom alternative sources of support. According to him, snippets of the Kingdom as new imagined spaces for the displaced followers of Jesus are discernible in texts such as Q 10: 2-10; Q11: 11-

815 Ibid.
816 See, *βασιλεία*, STEP Bible URL.
817 Squires, 1993: 25.
818 Elliot, 1991a: 104-105.
819 Ibid. 105.
820 Moxnes, 2003:114; Danaux cited in Verheyden, 1999: 974.
821 Elliot, 1991: 102-108.
822 Ibid.

13; Q12:22-31; Lk 8:1-3.[823] The above examples of the providential dimensions of the Kingdom of God underscore its over-arching symbolism in the Sermon and across the whole Gospel.

Therefore, understood sequentially, the good news to the poor that Jesus promised in Lk 4:48 eventuates in the possession of the Kingdom of God by the poor in 6:20. It can, therefore, be argued that Luke's concern with the Kingdom of God makes it the "transcendent order" in Luke's story world. Its values of powerlessness, dependency and vulnerability associated with the destitute are celebrated in Lk 6: 20-23. The idea of hungry, mourning and ostracism as expressions of destitution represent the Kingdom values of dependence on and therefore security in God. The values not only promote dependence on God but also, by implication, creates the possibility of *κοινωνία* within the Lucan churches.

Inversely, in Lk 6: 24-26, the values of power and independence associated with being rich are denigrated as incompatible with the Kingdom of God. The juxtaposition of the acceptable and the unacceptable makes the Sermon the site for the contestation of the social order. Yet this contestation is not only meant to help the communities to become aware of the reality of division within themselves but also to engage them in the act of creating a culture that challenges the disturbing practices and loyalties that endangered their communal co-existence. As Michael Wilcock argues, in Lk 6: 20-26, the values which are taken for granted by other people are questioned and considered in the searching light of spiritual truth, hidden reality and future life.[824] Such questioning of old values suggests a quest for an alternative reality in the community.

In keeping with the epideictic function of engaging the audience in the act of creating their world, in Lk 6: 27-49, both the rich and the poor are called to participate in the creation of their identity as a culture in which friendship, kinship, and *κοινωνία* are no longer based on reciprocity. The use of subjunctive verbs with conditional particles in vv. 32-34, followed by the question *ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν*; "What good is it to you?", represents Jesus' direct attack on the Greco-Roman system of reciprocity. The exhortation to love enemies, to give and lend

[823] Moxnes, 2003: 116-117.
[824] Wilcock, 1979: 86.

freely without expecting a return (vv. 35-36) is a call to members of the Christ-groups to live their life in counter-cultural ways and, therefore, to demonstrate the identity of their new community. As Wilcock argues, as God's people they were to see as God sees and act as God does. In doing this they would not be following the sense of duty but the call of love (27-38).[825] Thus, in the Sermon, Luke's audience is not only made aware of their situation but also empowered to participate in remedying the situation.

The second way epideictic reinforces community values is by taking its hearers out of ordinary time and by making time sacred. According to Carter, ritual theory suggests that this special conception of time creates an awareness of immortality and a sense of being outside the temporal. In doing so, it also offers its participants a different foundation of order beyond everyday perceptions.[826] As Walters has argued, one way in which ritual context helps in reconceptualising reality is through speeches. In a ritual context, epideictic speeches help make social zones which are considered normal become timeless and the clear-cut become abnormal and ambiguous.[827] In an Easter context, it is likely the Sermon similarly takes its audience out of ordinary time and creates a foundation of order beyond everyday perceptions. First, in the makarisms and woes in vv. 20-26, Jesus interweaves the present and the future and, in the process, reconceptualises reality for both the poor and rich. Table 5:1 below demonstrates the above discussion.

[825] Carter, 1991: 220-21.
[826] Ibid. 223.
[827] Walters, 1980: 18.

Table 5.1

Makarisms	Woes
Blessed are you who are poor, **for yours is the** Kingdom **of God**.	Woe to you who are rich, **for you have already received your comfort**.
Blessed are you who **hunger *now***, for you will be satisfied.	Woe to you who are well fed now, for you **will go hungry**.
Blessed are you **who weep *now***, for you will laugh.	Woe to you who laugh now, for you **will mourn and weep**

In the above sample of makarisms and woes, two aspects of time "the now" and "the future" are juxtaposed as "bleak" and "bliss" or vice-versa for the destitute and the rich, respectively. In juxtaposing the present and the future with its implications on the fate of the individual, Jesus takes his hearers out of ordinary time. Like all participants in a ritual context, the participants at the Easter festival both as *catechumens* or the others enter a liminal context in which time becomes ambiguous.[828] Yet by introducing the Kingdom of God in the "the now" and "the future" the Sermon redefines both time and space. It not only redefines time as "now" but also within the Kingdom of God, as limitless. Thus, those being baptised or participating in the Easter festival are either entering or re-enacting their entry into this limitless reign of God, which is both physical and spiritual, timebound and infinite. Through this transposition of time, Jesus demonstrates that both the rich and destitute belong to a community bigger and beyond their temporal experience and therefore, beyond their control. This inherent reversal in the makarisms and woes has significant implications for understanding the function of the Sermon. At most, the reversal provides a mystery to the meaning of life and challenges the community's perception of reality.

The above mystery of life is further compounded in Jesus' call on the community to live out the values of the Kingdom in vv. 27-49. In the new order of reality, both the rich and poor are

828 Walters, 1980: 18.

called to live counter-culturally to conventional reality. For example, understood within the Greco-Roman context, the exhortation to love your enemies, to do good to those who hate you, to bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you, to turn the other cheek and give to everyone who asks you (vv. 27-30) represent a life lived with total indifference to everyday human conventions and reality. Thus, the Sermon proposes an "out-of-this-world existence" or what Moxnes calls the "not-yet places" whose practice would represent the realised aspects of the Kingdom of God.[829] An example of this "out-of-this-world existence" is later demanded of the rich ruler (Lk 18:18-30) which he rejects, but which is happily accepted by Zacchaeus (LK 19:1-10). The poor widow (Lk 21: 1-4) can live it while the rich miserably fail.

The third way in which praise and blame reinforced community values is by creating harmony among the antinomies that characterize people's lives. According to Carter, epideictic has the power to "transfigure the world by reuniting it." For him, one of the functions of ritual is to address the mystery, the contraries of life, by helping its participants to discover harmony therein, an awareness of both opposition and unity that logic cannot offer.[830] It can be said that in a purely epideictic fashion, Luke's juxtaposition of riches and poverty in vv. 20-26 displays the contrariness of life in the Lucan communities and all communities of all time. The bestowal of blessings on the poor and denigration of the rich, therefore, signified the recognition of the deep chasm that existed between the two social groups in the Lucan communities. As a painful reminder of the challenges in the communities, the statuses of *πτωχεία* and *πλοῦτος* portrayed the deep divisions and brokenness in the Lucan communities. That image of contrariness is also represented in Jesus' contrasting images of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31), the Priest/Levite and the robbed man (Lk 10: 25-35) and giving of the poor widow vs the rich's giving (Lk 19:1-4).

Beyond demonstrating opposition and contradiction within the Lucan communities, the Sermon also works toward uniting the communities. In order to reinforce the above values, Jesus employs two images; the tree and its fruits (vv. 43-45) and the idea of building on the rock and sand (vv. 46-49). First, in the imagery of the tree and its fruit, Jesus compares the failure of the community members to live out the commonly held values of *κοινωνία* among them to a tree that fails to produce fruit. Johnson posits that the tree imagery expresses the universal

[829] See Moxnes, 2003: 53.
[830] Carter, 1991: 224.

conviction in the ancient world that character precedes action.[831] It underscored the relationship between being and doing or character and disposition and how the former influences the latter, respectively.[832] Therefore, since values drive behaviour, the adoption of Kingdom values by individuals would lead to their adherence to the spirit of κοινωνία. This would, in turn, result in a community of care, commensurate with the ideal community in Acts 2:42-47.

In the imagery of the two houses built on the rock and sand (vv. 46-49), Jesus underscored the impact of failure to adhere to his words on the well-being of the community. Failure to adhere to the values of the community propounded in the Sermon was compared to building a house on sand, with its disastrous consequences. Byrne argues that the paradox of the two houses makes sense in the light of the expected reversal central to the Sermon. According to him, if God's intervention is coming, which will be like a flood, adopting the vulnerable life Jesus commends is sensible. [833] Thus, to heed Jesus' words would imply grounding their building, (in other words their community), in an actual acceptance of Jesus as Lord, with all that implied; the adoption of powerlessness, dependency, and vulnerability as their identity.[834] It implies being totally dependent upon the "rock" of divine power and faithfulness.[835] Such a spirit of total dependence is found among the οἱ πτωχοί, whose values the Sermon advocates.

5.5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be argued that in its original social context, the Lucan Sermon had different aural implications for the various members of its audience: new converts and the rest of the membership. As an Easter panegyric in a community struggling with the co-existence of riches and destitution, it was intended for both new converts and old members of the community. At the heart of the Sermon was Luke's plea for the members of the community to adopt countercultural values of weakness and powerlessness as the basis for their identity. In Luke's estimation, for the rich and the destitute to exist in the community, a collective identity based on the values of weakness and powerless was necessary. This would enable the members, both rich and impoverished, to find their security and strength, not in the superficial material things which defined honour in the Greco-Roman world, but in their being chosen as disciples and

[831] Johnson, 1991: 114.
[832] Green, 1997: 279.
[833] Byrne, 2002: 80.
[834] Wilcock, 1979: 86.
[835] Byrne, 2002: 80.

belonging to the Kingdom. This attitude would create a new understanding of kinship, friendship, and reciprocity in the community of Christ-followers. Therefore, the question of the correct understanding of kinship, friendship, and reciprocity in a socially diverse community of Christ-followers was, for Luke, an important component of Jesus' overarching message of universal salvation.

CHAPTER 6

PRAISE AND BLAME IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

6.1. INTRODUCTION

The last chapter offered an exegesis of the Sermon from the perspective of Greco-Roman panegyrics. It argued that in its original context, the Lucan Sermon aimed to both integrate new members into the communities and inculcate commonly held values of *κοινωνία*. This chapter argues that the paradigm of praise and blame inherent in the Sermon is also not only discernible across the Third Gospel but also serves the Gospel's overall purpose. The structure of praise and blame is evident in the way the Gospel praises generosity, both divine and human, and disapproves lack of generosity. The chapter has three sections. The first section examines the Hymns to God and *encomium* to Jesus in the Third Gospel. The second section explores specific Lucan texts in which Jesus praises generosity and its implications for the Christ-followers in Lucan churches. These texts include the parable of the good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37), the parable of the banquet (Lk 14:12-24), the parable of the prodigal son (Lk 15:11-32), the parable of the dishonest servant (Lk 16:1-9), the story of Zacchaeus (Lk 19:1-10) and the story of the widow's giving (Lk 21:1-4). The third section examines Jesus' reproaches of stinginess both through parables and individual encounters. These texts include the parable of the rich fool (Lk 12:13-21) the parable of Lazarus and the rich man (Lk 16:19-31), and the Rich ruler (Lk 18: 18-30). All the texts are examined within the perspective of Greco-Roman praise and blame and its implications on Luke's audience.

6.2. HYMNS TO GOD AND ENCOMIUM TO JESUS

6.2.1. Hymns to God in Luke's Gospel

The singing of hymns to gods is a time-honoured human activity. As an expression of divine-human relationship it is practised in all cultures. In the Greco-Roman world it had been practised long before the emergence of Christianity. The compilations of Homeric Hymns, Hymns to Asclepius or the Aretalogies of Isis attest to the prevalence of praise of the gods in the Greco-Roman world.[836] The relationship between hymns and epideictic rhetoric is well documented in literature. In the *Progymnasmata*, an *encomium* to a god is referred to as a hymn.[837] The first treatise attributed to Menander includes in its discussion of epideictic literature, “hymns to the gods.”[838] The theory of the hymn began with Quintilian's treatise and was later taken up by that of Alexander, son of Numenius.[839] Quintilian’s summation of the context and form of the hymn to the gods became the standard framework for Greco-Roman hymnody. In his *Orator’s Education*, Quintilian asserted that:

> With God, in general, the first thing will be to show veneration of the majesty of their nature; next to expound the power of each and the discoveries of his which have benefited the community. Power will be displayed: for example, in Jupiter, control of the sea. Inventions will be shown too: the arts for Minerva, medicine for Apollo, Crops for Ceres, wine for Bacchus. Next, we must mention any exploits of theirs known to history. Even god (sic) derive honour from parent and from age. For example, those who descend from chaos-and also from their offspring: Apollo and Diana do credit to Latona. Some should be praised because they were born immortal, others because they earned their immortality by virtue, a theme which the piety of our emperor has made the glory of the present age too.[840]

Quintilian’s reference to the power of the gods in their various forms (control of the sea, inventions, arts, medicine and crops) and their benefit to the community signifies the importance of the celebration of divine magnanimity in hymns. Alexander, the son of Numenius, corroborated Quintilian's point when he posited that the gods are praised for their virtue as opposed to their abilities and, therefore, a hymn was an instance of *epainos*.[841] Belief in the beneficence of the gods was common in the Greco-Roman world. It is said that after the gods, the Caesars were often thanked for their χάρις and, therefore, appropriately worshipped for their magnanimity.[842] The above data are important for understanding the rhetorical context

[836]Gordley, 2007: 141, 147.
[837] Kennedy, 2003: 50.
[838] Menander Rhetor, 7-29.
[839] Pernot, 2014: 46.
[840] Quintilian, 2001: 494.
[841] Cited in Gordley, 2007: 117.
[842] Harrison, 2003: 210.

of the Lucan hymns. They shed light on the role of hymns in the Third Gospel and their function within the Gospel's overall purpose.

Quintilian's summation of the form and content of hymns has had a significant influence on scholarly approaches to the structure of Greco-Roman hymns. The works of Race, Gordley and Pernot represent the continuing influence of Quintilian's hymnody theory. For example, Race argues that three *topoi* defined ancient hymns: (1) finding the ἀρχή; (2) establishing χάρις; and (3) elements of the request.[843] In the ἀρχή, all the poets posited a god as the starting point or subject of the hymn with his/her name usually mentioned in the vocative.[844] In the χάρις, the poet seeks divine goodwill through the proper narration of the god/goddess' powers and exploits.[845] Lastly, the hymn finishes with a petition. The petition is often consonant with the god's powers as established in the body of the hymn, and follows naturally from the goodwill established between the god and man.[846] Furthermore, Gordley, after an analysis of the thirty-three Homeric Hymns, asserts that the hymns typically contain an introduction (praising the name of the god, as well as a series of epithets relating to qualities of the deity), and end with a conclusion, often a parting salutation, sometimes linked with a petition.[847] Recently, Pernot, closely following the structure of the *Progymnasmata*, has presented a five-fold structure to Greco-Roman hymns namely: (1) nature; (2) birth; (3) honours or cult; (4) power; inventions, actions and kind deeds; and (5) relations with other gods.[848] It can be argued that although there are some variations in the proposed structures above, the common threads on the content and context of the hymns demonstrate the influence of Quintilian's structure. It can be observed that in every proposed structure, the praise and description of the deeds of the gods represent the core ingredient.[849]

One of the unique features of the Gospel of Luke is the striking presence of hymns to God especially in the infancy narratives: the Magnificat (Lk 1:46-55), the Benedictus (Lk 1:68-79),

843 Race, 1982: 5-14.
844 Ibid. 6.
845 Ibid.. 10.
846 Ibid.
847 Gordley, 2007: 134.
848 Pernot, 2014: 46.
849 Krentz (cited in Gordley, 2007: 117) rightly argues that the commonality suggests an already developed form of praise with standard topoi, which show *mutatis mutandi*, in the New Testament passages that are hymnic in nature.

and the Nunc Dimittis (Lk 2:29-32). Owing to the prevalence of Septuagintal allusions in the hymns, most scholars interpret them from a Jewish perspective.[850] It can, however, be argued that, although the structure and form of Lucan hymns are uniquely steeped in Jewish tradition, they also share certain resemblances with the structure and content of Greek hymns.[851] Like their Greek counterparts, all Lucan hymns start with the name of God as a description of his nature. Mary calls God, the Lord, who is also Saviour (Lk 1:46-47). Zechariah calls him *κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ* (Lk 1:68). Using the vocative, Simeon calls God *Δέσποτα* (from *δεσπότης*), Sovereign Lord (Lk 2:29). Second, the hymns have a strong focus on God's *χάρις* with particular emphasis on his generous deeds (Lk 1:51-55; 68b-75). The exaltation of divine deeds resonates with the major contents of Greco-Roman hymns. Third, like Greek hymns, Lucan hymns also contain petitions to God. For example, in the Nunc Dimittis, Simeon combines both praise and petition (Lk 2:29-32). He praises God for allowing him to see divine salvation and asks God to allow him to die in peace. The above resemblances suggest that to a Hellenistic audience of the Third Gospel, the hymns were understood within the framework of a Greco-Roman hymn to gods.

6.2.1.1. Mary and the Magnanimity of God (Lk 1:47-55)

The Magnificat is the first hymn in the Gospel of Luke. It represents the celebration of the power of God and his kind deeds both to Mary as an individual and to her community, the nation of Israel. The question of whether the Magnificat comes from either Elizabeth or Mary, other Jewish sources, or if they were composed by Luke himself remains unresolved. Some scholars such as Cadbury and Farris hold that the Magnificat and the Benedictus and Nunc Dimittis were either composed by Luke himself or were part of a source which Luke utilised.[852] It can, however, be argued that Luke's acknowledgement of sources, both oral and written (Lk 1:1-4), suggests that he did not personally invent the stories.[853] With regard to the Magnificat, it is likely Mary is behind the essential elements of the song. Mary's status fits in with the major thrust of the hymn; her status as a young woman in a predominantly patriarchal culture makes

---

[850] See Levine and Witherington, 2018: 27 ff; Byrne, 2002: 27ff. Other scholars like Stephen Farris argue for Hebrew origins of the infancy narrative; that they resemble the Hebrew Psalms and were placed by the evangelist to anticipate certain key themes recurring in the two-volume work. Farris, (1985: 30).
[851] See Gordley's structure of Greco-Roman hymns, 2007: 134.
[852] Cadbury, 1958: 192 and Farris, 1985: 30.
[853] Brown suggests that the Lucan canticles can be traced to a Jewish Christian community from an area influenced by Jerusalem Christianity. Brown, 1977: 355.

her status humble. Green demonstrates the humble status of young Judean women who had to remain in seclusion until after they got married.[854]

In terms of structure, the Magnificat can be divided into two strophes: vv. 47-50, what God has done to Mary and vv. 51-55, God's action in society.[855] The importance of this structure is that it reinforces the idea of divine beneficence and magnanimity. This emphasis provides the literary foreshadowing for Luke's commitment to κοινωνία between the rich and the poor in the Sermon and across the Gospel. Lucan tendency for foreshadowing by demonstration or prophetic prediction finds support in other studies.[856]

The song starts with Mary praising the Lord, (v. 46). This verb used, μεγαλύνει (to exalt, to make great by word),[857] sets the tone of the whole hymn as the praise of the Lord. In a Greco-Roman context, such praise would have been similar to an aretalogical discourse, (except for the third person designation in the Magnificat) highlighting the virtues of the Lord.[858] It can be observed that the divine portrait that emerges from the Magnificat is that of God as a paragon of magnanimity. First, using the possessive Σωτῆρί μου, Mary presents God as her personal saviour (v. 47). The divine salvation presented is largely physical and social; God has elevated Mary from ταπείνωσις, humble estate, to boundless honour (v. 48). The implications of this divine intervention are far-reaching. All people will call her μακάριος. The reference to blessedness foreshadows Jesus' pronouncement of makarisms on the poor, the hungry, mourning and the ostracised in the Sermon (Lk 6:20-23). God is also demonstrated as long suffering (v. 49) capable of being merciful to generations (v. 50) of those who fear him. Mary's new blessed status lays claim to her belonging to a family of those who fear God.

In the second strophe (vv. 51-55) the image of God becomes one of an active and a mighty warrior on behalf of Mary's community; he scatters the proud in their plans and brings down

[854] Green, 1997: 94.
[855] Tannehill, 1996: 54; Nolland, 1989: 64.
[856] Brawley, 1990: 34-43; Talbert, 2003: 190-193.
[857] LSJ at Perseus, μεγαλύνω.
[858] Aretalogies were exaltations of the great deeds of the gods, usually in the first person "Iam." See Papanikolaou, 2009: 59-70.

the mighty δυνάσται (plural) from their thrones. The plural may be an allusion to the history of the world or Israel and could be a commentary on the historical rise and fall of dynasties and rulers, especially those who were hostile to God's covenant people. In v. 53, Mary refers to God as having provided for the hungry and left the πλουτοῦντες (partic. plural) (the rich) empty. The contrast between the rich and powerful and the poor and humble and its respective implications for God's relationship with each status demonstrate Luke's interest in poverty and riches. This theme will be crystallised in Lk 6:20-26 and further developed in Jesus' praise of generosity and blame of stinginess across the gospel (Lk 10:25-37; 14:12-24; 15:11-32; 16:1-9; 19:1-10; 21:1-4 cf 12:13-21; 16:19-31; 18:18-30).

It can also be observed that the reference to Israel (v. 54) and God's steadfast commitment to his promises for the nation underscores the Jewish context of the Magnificat. Tannehill argues that Luke's alleged fixation with Jewishness leaves out his Gentile audience.[859] The fixation apparently makes God largely a Jewish God. Yet it is also possible to argue that within Luke's primary audience, the Magnificat's concentration on Israel served two purposes. First, as a further catechesis on the Jesus story, the hymn provides the necessary context for understanding the Jewish origins of the Christian movement which Theophilus needed (Lk 1:4). Second, Luke's focus on God as the God of Israel helps Theophilus to envisage the nature and character of the God with which he is now associated. It demonstrates that this God is a subversive God, who, while his son can make friends of the rich (Lk 8:3; 19:1-10) and banquet with Pharisees (Lk 14:1; 19-1-10), he also has an undeviating commitment to the welfare of the poor (Lk 4:18-19). If Theophilus represented a social class with a complicated relationship with the poor, the life-changing implications of being a follower of Jesus would have become apparent to him at the earliest stage of hearing the Gospel. Therefore, in keeping with the major interest in Luke's Gospel, the magnanimity of the Lord God forms the major thrust of the Magnificat.

6.2.1.2. Zechariah and the Celebration of God's Generosity (Lk 1:5-25, 57-79)

The story of Zechariah the priest and his wife Elizabeth represents another instance in which Luke presents God as magnanimous. It can be observed that, although the couple are referred to as δίκαιος and ἄμεμπτος (Lk 1:6), this picture is blighted by their childlessness caused by

[859] Tannehill, 1996: 63.

Elizabeth's barrenness. Any possibility of remedying the situation is further barred by their advanced years (v.7). Yet this hopeless situation provides the context for the manifestation of God's beneficence to this family and the nation of Israel in general.[860] First, in her conception, Elizabeth sees God taking away her shame of childlessness (v. 25).[861] The cultural stigma towards childlessness that Elizabeth experienced is encapsulated in Hannah's life (1 Sam 1-2). Second, resulting from the birth of the baby, this insignificant priestly family is brought into the public spotlight across Judea (v. 65), not by their own efforts but by the ἔλεος (mercy) of the Lord. While in a Jewish context, the mercies of the Lord would be understood within the context of the covenant, within the Greco-Roman world, they represented divine beneficence. For example, Dio Chrysostom calls God "the many-named", some of which names are: "father of hospitality" and the "bringer of fruitfulness."[862] Both aspects of divine beneficence become manifest in the life of the priestly family. God had visited them both through Zechariah's vision, and this brought fruitfulness to their family life; they bore a child.

The Benedictus, with its politically charged tone, becomes the culmination of Luke's interest in demonstrating the praise of God's magnanimity. Some scholars believe the poem originated from either among the followers of John the Baptist or in early Jewish Christianity, which explains its political tone.[863] The hymn can be roughly divided into two sections. Verses 68-75 is Zechariah's praise of divine beneficence while vv. 76-79 represent the commissioning of John the Baptist. The thrust of the first section of the song is the praise of God for the fulfilment of the promises he had made to David and Abraham (v. 69, 73). In v. 68, Zechariah identifies God as the Lord God of Israel. This identification ties in with one of the five-fold Greco-Roman hymnal *topoi*, which identifies the nature of the divine as exhibited in the hymn.[864] At the same time, the designation κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ not only identifies him as the Adonai of Israel but also demonstrates how he is different from other gods, reflecting the *topos* that defines God's relationship with other gods.[865] From vv. 68-75 Zechariah underlines the kind deeds that the Lord God has done to Israel in fulfilment of what he promised (v. 70.): he has visited and

[860] The latter is also manifested in the virginal conception by Mary (v. 26-38).
[861] This was more important in the context where a woman's value and honour were tied to her having children. Esler, 2012: 121.
[862] Dio Chrysostom, *Orations*, 1:39, 41
[863] Tannehill, 1996: 60.
[864] See Pernot, 2014: 46.
[865] Marshall (1978: 90) thinks the reference reflects a Jewish outlook which does not take the Gentiles into account.

redeemed them; he has raised for them a horn (a saviour). In vv. 71-75 Zechariah captures the rationale of God's redemptive visitation of his people; to rescue them from their enemies so that they can worship him without fear, in holiness and righteousness (v. 75).

In vv. 74-75, the reference to God's plan to rescue Israel from the hand of their enemies also demonstrates a clear interest in the destiny of Israel. This interest would have received different reactions from the different sections of Luke's audiences. Tannehill notes that while Christian Jews would be sympathetic to this divine plan, it would ruffle the feathers of Gentile Christians like Cornelius who served in the army of Israel's "enemies" (vv. 74-75), the Roman army. He also notes that after the Jewish-Roman war, it would be difficult to serve the Roman government while being sympathetic to Jews.[866] Yet when this concern with Israel is understood within the larger context of Luke's praise of God's mighty deeds and his commitment to his promises, a different perspective on the political tone of the Benedictus emerges. It provides assurance to the Gentile audience that the God they have adopted is both able and willing to protect them, especially that the promises made to Israel now belong to those who believe in Jesus and their children (Acts 2:39).

The last section of the Benedictus (vv. 76-79) is a combination both of John's commissioning and a description of the nature of his work. Yet even the description of John the Baptizer's work is presented in a way that depicts him as a harbinger of God's beneficence. He is to be a prophet of the Most High God. He is to *κυρίου ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ*, prepare the ways of the Lord (v. 76). The word ὁδός has several meanings in its Greco-Roman context. While it could mean the literal way, path or road, it also portrays a moral sense of "the right ways"[867] or straight courses as opposed to crooked ones[868] or customs.[869] Aristotle used the word with reference to the function of City Controllers in the Athenian constitution, which was to stay 'keeping watch' or "to ensure."[870]

[866] Tannehill, 1996: 63.
[867] LSJ at Perseus, ὁδός.
[868] Aeschylus in *Eumenides* 770 also uses the word ὁδός with the moral sense of straight course as opposed to the crooked way (associated with breaking oaths).
[869] Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 110 uses ὁδός in relation to custom.
[870] Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens*, 50.

In this case, John the Baptizer is to go ahead of the Lord and to prepare and ensure that the values, the customs and ethics associated with the Lord God are adhered to among God's people (v. 76). John's message to Israel, the centre of which was generosity, is summarised in Lk 3:10-14:

> "Anyone who has two shirts should share with the one who has none, and anyone who has food should do the same. Even tax collectors came to be baptized. "Teacher", they asked, "what should we do?" "Don't collect any more than you are required to", he told them. Then some soldiers asked him, "And what should we do?" He replied, Don't extort money and don't accuse people falsely—be content with your pay." (NIV).

It can be observed from the above that John's work of preparing the way of the Lord involved the revival of magnanimity and ethical behaviour in the national spirit. His message emphasised sharing among the common people, tax justice by the tax collectors, and a stop to the soldiers' practices of extortion. Here John aimed to inculcate the meaning and implications of divine salvation for the people of God (v. 77). An understanding and practice of the ways of the Lord will be the basis of divine forgiveness which will be realised when the Lord himself finally comes (v. 78). It also needs to be noted that, for Zechariah, even the Lord's coming will be a result of his tender mercies and therefore a reflection of his magnanimity (v. 78). Further, this coming of the Lord, according to Zechariah, will culminate in complete enlightenment and divine guidance (v. 79). It can, therefore, be concluded that the magnanimity of God to the lowly Zechariah and Elizabeth was symbolic of God's plan for the destitute. This divine plan was further recapitulated in Jesus' mission statement in Nazareth (Lk 4:18-19) and further explicated in the Sermon (Lk 6:17-49), and across the whole Gospel (Lk 19:10).[871]

6.2.2. *Encomium* to Jesus: Jesus and Generosity

Beyond the infancy stories, the rest of the Gospel's narrative presents Jesus' teaching and deeds. Most of these teachings and deeds reflect his magnanimity and their subsequent manifestation of his special nature as a son of God. In relation to the function of narrative, Nicolaus the Sophist argues that there are three types of narrative: descriptive (like Pindar's where one person says

[871] See Holladay, 2008: 86.

everything); dramatic (where everything is said by the characters); and mixed narrative.[872] It can be observed that in telling the story of Jesus, Luke takes a mixed approach where the author and the character share the literary space. Second, according to Nicolaus, although brevity, charm and grandeur are integral virtues of narrative, persuasiveness is the greatest of the virtues of narrative.[873] The genre of *encomium* by its very nature belongs to the realm of persuasion. By ascribing honour to an individual or object, the author of an *encomium* aims at influencing others to view the subject of *encomia* as she or he does. The Gospels, with their presentation of Jesus teachings and deeds, take a similar stance. They aim to project Jesus not just as the messiah or son of God but also one whose deeds and teachings become ethical imperatives for those who follow him. According to Theon, among the topics of *encomia* understood as ethical virtues are goods of the mind and action.[874] We argue that some of the ethical virtues which resonate with the Gospel's presentation of Jesus' teaching and deeds are prudence, temperance, courage, justice, piety, generosity, and magnanimity. It can be observed that in his presentation of Jesus' story Luke does not follow the topics for encomia in every detail. This selective approach is not unique to Luke. Theon advises of the need to argue from what is possible but following the list chronologically.[875] Luke appears to have followed this trend closely. He picks up the topics of Jesus' birth and death, and in between them, his virtues of generosity and magnanimity act as the narrative keys to emphasize the importance of Jesus to Theophilus, as a Saviour and moral exemplar.

6.2.2.1. Jesus' Birth and Death

The topics of birth and death were very important in the development of an *encomium*. Hermogenes argues that in praising someone, you first will mention any occurrences at their birth.[876] Beyond special occurrences at birth, Theon argues that the place of birth, tribe and ancestry are critical aspects of *encomium*.[877] It appears that in his Gospel Luke gave the topic of Jesus' birth special significance. The special and miraculous events surrounding the birth of Jesus point to encomiastic predispositions in the Third Gospel. This predisposition is evident in the series of events such as the annunciation (Lk 1:39-45), the priestly and temple connections (Lk 1:1-38), and the shepherds and the angels (Lk 2:8-15). All this served as a

---

[872]Kennedy, 2003: 136
[873] Ibid. 137.
[874] Ibid. 50.
[875] Ibid. 51, 52.
[876] Ibid. 82.
[877] Ibid. 50.

literary foreshadowing of Jesus' divine claims later in the Gospel. Even the mention of such place-names as Nazareth (Lk 1:26), Judea (Lk 1:39) Bethlehem (Lk 2:4) ascribes political and social legitimacy to Jesus' royal claims. It is likely that Bethlehem, the City of David, symbolised Jesus' association with the royal house of Israel. On the other hand, Jesus was also associated with Nazareth of Galilee, which in the first century CE was the heartland of the Jewish revolutionary spirit.[878] His Galilean connection underscored, by default, Jesus' commitment to the Kingdom of God, which unfortunately was understood mostly in revolutionary terms among Galileans.[879]

The above claims to Jesus' political and social connections are later enhanced by the genealogy in chapter 4, which traces Jesus' ancestry not just back to King David but to Adam, making him a universal progenitor. Even in Jesus' death, Luke also underscores the encomiastic aspects of the Gospel. At his death, amidst the unusual things with the sun and the temple (Lk 23:44-45), Jesus is declared innocent by a Roman soldier (Lk 24:47).[880] Beyond this, even death was not the final word for Jesus. He was not only raised from the dead but also, based on his resurrection, a movement was born to spread the good message (*εὐαγγέλιον*) of universal salvation beyond Jerusalem to the whole world (Acts 1:8). Thus, it seems, for Luke, whatever happens to Jesus was both from God and for the benefit of all humanity. Everything was a demonstration of his magnanimity.

6.2.2.2. Jesus' Magnanimity and Generosity

Furthermore, in Luke, Jesus' life and ministry represent an example of divine magnanimity. The term magnanimity (μεγαλοψυχία) has its root in the Greek word-pair μεγαλο- great, ψυχία, soul. Its Latin equivalent was *magnanimitās* formed from *magnus*, (great) and *animus* (soul). The word, therefore, means greatness of soul, high-mindedness, and lordliness.[881] On the other hand, the word ἐλευθεριότης (generosity) mean liberality or giving freely.[882] From the above definitions, it can be observed that magnanimity and generosity are almost mutually inclusive.

[878] Cf. Josephus, *War* 2.118.
[879] See, also Horsley, 2003: 41.
[880] Hermogenes says that "for the manner of their death, you mention any events after their death, including any oracles." Kennedy, 2003: 82.
[881] LSJ at Perseus, μεγαλοψυχία.
[882] LSJ at Perseus, ἐλευθέριος (free) and ἐλευθεριότης (generosity). See also Lampe, 2016: 2.

In the *Progymnasmata*, they fall under the deeds of the Soul together with justice, wisdom, temperance, courage and piety.[883] Also related to the terms magnanimity and generosity is the term beneficence. Beneficence (εὐεργεσία, Lat. *beneficentia*) was primarily the privilege of the gods, the emperor and the οἱ πλούσιοι.[884] The gods were known for their beneficence in the provision of material goods. Imperial beneficence through the provision of food to the poor and protection from enemies represents the second level of Greco-Roman beneficence. Beneficence was also expected of the rich and local *archons* across the empire. For example, Herod's lavish beneficence to Antioch in paving the main street with marble and building the beautiful Temple in Jerusalem was part of the local ruler's display of beneficence.[885] The public beneficence of local magnates included building temples to gods or emperor in return for which they received public or religious office.[886] Likewise, Luke presents Jesus as performing miracles with human beneficiaries and interacting with the outcasts of society. In this way, Luke portrays Jesus not only as an embodiment of divine generosity but also as an exemplar of magnanimity for the Lucan churches. The table 6.1 below summarises Luke's interest in demonstrating Jesus' magnanimity.

Table 6.1: Jesus' Miracles

	Healing Miracle	**Text**	**Tradition**
1	The demon possessed man	4:31-37	Double with M
2	Peter's mother-in-law and others	4:38-41	Triple Tradition
3	The Man with leprosy	5:12-15	Triple Tradition
4	The paralysed man	5:17: -26	Triple Tradition
	The man with the withered hand	6:6-11	Triple Tradition
5	The raising of the son of the widow of Nain	7:11-16	L
6	The bleeding woman and the dead girl	8:40-53	Triple Tradition
7	The demon possessed boy	9:37-42	Triple tradition
8	The crippled woman	13:10-17	L
9	A man with dropsy	14:1-5	L
10	Ten men of leprosy	17:11-19	L
11	The blind Beggar, 18:35-	18:35-42	Triple Tradition

[883] Kennedy, 2003: 206.
[884] For examples *Hymn to Demeter*, 485-9 says "Right blessed is he among men on earth whom they (the gods) freely love: soon they do send Plutus as guest to his great house, Plutus who gives wealth to mortal men." tr. Hugh G. Evelyn-White. See also Brown, 2002: 5; Horsley, 2004:16.
[885] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 16:148, *Jewish War* 1.425.
[886] Horsley, 2004:16.

We can observe from Table 6:1 above that out of the eleven healing miracles recorded by Luke four miracles are purely Lucan. These four miracles represent 36% of Jesus' total healing miracles in the Gospel. The statistic suggests that Luke goes the extra mile to provide more evidence for the magnanimity of Jesus as a fulfilment of his Nazareth manifesto. The first man liberated from oppression is the man with an unclean spirit in Luke 3:31-37. The historical connection between spirit possession and epileptic seizures (v. 35)[887] demonstrates the deplorable condition from which Jesus liberated the healed man. The healing of Simon Peter's mother-in-law and others follows in Lk 4:38-44. These formative acts of magnanimity fuse into the general character of Jesus' ministry as the Gospel's narrative unfolds.

Also interspersed with the miracles are instances of Jesus' fellowship with sinners and the poor. Table 6.2 below demonstrates the instances in which Jesus not only interacted with ordinary individuals but also provided for their daily needs. It can also be observed that like the healing miracles above, Luke goes beyond the common sources to demonstrate Jesus' magnanimity.

Table 6.2: Jesus' Fellowship with the Outcasts

	Feeding/Fellowship	**Text**	**Tradition**
1	Miraculous catch of fish	5:1-11	L
2	Eats with sinners	5:27-31	Triple tradition
3	Sinful Woman's anointing	7:36-50	L
4	Feeding the five thousand	9:10-17	Triple tradition

6.2.2.3. Jesus' Generosity in Greco-Roman Context

In the Greco-Roman world, generosity was strongly tied to reciprocity. Reciprocity was a system of social exchange aimed at satisfying a need.[888] The concept had both economic and ethical dimensions. Although Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.* 1119b, 22ff) encourages every free man, ἐλεύθερος, to give liberally, reciprocity was the underlying assumption behind such generosity. In the everyday reality of the Greco-Roman world, the primary objects of reciprocity were equals, such as friends who were capable of returning the favours.[889] Marshal Sahlin provides us with three types of reciprocity: (1) Generalised reciprocity, which was altruistic in nature

[887]See Cavanna, Cavanna and A. Cavanna, 2010: 89-91.
[888] Von Reden, 1998: 180-197.
[889] Lampe, 2016: 2.

and mostly understood in terms of kinship; (2) Balanced reciprocity, which was defined as mutual helpfulness; its pragmatic test was the inability to tolerate one way-flows; and (3) Negative reciprocity, which involved the attempt to get something for nothing with impunity, usually from those outside the kinship group.[890] From the above types of reciprocity, it is difficult to determine the nature of reciprocity in Jesus actions in the Gospel. Nevertheless, because of its altruistic dimension, Jesus' action can be described as generalised reciprocity. His depiction of Gentile generosity (Lk 10:25-37), his magnanimity to the masses (Lk 9:1-17) and his association with the rich outcasts (Lk 19:1-10) and the sinful (ἁμαρτωλός) woman (Lk 7:36) demonstrate that in his life and ministry Jesus was creating a fictive kinship. He was creating a new community around him using individuals from ethnically and socially differentiated backgrounds. By modelling generosity in his everyday life Jesus envisaged that in this community of kin and fictive-kin, social relations would be intimate, inclusive, and governed by the reciprocity characteristic of family and friends.[891] It is also possible to call Jesus' action non-reciprocal generosity. This was a conception of generosity espoused by some philosophers and moralists, such as the Aristotle and Plutarch, which went beyond the general cultural conception of generosity and reciprocity. Contrary to conventional thinking, Aristotle advises that it is noble to render a service not with an eye to receiving one in return.[892] In relation to the masses (οἱ πολλοί), Plutarch argues:

> First, then, let the gifts be made without anything in return (γιγνέσθωσαν οὖν αἱ μεταδόσεις πρῶτον μὲν ἀντὶ μηδενός), because in this way they surprise and overcome the recipients more completely. [893]

The above type of generosity describes Jesus' actions with the masses. The story of the bleeding woman provides a good example of Jesus' non-reciprocal generosity. Although Luke only says, "no one would heal her" (8:43), Mark records the huge sums of money she had spent on doctors (Mk 5:26). Yet Jesus heals her and lets her go without payment. [894] Given the above example,

---

[890] Sahlin, 1972*:* 176, 177, 310.
[891] Elliot, 1991: 104.
[892] Nic. Eth. 1162b.
[893] See Lampe's (2016: 3) translation of *Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae*, 822ab.
[894] From Simon Magnus' story in Acts 8:9-25, it is possible that he benefited from his practice of magic. This is possible when seen against the background of the story of the slave girl with a predicting spirit in Acts 16:16-4 and her owners. It appears she used to make money for her masters.

in the ears of Luke's Hellenistic audience Jesus' actions were in keeping with the character of the gods, the Emperor and the local πλούσιοι who were expected to be generous to the masses. Yet, while for the Emperor and the local πλούσιοι, loyalty was expected from the beneficiaries, Jesus' generosity went beyond this conception of beneficence. In this way, Luke called on the rich to learn from Jesus' magnanimity and replicate it in their everyday life (Lk 9:1-6; 18:22; Acts 3:1-10). For the rich such replication would take place within the new fictive kinship groups in which they together with the poor have come together by virtue of being followers of Jesus.

It can also be argued that Jesus' fellowship with sinners such as tax collectors and prostitutes and his feeding of multitudes provided a further didactic dimension to the understanding of fellowship within Luke's communities. Studies in Greco-Roman commensality demonstrate that meals had exclusive or inclusive significance. Meals had a putative aim of "making-friends" and determined who was included or excluded from the social group.[895] Eating and drinking together was a confirmation of fellowship and mutual social obligation.[896] A Pompeian graffiti announcement that "the man with whom I do not dine is a barbarian to me"[897] confirms the segregative aspects of meals. Yet, while the average person dined with kith and kin, contrary to conventional practice Jesus dined with sinners, the poor, and interacts with prostitutes (Lk 7:36-50). He also provided for the masses in times of extreme need (Lk 9:10-17). He even provided fish for poor fishermen who had toiled all night (Lk 5:1-11). Through all this, Jesus emerges as the "lover of the poor", a person who embodied public virtue in antiquity.[898] Quintilian emphasized that praise must be given not for the mere possession of external and accidental advantages but for their honourable employment.[899] Jesus' magnanimity to the poor represented all the elements of honourable employment of virtue. This characterisation of the action of Jesus who is summarised in Acts as one who "went about doing good" (Acts 10:38), demonstrates the encomiastic dimensions of Luke's writings.

[895] Braun, 2007: 52.
[896] Ibid. 47.
[897] Quoted in Ibid. 47.
[898] This is also called *humanitas*, the benevolent style of rule associated with a Roman emperor in the classical period. See, Brown, 2002: 1.
[899] Vickers, 1983: 505.

6.3. JESUS AND THE PRAISE OF GENEROSITY

Besides his action of healing, interacting with sinners, and feeding the poor, Luke records several instances in which, through parables and in specific didactic encounters with individuals, Jesus directly praises generosity. A major component of Jesus' teaching involved the use of parables. This practice resonated with the convention of Greco-Roman rhetorical pedagogy. The relationship between parables and progymnasmatic exercises of *chrea*, maxims and fables and their didactic function has been a significant feature of recent studies on parables.[900] This relationship suggests that to Luke's audience, the didactic and paraenetic function of the fable and *chrea* would have been obvious in Jesus' teaching through parables. In this section, we examine four parables of Jesus and two didactic encounters and argue that they demonstrate Jesus' praise of generosity.

6.3.1. The Parable of the Magnanimous Samaritan (Lk 10: 25-37)

The parable of the Good Samaritan is the first parable in Jesus' travel narratives (9: 51-19: 48). One of the narrative needs of the section is the formation of the disciples.[901] The context of the parable is the lawyer's question on how one can attain eternal life (Lk 10: 25). The lawyer's question has parallels in Mt 22: 34-40 and Mk 12: 28-34. Only Luke's version of the encounter extends the discussion into the parable of the Good Samaritan. This unique departure is very telling for Luke's redactional intentions and community application. It demonstrates his interest in interpersonal relationships among his original audience. It can be observed that embedded in the parable are two rhetorical devices that highlight Jesus' intentions for his hearers and by implications Luke's message for his community. The two rhetorical devices are *synrisis* (comparison) and amplification. *Syncrisis* (comparison) creates a contrast that demonstrates that the extolled person is the measure of perfection.[902] According to Aphthonius the Sophist, while virtues are to be honoured for themselves, when measured against each other they become worthy of imitation[903] In his analysis of *syncrisis*, Nicolaus advises on the need to compare one's subject with those generally above them. He posits that "our subject will seem great when they seem greater than the great.[904] Jesus' comparison of the Levite and Priest against the Samaritan demonstrates his acute application of *syncrisis*. Within Jesus' Jewish audience, the

900 See, Hock, 2003: 181-96; Klyne, 2008: 45–77; Penner, 2012: 349-360; Yan. 2012: 3-28.
901 Green, 1997: 397.
902 Miguélez-Cavero, 2010: 25.
903 Kennedy, 2003:114.
904 Ibid. 163.

Samaritan's status was far below that of a Priest or a Levite. The contrast was, therefore, one of a lesser subject against greater subjects. Yet while the Levite and the Priest renege on their duty of care to the wounded traveller, Jesus elevates the Samaritan to the status of the hero of the story.[905] The Samaritan's virtuous action becomes the paragon of generosity and magnanimity and one that is to be imitated by the hearers.

Second, amplification helps to lengthen the "size of the subject" through the intensification of existing facts.[906] This can foster vividness that creates seeing through hearing.[907] Significant amplification is also evident in the parable. For example, in contrast to his presentation of the action of the Priest and Levite, Jesus goes to great lengths to explain the Samaritan's gesture of generosity in a way that heightens the Samaritan's image. He saw the wounded man and had compassion for him (v. 34). He conveys the injured man to an inn, puts wine and oil on his wounds, pays the innkeeper to care for him and promises to pay any bills that may be incurred in the care of the injured (vv. 33-35). Green has argued that the care the Samaritan offers is not a model of obligation, but exaggerated action grounded in compassion that risks much more than could be even required or expected.[908] Green's argument supports the presence of rhetorical amplification in the parable.

The image of the Samaritan that Jesus produces through the parable would have had several implications for both Jesus' audience and the primary audience of the Lucan text. For Jesus' audience, the parable radically revised the notion of neighbourliness within the context of Jewish-Samaritan ethnic relations. It postulated that true neighbourliness knows no bounds and must proceed from spontaneity and self-forgetfulness.[909] Within the mixed community of Lucan churches, where social differences posed a challenge to group social cohesion, Jesus' praise of the Samaritan's action challenged all boundary and social expectation.[910] The Samaritan becomes, like Jesus himself, the magnanimous individual who goes out of his way

[905] Josephus (See, *Antiquities*, 11:340-341), refers to the Samaritans as apostates who deny being Jewish but embrace Jewishness when the nation experiences fortune. Therefore, within a Jewish context extolling the virtues of a Samaritan would have been unthinkable. The unfavourable reference to the Samaritans in Luke's Gospel (9:51-55) also confirms this negative depiction of the Samaritans. Yet Jesus characterisation of the Samaritans does the opposite, to the consternation of his Jewish audience.
[906] Pernot, 2014:87; Miguélez-Cavero, 2010: 31.
[907] Kennedy, 2003: 86.
[908] Green, 1997: 432.
[909] Franklin, 2001: 942; Esler, 2000: 325-357.
[910] Culpepper, 1995: 229; Green, 1997: 431; Nolland, 1989: 450.

to aid those in need without consideration for his safety but that of the victim (Lk 10:19). As Culpepper has argued, the assailants left the victim with nothing to identify his status except his desperate need.[911] Jesus' failure to specify the man's ethnicity was absolutely essential to the situation he establishes and to what transpires thereafter.[912] The non-discriminatory character of the Samaritan becomes a significant contrast to the non-caring attitude of the officers of Jewish religious establishment.

Therefore, in a society where all social intercourse was determined to a greater or lesser degree by the perception of participants' position in society,[913] the parable was a revolutionary attempt to reinforce commonly held values in the Lucan churches. It challenged the rich to redefine their concept of friendship and kinship and the nature of reciprocity they practised. The challenge to emulate the lowly Samaritan who was prepared to go to the aid of those who despised him challenged not only privilege and status, but also exclusiveness.[914] This notion would have had significant implications even for the poor and those despised in the community. Its challenge to love "the different other" was reminiscent of Jesus' call to "love your enemies and do good to those who hate you" (Lk 6:29-35). For Luke's immediate audience, the parable demonstrates that while salvation had its basis in God's relationship with humanity (v. 27), the expression of this relationship is found in everyday human encounters. It is found in the broader understanding of a neighbour as anyone in need. It is found in the effort to go the extra mile for a stranger, whatever their ethnic group, without expecting anything in return. That is what, for Luke, constitutes magnanimity, a virtue that reflects the very nature of God and Jesus (Act 10:38), and one he expected to inculcate in Theophilus, his fellow new converts and the rest of the community members.

6.3.2. Magnanimity and the Parable of the Banquet (14:12-24)

The parable of the banquet (14:12-24) continues Jesus' praise of non-reciprocal generosity. Some scholars see chapter 14 of Luke as having its setting in a symposium where related teachings of Jesus in vv.1-6, vv. 7-14, and vv.12-24 are combined.[915] This understanding has

[911] Culpepper, 1995: 229.
[912] Esler, 2000: 337.
[913] Pomeroy, 1991: 51.
[914] Franklin, 2001: 942.
[915] Levine and Witherington, 2018: 387.

led to a variety of interpretations for the parable. For some scholars, the theme of the parable is the position of Israel in relation to outcasts. Such outcasts could include Gentiles who form part of the third invitation. For others, the parable reflects Jesus' interest in both the Jewish and Gentile mission of the church. Therefore, the eschatological reversal in the fortunes of Israel forms the major teaching here. The problem with this position, for some scholars, is that it makes the poor and the outcasts afterthoughts in God's plan.[916]

There are, however, two mutually inclusive perspectives that can be used to interpret the parable. First, when the parable is read from the context of v. 15 and v. 24, the emphasis becomes the eschatological reversal based on people's response to Jesus' invitation. This makes the parable a commentary on Jesus' ministry.[917] The second perspective is to understand Jesus' call for the adoption of unconventional banquet customs in v. 14 as the basis for understanding the thrust of the parable.[918] This second position aligns well with the whole chapter's general argument for unconventional behaviour, which challenges the endemic Greco-Roman male quest for honour.[919]

At the heart of the parable is what the rich householder does when his peers snubbed him. Against the social conventions of his day, he invited the poor to the banquet. Understood within the context of Greco-Roman system of kinship and reciprocity, the host's action demonstrated the transformed understanding of social relations of a dishonoured rich man.[920] This transformation or conversion enabled him to include anyone, especially the poor, as his table guests. The rich host in the parable, therefore, became an exemplar of an elite who took Jesus' earlier counsel (vv. 12-14) seriously and extended hospitality to those generally defined by their dishonourable status and therefore excluded from the circles of power and privilege.[921]

It is also interesting to note that the position the rich host took, after being snubbed by his peers, is a very difficult one. By inviting the poor to his banquet, he was not only issuing an insult to

---

[916] See Lampe, 1962*:* 836; Evans,1990: 225; Marshal, 1978: 585; Franklin, 2001: 946.
[917] Tannehill, 1996: 234.
[918] Green, 1997:557; Tannehill, 1996; 234.
[919] Balch, 2003: 1136.
[920] Green, 1997: 561. See also Balch, 2003: 1136.
[921] Green, 1997: 561.

his rich friends but also shunning the social standards that defined their privileged status.[922] His action required not only a change of mindset to make a clean break with his past but also the radical discipleship that Jesus demands (14:25-35).[923] It is telling how the host appears to exemplify radical discipleship demanded by Jesus in v. 12. This is evident in the way he announces that those who rejected him will never partake of his banquet (v. 24). According to Green, through this statement, the host raised the stakes considerably and completely rejected the social order that gave power and significance to those who had heaped shame on him.[924] He embraced a new identity and a way of life that resonated with the spirit of Jesus' magnanimity. He became not only a friend of the destitute but also through his experience of rejection by his peers, becomes one who identified with their experiences. This new identity of destitution enables him to freely share with those whom he would not normally socialise at the same level.

It can, therefore, be concluded that for the Lucan audiences, the parable would have been relevant both in the context of the eschatological reversal and as a challenge to conventional table etiquette. The two dimensions together suggest that those who have responded to Jesus' call and who will partake in the eschatological banquet have the responsibility to demonstrate magnanimity to the poor in everyday life. It is possible that in the Lucan context, the parable reflected the problem that a rich believer might have when trying to keep one foot in each social world.[925] While this would have been difficult into put in practice, as it involved sailing against the current of entrenched kinship and reciprocity, those who follow Jesus, as our rich host, must be willing to break with tradition (vv. 25-33).

6.3.3. The Parable of the "Loving Father" (Lk 15:11-32)

The parable of the Prodigal Son (as it is traditionally known) continues the theme of Jesus' praise of generosity. The parable is the longest and third of a set of three parables dealing with lost but found items that culminate in celebration (Lk 15:6, 9, 22-24). Among numerous approaches that have been used to interpret the parable, two deserve mention. The first and

[922]Culpepper, 1995: 290.
[923]Tannehill, 1996: 234.
[924]Green, 1997: 562.
[925]Tannehill, 1996: 234.

dominant trend emphasises the estrangement and subsequent restoration of the son.[926] The second approach places emphasis on the magnanimity of the father in accepting his estranged son.[927] This approach has often determined the traditional title of the parable as the parable of the prodigal son. It can be argued that both approaches provide a plausible interpretative framework for understanding the meaning of the parable. Nevertheless, the significant detail that Luke devotes to the action of the father magnifies his image as a figure worth imitating. The father demonstrates his magnanimity in several ways. First, the father is willing to give a share of his property after his younger son's request. Although according to property law, a child was entitled to ask for part of their parent's property (cf. Sir 33:19-20), this was an unusual practice. Yet the father gives in to the demands of the son. The father's generous behaviour later assures the son of the possibility of being accepted back and re-integrated into the family.[928]

Second, the indignity of running and embracing the once prodigal son, which was unconventional and surprising for an elderly in this culture, demonstrated the father's unusually magnanimous spirit.[929] This becomes further evident in the way the father celebrates his son's arrival in the most lavish way: a fatted cow, the best robe, the best ring, and shoes. Byrne argues that where slaves went barefoot, members of the family wore shoes; the ring signified a measure of authority and, to cap it all, there is to be a communal celebration (v. 24).[930] Eric Franklin observes that it is not clear that those who attended the celebration approved of the father's action and would have thought something was not right.[931] It is, however, more probable that slaves and servants of the household would have attended the celebrations. The aorist plural subjunctive *εὐφρανθῶμεν*, (from *εὐφραίνω*) "let us be merry" (v. 23), which is overtly inclusive, suggests a household party where the majority would be servants. The father's magnanimity to his servants is implicit in the younger son's reference to his father's servants having more than enough bread (v. 17) The verb used is the third person plural of *περισσεύω* which means "over

926 Knight, 1998: 119.
927 Levine and Witherington, 2018: 423. See also, Byrne, 2002: 144-147.
928 Levine and Witherington, 2018: 423.
929 Lieu (quoted in Levine and Witherington, 423) observes that the behaviour of the father resonates with Jesus' reaction to the death of the widow of Nain's son (7:13) and the Samaritan upon seeing the wounded man (10:33). It potentially portrays "the indignity of a respectable man running to meet his son with the crowds shocked at the absence of the expected and deserved rejection or rebuke." See also Morris, 1988: 265; Byrne, 2002: 145; Franklin, 2001: 947.
930 Byrne, 2002: 144.
931 Franklin, 2001: 947.

and above"[932] and demonstrates the father's natural spirit of magnanimity and the possible inclusion (apart from some being attendants) of the servants in the party.

The parable would have had significant implications in Luke's communities. First, although the major thrust of the parable is Jesus' teaching that the heavenly father welcomes repentant sinners, the story is also paraenetic. It encourages the welcoming of sinners and eating with them, celebrating the finding of the lost and confessing sinners in Christian households.[933] According to Balch the parable provided a model of generosity even among the rich, especially where one of their own had fallen from grace. The father's behaviour to the younger son both before and after his prodigality demonstrates a model of magnanimity and generosity that transcended the conventional social norms of the Greco-Roman world. The God-like image that the father portrays in the story becomes the standard for which Christians should treat confessing poor sinners. Such a picture represented Luke's commitment to demonstrating the cross-cutting nature of Jesus' message of salvation and its implications for social relations.

6.3.4. The parable of the Generous Steward (Lk 16:1-9)

The parable of the shrewd steward is also one of the most studied of Jesus' parables. Several dimensions, approaches, and emphases have been used in the study of this parable. Among the emphases are the question of the status of the steward,[934] his sin in squandering his master's *ὑπάρχοντα* (possessions*)* as a lesson in stewardship[935] and why, in spite of his dishonesty, Jesus commends the steward.[936] It would seem that the major question, which has led to different interpretations, is the meaning of the steward's action after his warning of impending dismissal and the commendation that follows.

From the larger literary context of the parable (9:51-19: 48), it can be observed that the theme of discipleship, particularly in relation to eschatological preparedness, forms the internal frame of the parable. Part of that pragmatic eschatological preparedness lies in being generous.

[932] Liddell and Scott, 2007: 553.
[933] Balch, 2003: 1138.
[934] Baergen, 2006: 25-38; Culpepper, 1995: 308.
[935] Lygre, 2002: 22-28.
[936] Schellenberg, 2008: 264.

However, the generosity advocated in the parable, although it contains some traditional elements of reciprocity—for the steward to be received into people's home (v.4) — has an interesting twist to it. Its debt reduction element (vv. 5-7), understood in the context of the problems of debts in the Greco-Roman world, has liberating overtones. Douglas Oakman notes how the problem of debt exacerbated the negative relationship between the rich and the poor. Because of the entrenched burden of debts, during the Judean Insurgency, the first action of the insurgents was the burning of the office where debt-records were kept.[937] In view of this understanding, some scholars think that the relatively high value of the debts owed (nine hundred gallons of oil and a thousand bushels of wheat vv. 5-7) reflects trading patterns among the rich. Even if this is true, it is also possible to argue that the steward's generous loan reduction mirrors the unorthodox reconciliation that was lived out by Jesus of Nazareth.[938] The steward's action was also almost commensurate with the unconventional forgiveness of the loving father in 10:11-32. In the context of the problem of debts in the Mediterranean world, such action echoed Jesus' mission objective summarised in the Nazareth manifesto (Lk 4:18-19).

The steward's liberating action above provides a framework for understanding Luke's presentation of Jesus' vision of inter-personal relationships in the socially differentiated churches associated with the Third Gospel. It presented an alternative way of being generous in the community. It demonstrated that apart from inviting the poor into their homes (Lk 14:12-24), renouncing everything (Lk 14:33; 18:22) and giving part of their wealth or all of it to the poor (Lk 8:3), debt reduction or relief (cf Lk 6:35) was another means through which interpersonal relationships could be managed in the community.[939] The parable compelled its primary audience to reconsider their own loyalties and emulate the debt relief scheme of the prudent steward. [940] In this case, the steward is not a negative figure but an example of how to be an eschatologically conscious disciple of Jesus. It suggests that to be a follower of Jesus means to find any means at one's disposal to live out the mission of Jesus with its political and economic implications. To emphasise the political role of Jesus' message, Ched Myers refers to the steward's role as "the manager of injustice."[941] Therefore, like the steward in the parable, the rich are called to relinquish their privilege and status and work towards correcting injustices

[937] Oakman, 2014: 18, 24.
[938] King, 2018: 18–25.
[939] See also Balch, 2003: 1138.
[940] King, 2018: 18–25.
[941] Myers, 2012: 17-32.

in their communities. Such an attitude would be not only commendable but would also provide an opportunity for internal unity and camaraderie among Christ-followers.

6.3.5. Zacchaeus and Generosity to the Poor (Lk 19:1-10)

The story of Zacchaeus represents Luke's continuing interest in the relationship between the rich and the poor and how salvation affects that relationship. With its context in the controversy over whether the rich can enter the kingdom of God (Lk 18:18-30), the story presents not only the possibility of salvation for the rich but also its implications for their attitude to wealth. Luke presents Zacchaeus as a rich tax collector who wanted to see Jesus.[942] As a chief tax collector, it is likely that Zacchaeus would rightly be referred to as πλούσιος (v. 1). In the Friesen Poverty scale, already discussed in chapter 4, those on level 3 (PS3) with an average annual income of 25,000-150,000 denari a year, were the municipal elites. This group constituted decurial families, wealthy men and women who did not hold office, some freed persons, some retainers, some veterans, and some merchants.[943] Since the retainer class comprised those who supported the governing elite by serving them in various functions, chief tax collectors belonged to this section.[944]

However, in a Jewish context, the reference to ἀρχιτελώνης, chief-tax collector, implies that Zacchaeus was an outcast in his local community.[945] Yet Jesus acts contrary to social convention; he is willing to ask for hospitality and be hosted by an individual with whom society would not associate (v. 5). Jesus' warm, unconventional and unconditional acceptance of Zacchaeus results in life-changing decisions for the latter. These life-changing decisions had implications for the poor in Zacchaeus' community. First, Zacchaeus is willing to re-arrange his finances by giving half of his ὑπάρχοντα, possessions, to the poor, and to repaying fourfold to anyone he has defrauded.[946] As a member of the provincial elite with an average income of

---

[942] The idea of, ἀρχιτελώνης "chief tax collector" suggests he was in charge of the collection of a variety of tolls in the area. See also, Danker, 1988: 305.
[943] Friesen, 2004: 341.
[944] Lensky, cited in Autero, 2011: 37.
[945] This is evident from the fact that although he was evidently rich and therefore, technically a leader, the crowd could make way for him (v. 3). Secondly, the by-standers' discontentment with Jesus' proposition to be hosted by Zacchaeus points to his low social status in Jericho (v.7). See, Nolland, 1989: 905.
[946] Levine and Witherington, 2018: 512. The present form of Zacchaeus' declaration has been a source of considerable hermeneutical controversy. Some think the present indicative active δίδωμι - "I give", and

25,000-150,000 denarii a year,[947] Zacchaeus' giving of half of that wealth to the destitute would have been life-changing for many. Zacchaeus' commendable gesture represents Luke's awareness of the proximity of riches and poverty in the community and the need to correct this contradiction.

It can also be observed that Zacchaeus' decision of restoration goes beyond the reparation for extortion cases in the Torah, which required restitution plus 20% (Lev 5:16; Numb 5:7). By repaying fourfold, Zacchaeus goes beyond normal requirements and binds himself to the law imposed on sheep thieves (Ex 22:1).[948] Nolland notes that Roman law also required fourfold restitution in certain circumstances, particularly in the case of wrongful accusation in the courts.[949] He further argues that Roman influence of the fourfold restitution could be seen in a Jewish divorce settlement.[950] Yet by going beyond what was required within his Jewish context, Zacchaeus was unusually magnanimous.

Within the churches associated with Luke, Jesus' magnanimity towards Zacchaeus and the latter's generosity towards the poor would have had significant implications. For outcasts like Zacchaeus, Jesus' action could have been an affirmation of their right to belong to the people of God, while for a community inclined to exclude sinners such as tax collectors or the destitute, it could have been a challenging reminder of the meaning of the inclusive mission of Jesus.[951] On the other hand, for those struggling with the question of how to handle unrighteous wealth after conversion, the story provided a model of what conversion meant.[952] It demonstrates that conversion results in a personal transformational that affects all aspects of an individual's life, including their attitude to wealth. In a community rocked with the challenge of the proximity of riches and poverty, the parable offered a framework of non-reciprocal generosity from the

ἀποδίδωμι- "I restore" suggests regular practice; that it is Zacchaeus' response to crowd's negative reaction. Yet most scholars think that v. 8 is Zacchaeus' statement of intent, a change in his social orientation. This latter view is supported by Zacchaeus's to the reference to "Lord." The vocative Κύριε (Lord) suggest that he is responding to Jesus' magnanimous welcome of him. Evans, 1990: 280; Levine and Witherington, 2018: 512; Green, 1997: 671; Eric Franklin, 2001: 951; Culpepper, 1995: 358.

947 Friesen, 2004: 344.

948 BDAG, 2000: 306.

949 Nolland, 1989: 906.

950 Ibid.

951 Tannehill, 1996: 277.

952 Ibid.

rich towards their poor fellow members of the Christ-groups.[953] It can also be observed that, in exalting generosity, the parable echoes both the other parables of Jesus, (Lk 10:25-37; 14:12-24; 16:1-9) and the spirit of the Sermon (Lk 6:17-49) in which generosity and non-reciprocal giving forms the major thrust.

6.3.6. The Widows' Offering and the Generosity of the Destitute (Lk 21:1-4)

The offering of the widow in Luke chapter 21 provides the last instance of Jesus' praise of generosity.[954] The incident takes place outside the travel narratives and forms part of Jesus' conflict stories with the religious leaders in the Jerusalem Temple. Jesus' praise of the widow's offering follows immediately after his condemnation of the scribes for devouring widows' houses (Lk 20:45-47). Given this context, some commentators argue that in the story Jesus is not commending the action of the widow but indicting the religious leaders for devouring the widow's livelihood. They argue that widows in her state should not have been giving to the treasury but rather being supported by it.[955] While this observation is possible, given the context of the incident, that Jesus is praising the widow's action remains a valid argument and weighs heavily against this view. First, the Torah and the whole Jewish sacrificial system did not exonerate the poor from giving. The poorest of Israel could bring a pair of turtle doves or young pigeons because that is all they could afford (Levi. 1:14-17). Second, the fact that the main characters in the story are the rich and the poor (the later represented by the widow) suggests that it is more than the religious establishment which is under indictment here. The incident ties in with Luke's penchant for juxtaposing the rich and poor (Lk 6:20-24; 14:7-24; 16:19-31; 19:1-10).

In the story, Jesus observes the giving patterns of the rich vis-à-vis that of a poor widow offering only two small copper coins (Lk 21. 2). The offering box was part of the temple treasury which was in the court of women. It had 13 shofar-chests (ram's horns) through which individuals contributed to the functioning of the Temple and its processes.[956] Nolland notes that the

[953] Balch rightly argues that Luke has transformed a story of a conversion of a rich man's household into an apology for legitimating Christian patrons. He thinks Luke is defending Christian households like that of Lydia, Aquila, and Priscilla; that if they give half of their property to the poor, then salvation has come to their household in spite of what Jesus says in 18:25. Balch, 2003: 1145.

[954] Edward, (2015: 588) observes that this is the seventh and last widow mentioned in the Third Gospel.

[955] Green, 1997: 728. See also Evans, 1990: 307.

[956] Some of these shofar chests were for new shekel dues, Old shekel dues, bird offerings, young birds for the

contribution of the rich provided the financial backbone of the maintenance and functioning of the Temple.[957] Yet the poor widow's offering attracts Jesus' attention and offers him an opportunity to teach about generous giving. The word used with reference to her economic status is not the conventional πτωχός but the adjective of πενιχρός, needy.[958] The word is found in classical literature such as Plato and Plutarch but is absent elsewhere in the NT and other Christian literature.[959] This reference to the widow's poverty provides a contrast to the rich who also present their offering.

The amount that the poor widow gave provides an interesting understanding of Jesus' perception of generosity. It took 128 lepta to make a denarius, a day's wage and the woman only offered two lepta. [960] Some scholars hold that it was not possible under Jewish law to offer less than two lepta.[961] This suggests that in monetary terms, the widow offered a small and almost insignificant gift to the temple treasury. Yet Jesus declares that she offered more than the rich. According to Jesus, the widow, out of her ὑστερήμα, need or deficiency, gave all her βίος, livelihood. She had been a πενιχρά, (needy) upon her arrival, and after her offering, she goes away a πτωχή (destitute). While in real terms, Jesus' claim that the widow gave all she had sounds hyperbolical, as the widow could not live on two lepta, it demonstrates her willingness to give despite her need. According to Levine and Witherington, her action epitomises appropriately placed generosity and acted as a model for the rich. It demonstrates that the amount of donation is of less value than the percentage of one's assets it represents.[962] This type of generosity also resonates with the Aristotelian liberality which emphasised prorated generosity.[963]

whole offering, wood, gold for the mercy seat, and six shofar chests for a free-will offering. See Edwards, 2015: 588.

[957] Nolland, 1989: 978.

[958] LSJ at Perseus, πενιχρός. According to Longenecker, the word πτωχός and πενιχρός are closely related in meaning. They all refer to destitution. For example, Longenecker observes that when Philo wants to speak of a poor man becoming destitute, he does not use πτωχός but πενιχρός. Longenecker, 2010:38.

[959] See Plato, *Republic.* 9.578a; Plutarch, *Amatorius,* 9.24.

[960] In a Jewish context it took 132 lepta to make a day's wage.

[961] Talbert, 2002: 228; See also Morris, 1988: 321-22.

[962] Levine and Witherington, 2018:557-8. Tannehill, 1996: 300, also observes that in this way, Jesus introduces a new way of counting gifts; (v.4): gifts contributed out of abundance, and those contributed out of poverty. See Tannehill, 1996: 300.

[963] Aristotle argues that "In crediting people with liberality their resources must be taken into account; for the liberality of a gift does not depend on its amount, but on the disposition of the giver, and a liberal disposition gives according to its substance. It is therefore possible that the smaller giver may be the more liberal, if he gives from smaller means." Aristotle, *Nicom. Ethics*, 4.1.19, ed. H. Rackham.

The function of Jesus' temple comment in the Lucan churches could have been varied depending on which perspective one takes: whether Jesus is indicting the religious establishment for devouring the widow or is advocating sincerity and generosity in the offering. Some see behind the text the controversy over the treatment of widows, especially in relation to their influence in the communities.[964] While again we cannot deny the existence of various undercurrents in the text, it is obvious that the story challenges the comfortable piety of the rich and encourages them to give generously as a demonstration of their commitment to the Lord.[965] At the same time, the story demonstrates that generosity is not only expected of the rich. Both the poor and the rich have the responsibility to give. Giving is not dependent on how much one has but on understanding one's responsibility to give in a community context. In this case, poverty is not a deterrent to generosity. Elsewhere, in 2 Cor. 8:2, Paul commends the Macedonian churches who, despite their abject poverty, demonstrate their commitment by giving generously. Thus, in the Lucan context, generosity should be the hallmark of the community of Christ-followers, regardless of their status.

6.4. JESUS AND THE REPROACH OF A NON-GENEROUS SPIRIT

In addition to praising generosity, the Third Gospel also depicts Jesus reproach of stinginess, greed and the spirit non-generosity. This section analyses two parables in which Jesus teaches against failed generosity. It also examines Jesus' encounters with the rich and how these provided the opportunity for his tirade against stinginess.

6.4.1. Parable of the Rich Fool (Lk 12:13-21)

The parable of the rich fool is part of Jesus' series of teachings against failure to share with the poor. As part of Jesus' travel narrative (Lk 9:51-18:48), the immediate context of the parable is the request from someone in the crowd who asked Jesus to settle his inheritance problems with his brother (Lk 12:13). The Greek word for inheritance, *κληρονομία*, has a sense of property or possessions.[966] The reference to property provides a fitting context to the parable. As Danker

[964] Balch argues that there were groups of ascetic widows in the Lucan churches (1:36-38; Acts 6:1-6; 9:36, 39, 41 and the issue of how they were treated (6:1) and their influence in the church was often controversial (Acts of Paul and Thecla, 30). See Balch, 2003: 1148-49.
[965] Culpepper (1995: 1149) thinks the widow is a model of giving, possibly also for rich Christians who mostly supplied the domestic space in which the church worshipped.
[966] Liddell and Scott at Perseus, *κληρονομία*.

has observed, possessions strike at the root of the human need which is security and drives humans into acquisitiveness.[967] As is demonstrable in the parable, this materialistic approach to property goes against Jesus' spirit of magnanimity and generosity.

In the parable, the land of a rich man produced plentifully. In a Greco-Roma context, the reference to the man as *πλούσιος* suggests that tenants worked his land. This would make him one of those rich landowners who established trans-regional property portfolios and created absentee landlords whose land was worked by poor tenants.[968] Some of these tenants could have been driven off their land due to debts or the burden of imperial taxes and consequently became tenants or landless labourers. Yet, when the land produced abundantly, the rich man put his enjoyment first with no regard for others. He first decides to increase the volume of his storage by building larger barns. This hoarding was meant to secure for himself a future enjoyment (v. 18). Perhaps the major question at stake in the parable is the function of wealth; is it for hedonistic purposes or for beneficent purposes?

The answer to the above question depends on understanding first, the bleak nature of the labour and the tenancy system in the Greco-Roman world and, second, the social expectation of beneficence of the rich towards the poor. Concerning the first, in the Greco-Roman world, the labourer not only got a meagre wage but was also employed on a daily basis and failure to obtain work meant the labourer and his family went hungry the next day.[969] Most became labourers after being pushed off their land due to failure to pay tax or other debts. As a result of debts, other labourers became tenants legally bound in perpetuity to the estate of their land-owning employer, along with their descendants.[970] Even with the tenancy system, as Oakman demonstrates, tribute taking implied that very little was provided to the village agriculturalist at the end of the harvest.[971] This created generational poverty and deep-rooted subservience to the landowners. Concerning the second dimension of the question, it can be observed that in Greek and Roman culture, giving or philanthropy towards the poor was an obligation of noble

[967] Danker, 1988: 248.
[968] Sarris, 2013: 77.
[969] Esler, 1987: 175.
[970] Sarris, 2013; 167-88.
[971] Oakman, 2012: 31.

status.[972] The rich were generally expected to be generous to the destitute.[973] For example, Herodes Atticus, the rich Greek Aristocrat, Sophist and Roman Senator believed that the main idea in having wealth was to engage in beneficent distribution.[974]

Given the bleak picture of human toil associated with the labour system in the Greco-Roman world and the social expectation of the rich, the rich farmer was far from being a public-spirited citizen.[975] He both ignored the people behind the bumper harvest and the role of public beneficence expected of the rich. His behaviour represented what Aristotle called illiberality, which takes two forms, stinginess and inordinate acquisition.[976] First, he is stingy in that he is not willing to share with the poor, as was expected of the rich.[977] Second, he indulges in inordinate acquisition, storing up wealth for the future in the context of abject poverty around him. Such an attitude assumes that life is so frail and contingent that many possessions are required to secure it.[978] According to Jesus, such a spirit goes against the ideals to which his follower should aspire.

It is likely that in the Lucan churches the parable challenged greed and acquisitivess. It pointed out that life belongs to God and he can take it any time despite the abundance of one's possessions. Therefore, those who are rich are called upon to be rich towards God (v. 21). Being rich toward God can have two meanings. It can mean finding one's security not in material things but in God.[979] Secondly, it may also mean using one's wealth in the service of God (16:9; 19:8). In this case, the parable's condemnation of stinginess and reckless acquisition probably brings to the fore some of the contentious issues within the Lucan communities. It exposed the inherent challenges of the proximity of riches and destitution in the Lucan churches, and the need on the part of the rich to be responsible in their use of wealth.

---

972 Pomeroy, Bursten, Donlan, and Roberts, 1999:60; Horsley, 2004:16.
973 Arist. *Nich. Eth.* 1119b, 22.
974 Danker, 1988: 248.
975 Danker, 1988: 248.
976 Aristotle, *Nico. Ethics*, 4.1.38.
977Tannehill thinks that one of the possible solutions to the farmer's dilemma of abundance would have been for him to become a benefactor. See Tannehill, 1996: 206.
978 Johnson, 1991*:* 201.
979 This will also become apparent in Jesus' encounter with the rich ruler (Lk 18:18-30).

6.4.2. The Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-31)

The parable of Rich man and Lazarus continues the theme of Jesus' teaching against stinginess. Its immediate context is Jesus' response to the Pharisees whom he referred to as the 'lovers of money' after they had ridiculed him in 16:14. Like the parable of the rich fool, at the heart of this parable is the responsible use of wealth. However, unlike the parable of the rich fool, this parable addresses the question of what happens beyond death for those who are preoccupied with possessions and fail to be generous to the poor in this life. It provides a window into the eternal consequences of dysfunctional relationship between the rich and the poor in the community.

The parable introduces the rich man as "dressed in purple and eating sumptuous meals" (v. 19). This was a typical description of the Greco-Roman rich. The designation reflects both a life of leisure and a striking contrast with the image of the destitute Lazarus (v. 20). In addition, the description of the rich man also highlights the beneficent responsibilities associated with his status.[980] Apart from other social responsibilities, he was capable of being a patron of the destitute. That is why the rich were also called *οἱ γνώριμοι*,[981] the notables, or *οἱ δυνάμενοι*[982], the powerful. In the parable, we are told the Lazarus was placed at his gate (v. 20). The word used is *ἐβέβλητο* which is the pluperfect of *βάλλω*, which means to throw, put forward, or place out.[983] This implies that whoever placed Lazarus at the rich man's door did not intend him to only to be seen by the rich man but also to be assisted by him. Balch and Danker argues that the rich man does not do anything overtly evil to the beggar or refuse alms to Lazarus.[984] However, the fact Lazarus desired to have crumbs from the rich man's table suggests Lazarus never got his fill.[985] This suggests that Lazarus was starving amid plenty, and the rich man simply did not open his eyes to the destitute Lazarus. He failed to be a responsible benefactor to the beggar Lazarus and representatively to many others who were destitute.

What happens in vv. 22-31 to Lazarus and the rich man is reminiscent of the reversal already envisaged in Sermon (Lk. 6:20-26). It reflects the failure in the responsible use of earthly wealth

[980] Aristotle, *Nicom. Ethics*, 1122b.20.
[981] Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution*, 1.
[982] Democritus Frag. 255.
[983] LSJ at Perseus, ἐβέβλητο.
[984] Balch, 2003: 1139, See also Danker, 1988: 283.
[985] Danker, 1988: 283.

envisaged in Lk. 16:9 and the corresponding discontinuation of the poor's service to the rich in the afterlife. Abraham's reference to the rich man having received 'good things in life' against Lazarus' 'bad things' (v. 25), echoes the apodosis of the first woe in Lk 6:24, where the rich are said to have received their consolation. Abraham's statement is, however, not an indictment of wealth. Like the previous parable, it underscores the need for responsible use of wealth during this life for those who follow Jesus.

Interestingly, as Green notes, both the wealthy man and Lazarus are in Hades.[986] Yet in spite of their common presence in Hades v. 26 confirms the permanence of the reversal between the two men, which is determined by the quality of their earthly life. This permanence underscores the importance of seizing the moment by heeding the message from God. For Jesus` audience, they had the Torah and the prophets (v. 29). For Luke's audience they had the message of the resurrected Jesus (v. 31). The reference to the resurrection probably points to Jesus' own death and resurrection.[987] The reference suggests that unlike Jesus's audience, the readers of Luke's Gospel were better placed to hear from someone who came from the dead. Yet, those enmeshed in their riches have closed their eyes and ears to God and do not heed the message from the resurrected man.[988] The parable, therefore, demonstrates Luke's intention to warn his immediate audience of the eternal consequences of failing to show hospitality to the needy. It warns his audience that after death, there is no room for reversal if the rich do not take advantage to use their wealth for the welfare of others. Here, as in the other parables, Luke demonstrates that stinginess within the communities of Christ-follower is antithetical to the magnanimity of God and Jesus himself and that such attitude also has eternal implications.

6.4.3. Jesus and Rich Ruler (Lk 18:18-30)

Jesus' encounter with the rich ruler represents yet another example of his teaching on possessions and reproach of the spirit of non-generosity. The encounter not only highlights the rich's responsibility for the poor but also, within the broader context of Jesus teaching on discipleship (Lk 9:51-19:48), the relationship between salvation and generosity. The immediate context of the encounter is not easy to establish. Yet it is certain that it follows a Pharisee's

[986] Green, 1997: 607.
[987] Balch, 2003: 1140; Fitzmyer, 1981: 1134; Nolland, 1989: 833.
[988] Nolland, 1989: 833.

question on the timing of the Kingdom of God (Lk 17:20). Jesus' answer to this question, which focusses on the attitude of those expecting the Kingdom, leads to two parables; the Parable of the Persistent Widow (Lk 18:1-8) and the Parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (Lk 18:9-15). The example of child-like character as a precondition for receiving the Kingdom summarises Jesus' answer to the Pharisee's question in Lk 17:20. However, the rich man's question in v. 18 turns the focus of the discussion from when the Kingdom will come to how it can be personally attained. It is interesting to observe that the question comes from a rich man (v. 23). This appears to reinforce Luke's interest in the relationship between poverty and riches.

In v. 20, Jesus recommends the Ten Commandments as the basic requirement for attaining eternal life. Yet the ruler's answer that he had kept all the commandments since his youth revealed his contented piety which was characteristic of the Pharisees (vv. 11-12). To challenge such piety, Jesus moves the discussion from soteriology to ethics.[989] He asks the rich ruler to sell everything and give it to the poor and follow Jesus (v. 21). The fact that he was *σφόδρα πλούσιος*, very rich (v. 23), suggests heeding Jesu's request would be a significant act of generosity to the poor by the rich man. The act would also have demonstrated a real leap from conventional religious practice, that was characteristic of his commitment to the Torah, into the type of discipleship that Jesus demands in the travel narrative.[990]

It can also be argued that Jesus' emphasis on selling 'all' (v. 21) was not meant to set a standard for all the rich. Otherwise, it was possible to be rich and continue to provide for the poor (12:12-24; 16:9; 19:8). By selling all, giving his money away, and following Jesus, the man will be exchanging security in his wealth for the treasure in heaven (12:33-34).[991] The reaction of the rich ruler to Jesus' advice may have been illustrative of the dilemmas of the rich in the Lucan churches in negotiating the challenge of riches and the radical demands of the gospel to share with the destitute.[992] The rich ruler's sadness at Jesus' suggestion was a sign of the difficulty the rich experienced in extricating themselves from finding security in Mammon. It demonstrated that, for the rich, sharing with the poor was equivalent to letting go of the very

[989] Levine and Witherington, 2018: 496.
[990] Byrne, 2002: 162.
[991] Ibid.
[992] The situation is exemplified in the story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11) who fail to give what they had promised at the last minute.

thing that defined their identity. Jesus condemns such an attitude along with stinginess. In vv. 24-25 he warns the rich to transform their attitude to wealth so that unless they find their security and identity in God and become generous to the poor, their place in the Kingdom of God will become untenable.

6.5. CONCLUSION

The chapter has analysed the rhetoric of praise and blame across the Gospel of Luke. It has argued that the praise of God's generosity found in the infancy narratives and Jesus' acts of generosity provides a basis for understanding God and Jesus as the first givers and the basis of magnanimity and generosity in the Third Gospel. This understanding is further buttressed by Luke's depiction of Jesus' praise and blame of generosity and stinginess respectively across the gospel. All this demonstrates that the paradigm of praise and blame inherent in the Sermon is also discernible across the Gospel. It shows that the praise and blame serve the Gospel's overall purpose.

CHAPTER 7

THE LOCAL AUDIENCE FOR LUKE'S GOSPEL

7.1. INTRODUCTION

The argument of this dissertation so far has demonstrated that the original meaning of the Sermon is best explained from the perspective of praise and blame, which are expressions of the Greco-Roman honour and shame culture. It has also demonstrated that the social setting of Sermon was the Easter festival of a local Greco-Roman community of first-century CE Christ-followers troubled by the co-existence of poverty and wealth amongst its membership. As a panegyric, the Sermon served as a pedagogical tool to both integrate new members into the community and reinforce the values of *κοινωνία* within the rest of the community. However, locating the Sermon in a community setting raises contentious issues in gospel scholarship. Two of these contentious issues which have for over two decades dominated gospel scholarship are: (1) gospel genre and its audiences and (2) the question of a Lucan audience. Due to the related nature of the two issues at hand, especially that they both deal with the question of gospel origins, it becomes economical to deal with them together. Using evidence from both primary and secondary sources, this chapter discusses the gospel community debate and reaffirms the continuing validity of the local audience thesis. In advancing its case, the dissertation reassesses the question of literacy, writing, audiences, and the issue of communication and diversity in the Greco-Roman world. The chapter also examines gospel genre, the redactional intentions in the Third Gospel, and how they provide a clue to the local orientation of the Gospel and indeed the Sermon.

7.2. THE GOSPEL COMMUNITY DEBATE

The relationship between the gospels and their audiences has in the past two decades been a major issue of discussion in gospel scholarship. At the centre of the discussion is the question of whether the gospels were written for local communities or more general audiences. The local audience thesis, which remains the dominant paradigm in gospel scholarship, represents the traditional reading of the gospels as community documents, written in response to issues affecting particular local audiences. The alternative view, advanced by Richard Baulkham and others after him, argues that the gospels were written not for particular communities but general audiences.[993] Bauckham's argument is based on four central premises. First, he argues that the close similarity between the gospels and the Greco-Roman βιοί, where the latter were tailored for more general audiences or any competent readers,[994] suggests that the gospels were also written for general audiences. Second, Bauckham argues that writing in the Greco-Roman world was a replacement for presence. Therefore, if the function of writing was to communicate widely with readers unable to be present at the author's oral teaching, unlike NT letters which were occasional, the gospels must have been written for wider audiences with whom the evangelists had no contact.[995] Third, Bauckham argues that there was high mobility and communication between Christian communities and leaders in the first Century. From this understanding Bauckham postulates the possibility of a significant amount of Christian social interaction that enabled them to think of themselves more as members of wider communities than small groups.[996] Wider Christian social consciousness, according to Bauckham, implied the possibility that in writing their gospels the evangelists had greater audiences in mind. Fourth, Bauckham argues that the presence of conflict and diversity in early Christianity supports the picture of early Christianity as a network of communities in constant communion and communication, which supports wider audiences for the gospels.[997] Bauckham's argument is supported by the evidence of relative ease of book production and circulation in the Greco-Roman world. [998] This relative ease allowed for efficient diffusion of literary productions, and therefore, enabled the gospel authors to envisage a wider audience for their works.[999]

Significant scholarly criticisms of Bauckham's thesis has been advanced by several scholars such as Philip Esler (1998), Joel Marcus (1999), David Sim (2001) and Margaret Mitchell (2005).[1000] Despite the above criticism, the continuing influence of the gospel for all Christians thesis is evident from its continuing support in the works of scholars, whose work we will later evaluate, such as Edward Klink (2009, 2010), Cedric Vine (2014) and Justin Smith (2015).[1001] At the heart of the gospel for all Christians thesis is an interrogation of what is assumed to be an untested scholarly hypothesis that regards gospels as windows into the communities that

[993] Bauckham, 1998: 11.
[994] Ibid. 28; See Burridge, 1998: 113-145.
[995]Bauckham, 1998: 28.
[996] Ibid. 32. See also Thomson, 1998: 49-70.
[997] Ibid. 43.
[998] Alexander, 1998: 71-112.
[999] Ibid.
[1000] Esler, 1998: 235-248; Sim, 2001: 3-27; Mitchell, 2005: 36-79.
[1001] See Bird, 2006: 474-486, Vine, 2014; Smith, 2011.

produced them. Although the problems of the local audience thesis has, over the years, been raised by a number of scholars such as E.A. Lavardiere and W.G. Thompson (1976), R.F. O'Toole (1983), Dale Allison (1988), Graham H. Stanton (1985), Harry Y. Gamble (1995) and Luke Timothy Johnson (2013),[1002] the importance of Bauckham's proposal is evident from the way it has polarised gospel scholarship. At its best, it has helped in raising salient issues in the relationship between the gospels and their audience (s) in the first century CE and, therefore, stimulated significant scholarly research in the Greco-Roman context of the New Testament. At its worst, resulting from the continued scholarly stalemate, it creates methodological and hermeneutical challenges to gospel studies. This is because, as Adela Collins has argued, the debate has implications for the choice of the primary cultural context in which to interpret the texts as well as the perception of the documents.[1003] Deciding to approach the Gospels either as community documents or as general documents impinges on how we can explain the cultural dynamics that motivated their literary productions.

However, in spite of the above challenges to the question of gospel audiences, scholars have continued to effectively demonstrate the possible audiences of Matthew, Mark and John based on context-specific expressions, implicit ecclesiastical and theological dispute, and major thematic overtones.[1004] However, the question of Luke's audience remains a topic of lively debate. Three clear scholarly trends have characterized approaches to Luke's audience: (1) the rejection of the existence of a Lucan community on account of Luke's presupposed OT/Jewish orientation on the one hand, and a universal perspective on the other,[1005]; (2) the acceptance of the existence of a Lucan audience consisting of a community or as an ensemble of communities of similar types,[1006] ; and (3) a cautionary approach to Luke's audience due to the difficulties of the local reading of the gospels and the ambiguous relationship between the terms audience and community.[1007] Consequently, the gospel for all Christians thesis not only pushes the boundaries of the debate on gospel audiences, but also further complicates the conceptualization of a possible Lucan audience.

[1002] Laverdiere and Thompson, 1976: 567-597; O'Toole, 1983: 1-17; Stanton, 1985: 45-46, Gamble, 1995: 102; Johnson, 2013: 129-134.
[1003] Collins, 1995: 239.
[1004] Theissen, 2004:26; Harrington, 2007:323-324; See also studies by Overman, 1990; Sim, 1998.
[1005] Allison, 1988: 62.
[1006] Esler, 1887: 12. Garland 2011: 21
[1007] Moxnes, 1994:379-89; Johnson, 2013: 129-134.

The different approaches outlined above also put into question this study's panegyric approach to the reading of the Sermon, which assumes a local audience setting for the gospel. It is, therefore, necessary for this dissertation to establish the conceptual and methodological framework through which it has been undertaken and how it is to be understood and evaluated. The position of this dissertation is that the gospels have their origins in local audiences in which the evangelists not only developed their theology and understanding of who Jesus was but also in response to whose issues the evangelists wrote their gospels.

7. 3. LITERACY, WRITING, AND AUDIENCES IN THE GRECO-ROMAN WORLD

7.3.1. Literary Documents and their Audiences

The interrelationship between literacy, writing, and audiences in the Greco-Roman world provides a plausible case for the local audience origins of the gospels and Luke's Gospel in particular. Recent studies of the Greco-Roman context of the NT by scholars such as Pieter Botha (2012) and Richard Last (2012) provide useful insights into the above interconnection. Pieter Botha's work is particularly significant in understanding the process of communication and writing in the Greco-Roman world.[1008] First, Botha argues that a proper understanding of the process of authoring and writing books in antiquity must be based on a history of everyday life, informed by routines, habits and phenomena associated with writing and reading in those times.[1009] According to Botha, writing was a collective venture in the Greco-Roman world. This process created an author-audience relationship which significantly distinguishes ancient conceptions of author and authorship from their modern understanding. This writing process made literary works largely collective, traditional and cultural enterprises, which, according to Botha, was evident in the anonymity characteristic of most ancient documents.[1010] Botha also argues that the critical role of an audience in the production of literary works is best understood through the meaning of the term ἔκδοσις, which did not mean publication in modern sense of the word, but was mostly understood as indicating the making public of a work by means of an oral presentation of the text.[1011] Thus, writing was not necessarily a replacement for presence, as Bauckham argues. Botha's work represents the most sustained cultural analysis of Greco-

[1008]Botha, 2012: 123-130.
[1009] Ibid. 130.
[1010] The anonymity of the Gospel documents provides further support to Botha's claim.
[1011] Ibid. 123.

Roman writing and reading habits. Its basis on primary sources makes its conclusion not only plausible but also insightful in understanding the origins of the gospels.

Botha's observations are supported by several scholars such as Leslie Kurke (1991), Gerald F. Downing (1997), and Loveday Alexander (1990). The eminent classist, Leslie Kurke, in her book *The Traffic in Praise,* demonstrates the specific social function that literary works such as poetry played in their original cultural milieu. She argues that in the Greek world, audience expectations shaped and constrained each individual poetic composition.[1012] Kurke's assertion above suggests that although Pindar's panegyrics and victory odes reflected a universal structure, their content was determined by the situation of its audience.[1013] For example, Pindar's praise of Theron of Acragas, whose audience was Theron and the fellow citizens of Acragas, provides a classic example of audience influence on literary production. First, in the ode, Theron's name and that of his city are mentioned four times and two times respectively; two times and once for each in the proem and epilogue respectively.[1014] Significant praise is also bestowed on Theron's city Acragas. In one instance of praise to the city, the poet writes "no city for a hundred years has given birth to a man more beneficent in his mind or more generous with his hand than Theron."[1015] Although, in the middle of the poem, the poet wanders off into tracing Theron's ancestry to the gods, the introduction and the closing of the poem ensure that Theron's victory and the significance of his city, who constitute his audience, are the main subjects of the praise. Furthermore, in a recent essay, A.D. Morrison has demonstrated that Pindaric odes were often re-performed after their first performance. The re-performances were usually done as part of latter family members' victory ceremonies, or at the commemoration of earlier victories. The re-performances aimed to reactivate and preserve the prestige of such earlier victories. According to Morrison, if victory songs were regularly performed, they would continue to be present in, and perhaps beyond, the victor's city.[1016] It was also inevitable that the change of context would enlarge the ode's audience from the

[1012] Kurke, 1991: 1.
[1013] Gordley has provided a structure of Pindar's poetic as mainly three-fold: 1) Specific details about the victor, his background and exploits. 2) The use myth in one or two ways (a) telling of a mythological story of ornament or b) providing brief mythological parallels to illustrate moral truths, and 3) Moralising or proverbial reflections arising mostly from the consideration of athletic success. See, Gordley, 2007: 135-137.
[1014] Pindar, *Olympian* 2.1-5, 95-100.
[1015] *Olympian*. 2.90-95.
[1016] Morrison, 2012: 113-114.

primary audience for which it was composed, to additional new audiences beyond the original city.

Beyond Pindar's poetry, it can also be pointed out that Greek comedies and tragedies reflected the experience of their audiences and communities. Drama represented a social critique of the values and norms of the communities in which they were produced. As Jean Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-Naquet have argued, although Greek tragedies did not reflect all of reality, they reflected the entire problematic of reality in the *polis*.[1017] In other words, the tragedies provided the polis with the opportunity to put itself and its values on trial. While Vernant and Vidal-Naquet's assertion was true of tragedy, it must also have been so for all Greek drama. Aristophanes play, the *Wasps*, is illustrative of the influence of context and audience in ancient composition.[1018] In the play, Philocleon, who has a pronounced obsession for voluntary jury membership at the Athenian law court, is put under house arrest by his son Bdelycleon. Philocleon's reasons for his obsession for working as a juror are an interesting reflection of Athenian society; the bribes from the rich (550-555), the juror's freedom to interpret the law the way they liked (560-565) (with no appeal for litigants) (576-59), and the little fee that the jurors received (605-620). Philocleon's motivations reflected the major problems affecting Athenian society at the time. The play portrays Athens under General Cleon (429-422 BCE) as a highly litigious society, ridden with corruption, and a highly under resourced judiciary in terms of professional judges and, therefore, dependent on the arbitrary judgements by the citizen jury. Several classical studies confirm the political context in which the *Wasps* was produced.[1019] However, although the play was conceived and had its context in Athens, this did not preclude its performance in other Greek cities. Nevertheless, wherever it was performed, its Athenian background provided the context for understanding its meaning and message. All this underscores the influence of local audience and context on the production of literary works in the ancient world.

Audience influence on literary production was not only confined to Greek drama. Downing also draws attention to the role of an audience in the performance of a text. He argues that in

---

[1017] Quoted by Kurke, 1991: 2.
[1018] Aristophanes, *Wasp* at Perseus.
[1019] Edmunds, 1987: 233-263; Konstan, 1985: 27-46; Dorey, 1956: 132-139.

antiquity, a text copy was acquired with the intent of having it performed.[1020] Since performance required an audience, the influence of the audience was, therefore, significant in the production process. Downing, similar to Botha, provides examples of how authors like Pliny the Elder, tended to give readings of their work before invited audiences in order to gather useful criticism and be able to insert corrections before the final version was issued.[1021] Also, Loveday Alexander, in her analysis of the role of 'the living voice' in the early church and Greco-Roman world, validates the author/audience relationship in literary production. She argues that as rhetoric was obviously the first and most important part of Greek culture, and loyalty to the oral tradition persisted even after the dissemination of the written text. The living voice continued to preserve not only the conventions of oral discourse but also the conviction that a speech should be delivered in person and should at least give the impression of extempore composition.[1022] If Bauckham had taken note of the above two works, his presentation of the gospel for all Christians thesis would have taken a significantly different turn.

The above discussion presents three significant implications for the conceptualisation of the author-audience relationship in the Greco-Roman world. First, it suggests as Downing and Alexander put it, that writing was secondary to oral presentation of a work, which implies a strong connection between an author and his immediate audience, of which he or she was also supposedly a part. The example of Pliny the Elder well demonstrates this author-audience relationship and the role of the community in shaping the final form of a literary production. Second, perhaps as a corollary to the first implication, the passing on of one's work before an invited audience prior to final publication of a literary work suggests that the immediate audience had a significant influence over the content of what was performed. This influence could be more significant if the story, as in the case of the gospel of Luke, was part of the community's origins. From a redactional perspective, an imaginary empire-wide audience, which is one implication of Bauckham's thesis, would be too remote to have any impact on such a story. In this case, even an itinerant missionary like Luke who, as Allison argues, probably collected stories from different Christian groups,[1023] would have had a "home church" in which his understanding of Jesus was primarily developed, and which also formed his

[1020] Downing, 1997: 30.
[1021] Ibid. 32.
[1022] Alexander, 1990: 226.
[1023] Allison, 1988: 64.

primary audience.[1024] It is also this church or group of churches which would influence how he organized the stories he collected from across the Christian world of his time. This is evident in the way, as it will be pointed out later in the chapter, Luke redacted the common material he shared with other gospels.

Third, there is a general scholarly consensus that the gospels circulated anonymously until the second century CE.[1025] This understanding not only supports Botha's viewpoint but also underscores the fact that the authority of the text rested not solely in the authors but also in the faith communities in which the texts were produced.[1026] Further, from a historical point of view, the established criteria for a book's acceptance into the canon confirm the importance of the primary audience in the production and preservation of a text. Apart from orthodoxy, apostolicity and consensus,[1027] place of origin also had a significant role in establishing the authenticity of a gospel text. [1028] Although politics and power dynamics in the early church may have been at the heart of the provenance questions, the provenance criteria underscored the role and influence of the local audience in the shaping of their gospel story. This suggests that the later importance of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome as possible gospel provenances is not just deeply rooted in the political role of these cities as "holy sees" in early Christianity, but also in the role of their Christian communities or their circumstances in shaping the structure of the gospel story. However, as some scholars have shown,[1029] such origins and contexts of gospel documents did not in any way limit the work's further spread beyond its geographical origins. Granted the trans-local nature of Christian communities, literary diffusion was a natural outcome.

7.3.2. Communities that Write?

Second, the communal nature of Greco-Roman writing is further supported by Richard Last's recent study of the writing practices of Greco-Roman associations.[1030] In his 2012 article,

[1024] As a Garland (2011: 21) argues Luke was not Paul's constant companion but a "sometime companion." Thus, whenever he was not with Paul, he belonged to a community of Christ-followers in a particular area. This is probably what the "we" passages in Acts suggest.
[1025] Marshall, 19:78: 33; Green, 1997: 20; Fitzmyer, 1981: 35.
[1026] Baum, 2008: 120-142.
[1027] Metzger, 1997: 36.
[1028] Brown, 1997: 11.
[1029] Esler, 1998: 235-248.
[1030] Last, 2012: 180.

Communities That Write: Christ-Groups, Associations, and Gospel Communities, Last makes an analysis of the writing practices of Greco-Roman associations which he compares with Christ-groups. He, however, makes two significant observations that lend significant weight to the local audience thesis. First, Last finds that Greco-Roman associations wrote everything regardless of genre and that all writing was done in the interest of the group's preservation and values. Secondly, he finds that associations required the approval of their membership before a piece of writing could become authoritative within the community. These observations led him to conclude that the Greco-Roman association's writings had narrow audiences.[1031] Last's findings and conclusions have significant implications for understanding the audience of the gospels. Admittedly, the relationship between Christ-groups and Greco-Roman associations remains subtle, especially given the associations' lack of trans-local links as opposed the Christ-groups, their chief interest in the pursuit of honour,[1032] and their homogeneous nature while Christ groups crossed social boundaries.[1033] However, even with such differences between the Greco-Roman associations and Christ-groups, Last's observations and conclusions provide useful insight into the communal nature of Greco-Roman writings and the potential development of the gospels in communal settings. In this case, as Joel Marcus puts it, the gospels were not necessarily written as a substitute for presence; they must have either served the function of preservation of tradition in the face of potential death or to shape their audiences through repeated performance of the story in the hope that its deeper secrets of structure and meaning may be revealed.[1034] The second person designation of audience and purpose of writing in Luke's preface (Lk 1:1-4) and Jn 20:31 underscores Last and Marcus' view of the purpose and context of the gospel texts. The reference to "*you*" in both texts probably attests to the communal nature of the documents.

However, the communal nature of the gospels does not in any way suggest that the evangelists were passive collectors of Jesus' traditions. As Robert Stein, following redaction critics before him, has argued, while the evangelists collected gospel traditions and were limited by them, each had a theological purpose in writing his gospel.[1035] However, such a theological purpose would both inform and be informed by the evangelist's immediate context. This would,

[1031] Ibid.
[1032] Kloppenborg, 1996: 19.
[1033] McCready, 1996: 63.
[1034] Marcus, 2009: 26.
[1035] Stein, 1991: 22.

therefore, make it possible for the evangelist to both respond to issues within their community and, where possible, to challenge values and norms in the same. Joel Green provides a typical example of how Luke's gospel would have both responded to and challenged community norms and values. He argues that although Luke's narrative contains contemporary issues with which his readers can identify, it also presents a vision of the world which cannot be equated with the first-century context insofar as can be reconstructed via historical inquiry.[1036] For example, in addition to contemporary issues, the gospel also presents a world in which God intervenes through miraculous conceptions and many other idealized phenomena. This, according to Green, suggests that Luke's narrative is both a response to contemporary issues and an invitation to embrace an alternative worldview and to live as if the reign of God has already revolutionized this age.[1037] Therefore, in view of the nature of the writing process in antiquity and the writing practices of ancient groups, it makes scholarly sense to see the gospels as originating in local settings.

7.4. COMMUNICATION AND DIVERSITY IN GRECO-ROMAN WORLD

One of the foundational bases for the gospel for all Christians thesis is the level of communication in the Greco-Roman world, which allowed for easy access to information. High mobility and communication between Christian communities and leaders in the first century enabled them to think of themselves more as members of wider communities than small groups.[1038] Wider Christian social consciousness created the possibility of the conception of wider audiences for the gospel writers. Indeed, the level of communication and travel in the Greco-Roman world has been well researched and documented. Most studies agree that the Roman imperial administration ensured that there was relatively easy communication in the empire.[1039] This possibly allowed for easy access and communication and significant broad cultural exchanges in the empire and a resultant widening of social and religious horizons of different peoples.[1040] Paul's travels across the span of the Greco-Roman world and the way his letters travelled to the different parts of the empire is significant NT evidence for the level of communication in the Greco-Roman world. However, as it will be argued below, despite the alleged communication across the empire, the Greco-Roman world was not a homogenous unit.

[1036] Green, 1997: 11.
[1037] Ibid.
[1038] Bauckham, 1998: 32. See Thomson, 1998: 49-70.
[1039] Roll, 1995: 1166-70; Horden and Purcell, 2000: 28; Osman Umurhan and Todd Penner, "2013: 168.
[1040]Desilva, 2004: 44; Johnson, 2010: 46.

Greco-Roman communities remained distinct from each other, therefore, allowing for independent theological developments as the church spread across the empire.

7.4.1. Migration Control in the Greco-Roman World

It can be argued that the extent to which Greco-Roman communication was possible for most of the population and its capacity to make individuals or groups consciously aware of belonging to a wider world, remains an open question. First, in relation to communication, Claudia Moatti has shown that while travelling was relatively easy for some in the Greco-Roman world, it was not necessarily so for the larger population.[1041] This difficulty, according to Moatti, arose out of the Roman regulation of immigration and emigration in order to control people's identities.[1042] One reason for this imperial control of people's identities, according to Suetonius, was to keep the barbarians at bay.[1043] For example, inside the empire, a person who wanted to leave the province from a port had to send a request to the prefect; their application would then be signed by the prefect and sent to the procurator at the exit port.[1044] This systematic control of identities suggests that many classes of people remained distinctive and culturally untouched by the imperial culture. This may have also been partly heightened by the Roman governance of subject peoples through local elites.[1045] Furthermore, Horden and Purcell, whose book challenged "mediterraneanism", the notion of a homogenous Greco-Roman world, also demonstrates that the Roman system allowed for movement within distinctive cultural groups. According to Horden and Purcell, such groups included landless peasants, unemployed artisans, casual agricultural labourers, outcasts of the city, beggars and women beggars, travelling preachers and gyrovagues such as vagabonds, street musicians, and shepherds with their flocks.[1046] Although this indicates significant social mobility, the fact that mobility was tied to social and cultural groupings militates against the conception of the Greco-Roman sphere as a highly homogenous world. Guy Halsaw has argued that wholesale migration into Rome took its significance between 378-568 CE and was a result of the decline of the Roman empire.[1047] Therefore, to suggest, as Bauckham does, that wider social consciousness enabled the evangelists to conceive of initial wider audience for their gospels is problematic. From the

[1041] Moatti, 2006: 120.
[1042] Ibid.
[1043]Suetonius, *Domitianus*. 12.2.
[1044] Moatti, 2006: 125.
[1045] Choi, 2013: 117-152; Lordkipanidze, 1983: 123-144.
[1046] Horden and Purcell, 2000: 383.
[1047] See Halsaw, 2007.

above observations, it can be concluded that in the Greco-Roman world, people existed in distinctive cultural groups. That is why Apostle Paul's reference to there being no *Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος* (Col. 3:11) both reflects and responds to the presence of different classes of people who made up the diverse groups of the Roman empire, a diversity that also found its way into early Christianity and its literary productions.

7.4.2. Paul's Diverse Missionary Experience

In addition, Paul's unique missionary experiences in Athens among the Areopagus (Acts 17) and in Ephesus (Acts 20) reflect the diversity of the Greco-Roman people groups. While in Ephesus Paul's preaching caused a riot that led to his arrest. Inversely, in Athens, though he was dismissed at the end, he was nevertheless given a hearing. The different cultural dynamics in the early reception of Christianity in these two cities provide ample evidence for the diversity of the Greco-Roman world. Granted that small communities formed the Greco-Roman world, it suggests that, as the Christian faith found fertile soil in these diverse social and cultural groups, the expression of the faith and its mushrooming theologies were bound to be culturally distinctive. From a sociolinguistic perspective, the cultural horizons and group dynamics within the communities would lead to a unique appropriation and domestication of the faith from unique questions and issues in the particular community.[1048] Inevitably, the kind of natural divisions detectable in the body politic were likely to leave their imprint on the literary works emanating from these communities.[1049] In this case, Luke, writing his gospel after Mark and Matthew would be aware of the peculiarity of his theology and that of his community and would, therefore, write his gospel according to the ethos of his community, so that, as E.A. Laverdiere and W.G. Thompson argue, his readers could find their own experiences reflected in the narrative.[1050] Such diversity explains why any attempt to create a theologically uniform trans-local Christian movement within the Greco-Roman world was a recipe for theological-cultural conflict and rivalry, as the history of the early Christian movement demonstrates.[1051]

[1048] Esler, 1998: 237-238.
[1049] Strange, 1983: 21.
[1050] La Verdiere and Thompson, 1976: 567-97. James Dunn (1990: 70) argues that the kerygmatic traditions, especially, the Passion narratives (which were shaped early) and other traditions served as unifying strands linking early Christian churches together. Yet the shapes of these traditions reflect the variety of different theologies and contextual issues within the communities the texts were produced.
[1051] The theological controversies that rocked the church and the succeeding church councils from Jerusalem Council, (Acts 15), Quartodeciman controversy (2nd century CE), Nicaea (325 CE), Constantinople (381 CE) and

However, the literary works were not only significant in their original contexts. Their significance went beyond their original provenance and were appreciated in other contexts. Parallels can be drawn from foundation myths in ancient societies whose major characteristic was plurality.[1052] Several versions of the same myth of origin existed alongside each other. Yet as Sweeney has argued, the choice to tell one story entailed not only the selection of the story told but also a rejection of the story not told.[1053] In the context of the gospel story, the basis for the "rejection" of a particular tradition of Jesus could not be individuality driven, given the community nature of the Gospel story. Sweeney further argues that although different, each of the foundation myths had significance when approached individually as a foundation myth.[1054] Similarly, with broader reception within the wider early Christian movement, each gospel added to the mosaic of testimonies to Christian origins. Therefore, to use communication and easy access to information in the Greco-Roman world as evidence of wider audiences for the gospels is a failure to appreciate the complexity of the cultural dynamics that were at work in that world.

7.5. THE GENRE AND AUDIENCE OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

7.5.1. The Genre of the Gospels

One pillar of Bauckham's gospel for all Christians thesis is the close relationship between the gospels and Greco-Roman βίος and its implications on gospel audiences. Yet the question of the genre of the gospels has been a contentious issue in gospel scholarship since the rise of biblical criticism during the Enlightenment. Although Hellenistic legends and aretalogies have been compared with the gospels, the debate on gospel genre has mainly centred on whether the gospels are historiography or Greco-Roman βίος. The works of such scholars as Charles H. Talbert (1977) and Richard Burridge (2004) represent significant watersheds in designating the gospel's genre as βίος, a designation which is now taken for granted by some scholars.[1055] In the following sections, we evaluate this assumption and some recent studies that represent the continuing support for Bauckham's gospel for all Christians thesis.

Chalcedon (451) demonstrate the separate literary and theological developments within the early church movement.

1052 Sweeney, 2015: 1.

1053 Ibid. 3.

1054 Ibid.

1055 Burridge, 1995; Johnson, 2010: 139; See also Talbert, 1977.

7.5.1.1 Edward Klink

Edward Klink's work represents the continuing influence of the gospel for all Christians thesis. In his book *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origins of John's Gospel* (2007*)*, Klink sets out to support the gospel for all Christians thesis. His arguments are based on two presuppositions; (1) a critique of the local audience thesis' conception of community (2) and the defence of gospel genre as βίοι. First, Klink rejects the whole notion of an accessible, geographically specific community associated with the gospels, and particularly that of John's gospel. He argues that not only do we not know what NT communities looked like but also that community construction does not consider the exclusive nature of the territorial and relational dimensions of community which in social science are contentious issues. Therefore, for Klink, the term "community" is both too vague and diverse to be helpful. Secondly, following Burridge and Bauckham, Klink argues that the gospels are βίοι and, therefore, must have been written with wider audiences in mind.

The strength of Klink's argument is its recognition of the continuing scholarly debate on the gospel community question. However, his presuppositions and conclusions are open to serious objections. First, concerning the question of community, it is interesting to note that while rejecting the idea of community, Klink also acknowledges the existence of communities in the NT.[1056] And indeed most NT communities mentioned in the letters and the Book of Acts are verifiable through history and archaeology.[1057] For examples, recent excavations in Thessalonica have been very significant in the reconstruction of the religious and political history of ancient Thessalonica and provide insight into the life of its communities.[1058] Therefore, to claim that we do not know the communities from which the gospels arose is to disregard the combined efforts of history and archaeological science on which the historical-critical method is based.

Second, Klink raises the question of the contentious nature of the relational and territorial dimensions of the conception of community in social science and the disregard of the

[1056] Klink, 2007: 48

[1057] Nearly forty year ago Jack Finegan traced the 15,000-mile travels of Paul. Using existing histories, literary accounts, and archaeological information, he brought out new discoveries of the world of Peter, John, and many other early Christians. See Finegan, 1981.

[1058] For a discussion of recent contributions of Archaeology to the understanding of the Thessalonian correspondence and its Christian community, see Donfried's *Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (2002).

exclusiveness of these two dimensions in NT community construction. In response to this, we argue that the conception of community in the Greek-Roman world assumed the relationship between the two dimensions of community. It entailed both the concept of place in which a group of people subsisted and the active communion of those individuals as part of their normal life. More than one word was used with reference to community such as *κοινόν* or *κοινότης*. The word *κοινόν* also referred to society, community, to government.[1059] The Lucan reference to the disciples as "together and having everything in common" (*κοινά*) suggests both a territorial and relational dimension. Furthermore, the word *κοινότης*, which does not appear in the NT, means sharing in common, or a community.[1060] In some cases *κοινότης* was used with reference to a physical place. For example, John Mazis, in his analysis of Greek associations outside Greece refers to them as examples of Ελληνική Κοινότης, Greek communities. In particular, the Greek community in Edessa was called, Ελληνική Κοινότης έν Έδεσσα.[1061] The above designation suggests both territorial and relational dimensions for the Greeks in Russia.

It can be argued that the NT conception of community, when understood as a gathering, *ἐκκλησία*, had both relational and territorial dimensions to it. For the early Christian movement, a community could be singular as in a city (Rom.1:1; 1 Cor. 1:2) or encompassing several territories (as in 1 Peter 1:1). These general descriptions also took relational factors into consideration. For example, for Paul, the salutation "to all in Rome" (Rom. 1:7) had both territorial and relational dimensions. This is because, like the Edessan Greeks above, the Christ-followers in Rome shared both territorial space and cultural and social ideals. In addition, as Ambrosiaster wrote, "the Romans embraced the faith of Christ, albeit according to the Jewish rite, although they saw no sign of mighty works, nor any apostles."[1062] Thus, the synagogue origins of their faith can be understood as one of the defining factors for the relational elements among the Christ-followers in Rome.

The same could also have been true for the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (1 Pet 1:1). Territorially, these provinces, which were around the Black Sea were the

---

[1059] BDAG, 2000: 551.
[1060] LSJ at Perseus, *κοινότης*.
[1061] Mazis, 2001: 200-224.
[1062] Cited in Edwards, 1992: 8.

areas where Paul was forbidden to evangelise in Acts 16:6-10.[1063] We do not know who evangelised the region, although a tradition ascribes the area's evangelisation to Peter.[1064] This tradition, in a way, provides a relational dimension to the community on the region. Alternatively, even if Peter did not physically go to evangelise the region, it is also possible that the Christianity of the regions originated from Peter's Pentecost Sermon among whose audience were some people from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia (Acts 2:9). If the same people helped to spread the Christian faith to north Galatia and Bithynia, the Petrine connection would have provided the relational basis for the providences. F.T.A Hort cited in Hemer once argued that, as the early churches were concerned with communication, the sequence of the names represented the likely route of the messenger who carried the letter.[1065] Thus, the Providences' shared communication routes entailed a common dimension that created the possibility of their being looked at as one community. It can, therefore, be argued that while at a conceptual level the idea of community might be complex and not easily reducible to one way of understanding, the NT data provides one possible way of constructing community as a product of the historical critical method. This approach finds its way into the local audience community construction. Therefore, Klink's denial of the usefulness of the concept of community from the local audience thesis is not only problematic but also a failure to appreciate the logic of NT data, which is also historically verifiable.

Second, it can also be argued that Klink's insistence that the genre of the gospel is βίοι and therefore, the gospels were written for a general audience is fraught with contradictions. First, Klink argues that Greco-Roman βίοι did not originate from closed groups but included people from outside (p.113-114). However, as Warren Carter has argued, Klink also concedes that βίοι can derive from a limited group like philosophical schools.[1066] If there were limited groups like philosophical schools which produced writings, one wonders if there were no other limited groups to which Christ-groups corresponded, which also produced writings for internal use. Richard Last's community writing practices within Greco-Roman voluntary associations, discussed above, significantly undermines Klink's challenge to the local audience thesis. Further, as Carter notes in relation to Klink's argument, while βίοι in philosophical groups were

[1063] Hort, 1978: 239.
[1064] Eusebius claims that Peter evangelised the region among the Jews. His claim is deemed questionable given the Gentile orientation of the letter. See Michaels, 1988*:* xlvi; Davids, 1990*:* 7-8.
[1065] See Hemer, 1978: 239–243.
[1066] Carter, 2009: 403-405.

sometimes written to promote one's group over another, Klink does not give cognisance to the fact that, given the mass illiteracy, βίοι were usually written by and for a limited group of elites, which goes back to the same principle of initial limited audience. Beyond that, according to Carter, Klink also fails to contemplate what might happen when a genre that derives from a controlling group in a dominant society which exemplifies elite values, is adopted by a minority movement.[1067] It can, therefore, be argued that given the multiple relationships the genre of βίοι had with its audience(s), to use it as a basis for arguing for a local or general audience for the gospels, is significantly problematic.

In his 2010 edited book, *The Audience of the Gospels*: *The Origins and Functions of the Gospels in Early Christianity*, Klink allegedly brings together into a symposium, scholars from the two sides of the gospel community debate. It is, however, interesting to note that out of the seven essays in the book, five of them from Edward Klink (two from him), Michael F. Bird, Justin Smith, and Richard Bauckham represent the gospel all Christians thesis. Of the other two, Craig Blomberg's essay is meant to stand on the fence, while only Adele Reinhart's essay represents the local audience thesis. It is also remarkable that all the five essays, from Klink, Bird, Smith, Bauckham, bring nothing new to the table but rather a restatement of their author's entrenched positions in the debate already outlined in their previous works. Beyond that, Craig Blomberg's argument (pp.111-133) that the gospels were written for specific communities and all Christians does not represent a new insight into the debate. It is what the local audience has always stood for; that while gospels originate in local audiences, but this does not preclude their use beyond the community as Esler argued as soon as Bauckham's *Gospel for All Christians* appeared. Lastly, Adele Reinhartz's essay, while faulting the Gospel for all Christians thesis, supports the local audience thesis.[1068] Her example of how the closed communities of the Dead Sea Scrolls point to the local audience contexts of the Gospels represent further continuing evidence for the plausibility of the local audience thesis. However, like, Lavardiere and W.G. Thompson, R.F. O'Toole, Allison, Stanton, Gamble, and Johnson before her, Reinhartz raises the necessary caution on the inherent methodological, and sometimes contradictory challenges in community reconstructions and the way the gospels are read as reflections of their community. Overall, Adele finds the local audience thesis to be not only the most

[1067] Ibid.
[1068] Klink, 2012: 134-152.

hermeneutically viable but also one that will not be replaced by Bauckham's gospel for all Christians thesis.

7.5.1.2. Cedric Vine

Second, Cedric Vine's book, *The Audience of Matthew: An Appraisal of the Local Audience Thesis* (2014) represents another continuing support for the gospel for all Christians thesis. He bases his argument on two assumptions: a charge that the local audience thesis is selective in its treatment of the gospel narrative, and the use of aural experience of the gospel as a basis for determining the audience of the gospels. First, Vine argues that the local thesis audience tends to be selective in its treatment of gospel narrative in that it overlooks the question of plot and characterisation and therefore fails to appreciate how the gospel text might have been experienced aurally by the early Christian audience. Second, Vine also argues that the concept of "audience" is very ambiguous and makes it difficult to establish whether the text should be read in relation to the implied or the real reader, the time of Jesus or Matthew's composition. He, therefore, suggests that since early Christian audiences were mixed in terms of ethnicity, age, sex and commitment to the Christian tradition, the aural reception of the gospels was varied as was its impact. This, therefore, makes it difficult to determine the audience of the gospels.

It can be argued that Vine's book, while sincere in its attempt to support the gospel for all Christians thesis, makes two category mistakes. First, Vine's argument that the local audience thesis creates an ambiguity on whether the word audience can be understood as implied/historical reader or from the time of Jesus or that of Matthew is a category mistake. He again fails to recognise that that the implied reader, as a product of narrative criticism, is presupposed and constructed from the text itself, while a historical reader is a product of the process that involves time, place and circumstances.[1069] While the former is interested in the impact of the book as a finished product, the latter is interested in its origins and how this origin provides the background to its development.

Second, Vine's use of aural experience as a basis for determining the audience of the gospels is significantly problematic. Aural experience belongs to the field of orality criticism, which

[1069] Ibid. 15.

focuses on aural reception of literature in oral cultures.[1070] Therefore, Vine fails to recognise that the aural experience and impact involves dealing with the text of the gospel as a finished product. It has to do with the performance of the finished product of the gospel to an audience. It, therefore, has nothing to do with the genesis of a text within an audience. Thus, Vine's argument represents the weakest link in the continuing support for the gospel for all Christians thesis.

7.5.1.3. Justin Smith

Another proponent of the gospel for all Christians thesis is Justin Smith. In study *Why Bíos? On the Relationship between Gospel Genre and Implied Audience,* Smith argues that Greco-Roman βίος had multiple relationships with its audiences. He arrived at this conclusion through categorization and sub-categorisation of the Greco-Roman genre of βίος and used the results as evidence for gospel genre and its implied audience. Smith, following Burridge, categorises Greco-Roman βίοι as (1) Non-Contemporary-Focused; (2) Non-Contemporary-Open; (3) Contemporary-Focused, and; (4) Contemporary-Open).[1071] He argues that the Gospels belong to a group of biographies (Contemporary-Focused) that have a focused primary audience with the subject having been contemporary to the authors. For him, the focus does not suggest an audience that is so focused that it represents a specific Christian community or even a group of likeminded Christian communities. He envisions a Christian audience, in general, as the primary audience for the Gospels with the potential for some emphasis on Jewish (Hebrew) Christians and/or Gentile Christians in some texts. To buttress his point, Smith also appeals to the early interpreters of the gospels. He argues that the early church fathers conceived of the gospels as general authoritative documents in the whole church and not as sectarian documents.

It can, however, be argued that while the idea of an audience that is simultaneously focused and general is ambiguous, a strict comparison of the Greco-Roman βίος with the gospels is an oversimplification. As the history of canonization demonstrates, Jesus' story was a community story. Unlike the ordinary βίος, the gospel story was tied to a movement which was both local and trans-local. Any writings about that movement would require some 'sanctioning' as Last's

[1070] Rhoads, 2004*:* ix.
[1071] Smith, 2011*:* 241.

Greco-Roman writing communities suggests.[1072] Such sanctioning could only take place in a context from which the story originates.

Second, Smith's reference to Origen c.184-c.253, Eusebius c.260-c.339, Chrysostom c. 347-407 and others as earliest interpreters of the Gospels is only based on the evidence of the extant interpretations of the gospels available to us. In chronological terms, these interpreters are by no means the earliest testimonies to the authority of the gospel texts both in their local and wider context. For example, Origen stands nearly a century after the authorship of the Gospel of John. This suggests that even our earliest interpreters represent a later stage in the reception of the Gospels beyond their local context. It can, therefore, be argued that Smith's argument in relation to the earliest interpreters of the Gospels, misunderstands the difference between the context of a literary work and its later circulation and wider use. A work's genesis in a specific place does not confine it to that place forever. Depending on its quality and relevance, any literary work has the potential to go beyond its original context. There are several modern literary works that have changed the world. For example, Chinua Achebe's 1958, *Things Fall Apart*, moved from a local Nigerian novel to a global novel selling 10 million copies around the world and translated into 50 languages. While the book took on a global audience, its metaphors and idioms reflected Chinua Achebe's cultural context. Yet beyond its original context, the book can be studied, within literary theory, like any other novel. Therefore, the wider authority of the gospels among the second-century church fathers does not invalidate their origin in local settings.

7.5.2. The Genre of Luke's Gospel

In relation to the genre of Luke's gospel and its implications for its audience, a significant array of scholarly views exists, most of which challenge the conception of the gospel as *βίος,* and by implication, the gospel for all Christians thesis. Scholars such as Joel Green (1997), Paul Maier (2013) and Andrew Pitt (2013) regard the gospel of Luke as historiography. Joel Green, for example, argues that Luke's preface categorizes itself as *διήγησις* which in the Greco-Roman world lends itself to categories of either historiography or *βίος*.[1073] Yet for Green, it makes sense to regard Luke as a historiography on the basis of the primary aim of *διήγησις*, which is

[1072] Last, 2012: 180.
[1073] Green, 1997: 2.

historical, as well as the inability of the biographical genre to account for Luke-Acts taken as a whole.[1074] It can however, be argued that although the obvious differences in focus of the gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles make Green's conclusion an oversimplification, his analysis of the primary purpose of narrative as historiography not only makes an interesting case for viewing Luke's Gospel as historiography but is also supported by primary sources. For example, Nicolaus the Sophist argues that there are three types of narrative: descriptive, dramatic, and mixed. According to him, the virtues of a narrative are brevity, charm, grandeur with persuasiveness as its epitome.[1075] Nicolaus' reference to persuasiveness as the primary characteristic of narrative is important in understanding the purpose of the Third Gospel, which is to ensure that Theophilus has certainty (ἀσφάλεια) of what he had been taught (Lk 1:4). Yet, it is interesting that for Luke, what Theophilus had been taught is not confined to the Third Gospel alone but goes all the way into the Book of Acts. The seamless transition of the accounts from the Gospel according to Luke into the Acts of the Apostles evident in Act 1:1-3 makes it difficult to clearly designate the Third Gospel as a mere βίος. This understanding of Luke-Acts supports Green's position above.

In addition, in a recent study, Paul Maier has also challenged the growing consensus on understanding the Gospels, especially regarding Luke, as βίος.[1076] Maier compares Luke and Greco-Roman historiography in terms of credentials, dedication, methodology, sources, objectivity, literary ability and accuracy. He argues that Luke's qualification for historiography, his methodology, use of sources, attempted objectivity, literary ability and accuracy not only run parallel to those of the most important Greco-Roman historians of his day but also exceeds them.[1077] Maier is supported by Andrew Pitts, who in his analysis of source citation in Luke-Acts argues that Luke uses a mimetic model drawn from Greek historiographic theory, primarily when integrating materials based in his sources for Jesus tradition.[1078] The support for the historiographic basis of the Third Gospel by some recent studies throws out of balance the alleged preoccupation of the gospel for all Christians thesis with the biographical nature of the Gospels.

[1074] Ibid. 4-6.
[1075]Kennedy, 2003: 136.
[1076] Maier, 2013: 413-434.
[1077] Ibid. 413.
[1078] Pitts, 2013: 349-388.

7.5.3. Which Genre: βίοι, Historiography or Both?

The question at this stage is, however, whether looking at the gospel as historiography has any implications for understanding the nature of an audience as particular or general. This is because, as Daniel Tober has argued in an important paper, even Greek historiographies had their tensions between local and outside audiences.[1079] Daniel Tober, using an example from the writings of Athenian historian Philochorus, demonstrates that while a local history was received in many cases by the members of the focal community themselves and was intended, at least in part, for them, the packaging of local material for non-locals was itself also typical of Greek local historiography.[1080] Yet, according to Tober, even while intended for a wider audience, a local historian actually frequently intended the focal community, keenly interested as it was, in reading about itself and its collective past, as the principal audience.

Tober's observation above, which is supported by some key classical scholars such as J. Grethlein and L. Kurke, has significant implications for the local audience thesis.[1081] At most, it suggests that it is unwise to hastily surmise that the gospels are βίοι or historiography and by extension to hastily conclude that they, therefore, were originally meant for wider audiences or vice-versa. As Last has observed, it is difficult to imagine if the gospel writers started writing with genre in mind, or whether starting with genre in mind is a product of modern biblical criticism. Even if genre matters, as Smith argues, it needs to be realized, as Kloppenborg has argued, that the function of genre is to mediate between the speaker and the hearer by establishing a common dynamic capable of ruling both the production of discourses as a work of a certain kind and its interpretation according to rules provided by that genre.[1082] Kloppenborg further argues that new genres emerge through the transformation of old genres and the use of a genre in new situations may affect the way that genre is interpreted.[1083] Given the process of writing and dissemination of literary works in the Greco-Roman world and the unique nature of the Christian movement, the adoption and adaptation of a contemporary genre for purposes of contextualization was an inevitable process.[1084] Such contextualization, as

[1079] Tober, 2017: 1–25.
[1080] Ibid. 2-3.
[1081] See, Grethlein, 2010: 148–70; See also Kurke's 2011 work on *Aesopic Conversations*.
[1082] Kloppenborg, 1987:13.
[1083] Ibid.
[1084] Macdonald, 2013: 363-396; Kosternberg, 2013:435-462.

Andreas J. Kostenberger has shown, would have led to the gospels taking on features of both βίοι and historiography, and therefore, both originating in a local context but also capable of serving wider contexts.

The above understanding is particularly significant for Luke-Acts whose character traits overlap the two types of genres. John Carrol and David Garland support this view. For example, Carrol argues that since Luke places himself as a third-generation Christian (1:1-3), for such a readership, he provides a genre-bending narrative that employs conventions of both biography and *historia* that were widely known in the Hellenistic world. [1085] Therefore, to conclude that the gospels are βίοι and, therefore, were written for broader audiences is a position which fails to appreciate the unique and complex literary context of the world of the gospels and their audiences.

7.6. INTERNAL EVIDENCE

7.6.1. The Lucan Preface in Scholarship

Besides all the literary and historical evidence presented for the local audience thesis of the gospels, it is essential to examine how the text of Luke's Gospel itself provides evidence for its community orientation. First, it can be argued that Luke's unique preface in the context of Greco-Roman literary works provides a plausible explanation for the local audience basis of the gospel. H.J. Cadbury's rejection of preface composition as a basis for establishing a text's audience based on the relationship between preface and audience in Greco-Roman literary works is well known and taken for granted by some scholars.[1086] However, insufficient attention has been given to Loveday Alexander's comparison of the Lucan preface with Greco-Roman scientific literary works and its implications for understanding Luke's audience.[1087] Alexander observed that, unlike the Greco-Roman βίος or historiographical prefaces, the Lucan preface is unique in that it is short, does not contain general moral reflections and speaks in the second person.[1088] At the same time, according to her, Luke shares some of its characteristics such as second person reference and the preface's detachment from the main text, with technical or scientific literature, which were not designed to circulate outside the school that produced

[1085] See Carrol, 2015: 2. See also Garland, 2011: 26-31.
[1086] Cadbury, 1958, Alexander, 1998: 48-74, Esler, 1987: 24
[1087]Alexander, 1986: 48-74.
[1088] Ibid 50.

them.[1089] While a comprehensive understanding of the specific function of scientific prose in the Greco-Roman world remains a significant challenge to the Greco-Roman historian, as Alexander argued, the differentiation of the Lucan preface from the general class of ancient βίος or historiography provides a window into the unique relationship of Luke's Gospel with its audience. Alexander's argument was advanced more than three decades ago. However, although not given enough attention, no plausible challenge to her thesis has been advanced to date.[1090] Alexander's ability to relate the Third Gospel to the Greco-Roman scientific documents demonstrates the unique nature of the gospel and its likely community orientation.

7.6.2. Lucan Redaction in the Third Gospel

7.6.2.1. The text of the Lucan Preface

It can also be argued that a lexical analysis of Luke's preface provides a compelling case for Luke's familiarity with his audience. For example, Luke's purpose of writing is that Theophilus *ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*. Talbert argues that the way *ἀσφάλεια* is used in its different forms in Luke-Acts (Lk 5:23; Acts 21:34; 22:30; 25:26) needs to be understood in relation to Luke's legitimation strategy but across a wider Christian audience.[1091] However, while legitimation can explain Luke's use of *ἀσφάλεια*, Talbert's conclusion that such legitimation needs to be understood from a wider audience perspective fails to appreciate the immediate context of the term. When *ἀσφάλεια* is understood from the perspective of the second person σοι plus the infinitive *γράψαι* (v. 3) and the repetitive vocative Θεόφιλε in Lk 1:3; Acts 1:1, it demonstrates both a personal acquaintance with the addressee and an understanding of their circumstances. In addition, the second person aorist indicative passive *κατηχήθης* "you have been taught" shows that Luke knows that Theophilus had been instructed about Jesus but needs *ἀσφάλεια*. If Theophilus needed further *ἀσφάλεια* for what was already available in the other sources whose existence Luke acknowledged, then contextual issues which were unique to his situation or some of the members of his community may have necessitated a restatement of the church's catechesis of the Jesus event. From a sociolinguistic perspective, the way such a restatement is made throughout the Third Gospel and the Acts, granted that Luke knew and used Mark, reflects the circumstances of both the author and his immediate audience.

[1089] Ibid. 57.

[1090] Adams only challenges Alexanders comparison of the Gospels with historiography. See, Sean A. Adams 2006: 177-91.

[1091] Talbert, 2002*:* 3.

Otherwise, with other sources available to Theophilus, which Luke acknowledges, the need for the restatement of the Jesus event would not have been necessary, unless there were contextual issues to address. Inevitably, as the Gospel's text spread beyond its original context, its unique materials became its contribution to the development of the Jesus tradition within the wider early Christian movement.

7.6.2.2. Personal Acquaintance in the Lucan Text

Beyond the Lucan preface, there is also significant evidence of Lucan redactional intention and community application. First, as Esler has argued, Luke's reference to the Ephesian *ecclesia* as a flock (Acts 20:17-35) of which the elders are the shepherds, and the warning that after his departure fierce wolves will invade the flock, underscores Luke's use of apostolic history to speak to his audience.[1092] Further, according to Esler, the image of separateness and fragility of the Christian congregation in Luke 12:32, suggests that Luke found the idea of the flock appropriate to the circumstance of his audience. It can be further extended from Esler's point that the reference to τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον betrays an intimate and personal familiarity with his community, which would be awkward, though not impossible, if Luke was making the reference in relation to the whole Christian community across the Greco-Roman world. The closeness of this Lucan reference to John's Τεκνία μου (1 John 2:1) reinforces the personal nature of Luke's acquaintance with his audience. This personal acquaintance is further supported by the structure of the Lucan makarisms, whose second person reference ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, "for yours" (Lk 6:20) has an immediacy that reveals both presence and acquaintance between the performer and the audience. The use of the second person was a prevalent style in Greco-Roman panegyrics, which were themselves local and contextual. For example, in his speeches, which were delivered personally, Isocrates uses the term ὑμεῖς 206 times for every ten thousand words.[1093] This shows the extent of the personal reference in the speech, which was itself occasional, local and contextual. Garland argues that the possessive pronoun "yours" makes it clear that Jesus addresses the beatitude to a particular audience, and not referring to the poor in the entire world.[1094] Given the above arguments, to imagine ὑμετέρα in the Sermon as referring to an imaginary and distant audience becomes very difficult.

1092 Esler, 1987: 26.
1093 See, Isocrates, Areopagiticus, Perseus Program word statistics.
1094 Garland, 2011: 276.

7.6.3. Lucan Sapiential Materials and Community Orientation

It can also be argued that Luke's preoccupation with interpersonal issues, especially concerning poverty and wealth, reflected in the very structure of the Gospel, suggests the presence of a unique audience. Albert Hogeterp has shown that several sections in the Third Gospel about poverty and wealth are part of Luke's special material (Lk 12:13-21; 14:7-14; 16: 9-12; 16:19-31).[1095] Using Kloppenborg, he rightly argues that most of these sections were part of the sapiential instruction in the sayings source. Since all the texts above are L material, it is possible to understand Hogeterp's position in terms of the affinity the above materials have with the sapiential tradition. This resonance is also evident when the same are compared with the sapiential instructions on poverty and riches from the Qumran community, a closed community by nature.[1096] Hogeterp's logic followed to its conclusion, and supported by the evidence from the Qumran community, places these texts, and by implication, the Gospel of Luke, within a wisdom school or community context. As Alexander has shown, scientific documents derived more from a school context; they were school texts, the distillation of the teaching of a school or a craft tradition as it was passed down from one generation to another.[1097] The relationship between sapiential material to the school or particular community in Greco-Roman philosophical tradition and Jewish tradition is well attested.[1098] Granted that the Lucan preface places itself within the category of scientific documents, which were communal, it becomes plausible to place Lucan origins within a community context.

It can also be observed that even in those passages which the Third Gospel shares with other Gospels, Luke's redactional intention and community application are conspicuous. For example, in the genealogy section (Lk 3:23-38) Luke reworks the structure of Jesus' genealogy to project an orientation relevant to his audience's needs. By tracing Jesus' genealogy all the way back to Adam, Luke demonstrates not only Jesus' relationship with all humankind but also the relevance of his Jewish ancestry to that relationship. While the genealogy does point to a Gentile audience and not a specific Gentile audience per se, it demonstrates a way of thinking for the evangelist, which significantly differs from that of Matthew. As Green has argued, all

1095 Hogeterp, 2013: 41-63.
1096 Cf. 4Q416 2ii 2-7.
1097 Alexander, 1986: 69.
1098 Some works that underscore the relationship between wisdom and philosophical school and communities are Johnson, 2013: 93-110; See also Goff's (2007) work on *Discerning Wisdom.*

language is embedded in culture, and, therefore, Luke's narrative enterprise would have been set within a particular discourse.[1099] From a cultural and social perspective, the difference in the thinking of the two evangelists over Jesus' genealogy suggests community influence. Each evangelist is probably responding to specific questions in their community.

7.6.4. Lucan Preoccupation with Poverty

Further evidence of Luke's redactional intention and community application is apparent in the story of the woman's anointing of Jesus in Lk 7:36-48. The story has parallels in Mt 26:6-13; Mk 14:3-9; Jn. 12:1-8. John's version is considerably at variance with the Synoptic testimonies. Yet Jesus' response to the audience's murmuring against the woman's action results in two responses that demonstrate Lucan redaction and community application. First, of all the three traditions, only Luke omits Jesus' statement that "the poor will always be with you (there*)*" (Mt 26:11; Mk 17:7). The omission of Jesus' reference to the poor indicates the sensitive nature of the reference to Luke's audience. In a community troubled by the existence of poverty and riches, such a reference would have had significant implications on internal social relations. To avoid exacerbating the already simmering problem of riches and poverty in the community, Luke decided to drop that controversial saying of Jesus. This omission would not have been necessary if Luke was writing to a general audience.

Second, only in Luke does Jesus respond to the audience's murmuring with a parable on forgiveness (vv. 40-50). The connection between the woman's generosity unto Jesus and the forgiveness of her sins mirrors specific community issues in Luke's churches. It demonstrates the relationship between generosity and salvation, which potentially touches on the relations relationship between the rich and poor and the role of the former in the community. Beyond that, the parable also echoes the question of forgiveness, reconciliation and acceptance as the main issues within Lucan churches. These themes are also echoed across the Gospel, evident in the story of the sinful woman (Lk 7:36-50), the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Lk 16:11-32) and the Parable of the Shrewd Steward (Lk 16:1-9).

[1099] Green, 1997: 12.

Another plausible example of Lucan redaction is the Parable of the Banquet in Lk 14:15-24 against Matthew's in chapter 22:1-14, and Gospel of Thomas 64. The similarity in the basic outlines of parables in the three gospels suggests a common source for all the three evangelists. The similarity demonstrates that the parable may have been part of Jesus' logion to which both evangelists, and the author of the Gospel of Thomas, had access.[1100] Common to all the three versions of the parable is the idea of a banquet host who is snubbed by all his potential guests. The host's reaction to his dishonour at the hands of his peers provides an intriguing case for understanding the redactional intentions of the authors. For Matthew, the alternative guests to the banquet comprise everyone, whether *πονηρούς* or *ἀγαθούς* (22:9-10). In the Gospel of Thomas, the host instructs his servants to invite as many as possible with no apparent social designation.[1101] For Luke, the poor, the crippled, the blind and the lame become the alternative guests. The significant contrast between Matthew's preoccupation with evil (unrighteousness) and goodness (righteousness) and Luke's emphasis on poverty and riches echoes distinctive emphases in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount and its Lucan counterpart (Mt 5:3-12 cf Lk 6:20-23), respectively. The emphases in the two Sermons cannot be easily explained except as indicators of community orientation of the Gospels.

7.7. CONCLUSION

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that understanding the Gospels, and particularly the Gospel of Luke, as originating in local audience(s), represents the most plausible explanation for gospel origins and their functions. A panegyric reading of the Sermon provides a practical case for locating the Gospel in a local setting. Beyond that, the Greco-Roman processes and practices of writing, communication and diversity in the Greco-Roman world and its sociolinguistic implications support the local understanding of gospel origins. However, as Jonathan May quoting Adele Reinhartz argues, the all Christians hypothesis has value in that it reminds us of the tenuous nature of any historical reconstruction of first-century Jewish and early Christian communities.[1102] Yet in spite of all these difficulties, the local audience thesis remains the most relevant paradigm for understanding the origins of the Gospels and their audiences.

[1100] Q 14: 16-18, ?19-20, 21,23, See Robinson, Hoffman, and Kloppenborg, 2002: 135

[1101] Gos. Thom. (Nag Hammadi II 2).

[1102] May, 2011: 154-157.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

8.1. INTRODUCTION

The dissertation set out to demonstrate that the original meaning of the Sermon is best understood as having its setting in an honour and shame first century CE community of Christ-followers struggling with the proximity of riches and poverty. Using the paradigm of Greco-Roman praise and blame, embedded in Greco-Roman panegyrics, Luke presents Jesus as a Greco-Roman orator who employs the paradigm of praise and blame to integrate new members into the values of the community and to reinforce shared values among the rest of the members.

8.2. SUMMARY OF DISSERTATION FINDINGS

The dissertation had three objectives. The first one was to establish the relationship between makarisms and woes and praise and blame and by extension the relationship between the Sermon and Greco-Roman panegyrics. The second objective was to identify the meaning and function of the Lucan Sermon of Jesus in its original social context. The final objective was to demonstrate how the paradigm of praise and blame, inherent in the Sermon, is discernible across the Third Gospel, and arising from a panegyric reading of the Sermon, to affirm the local audience thesis for the Gospel of Luke, and indeed all Gospels.

In the first chapter, the dissertation set out the context of the study, the aim, objectives and the status of research on the Sermon. The chapter argued that the continued neglect of the Sermon in both the academy and the church required a new approach to its reading. Such a reading should recognise both its meaning and function within the communities for which it was intended. The study, therefore, argued that given its similarity with Greco-Roman panegyrics, a panegyric reading could provide the most plausible framework for understanding the meaning and function of the Sermon with its original setting.

In the second chapter, the dissertation argued for the relationship between Lucan and Greco-Roman makarisms and woes and their relationship to praise and blame. The establishment of such a relationship was fundamental to establishing the relationship between the Sermon and Greco-Roman panegyrics whose combination of praise and blame and exhortation is reflected in the Sermon's makarisms and woes and its succeeding paraenesis.

In the third chapter, the dissertation analysed the function of praise and blame in a Greco-Roman context. This analysis was meant to provide a methodological framework for the interpretation of the Sermon. It identified several functions of the panegyrics in the Greco-Roman world: the integration of victors or new members; the political function; the patronal function; and the ritual function. However, the above functions could be reduced to two: integration of new members into communities and the reinforcement of commonly held values. In view of the similarities between the Sermon and Greco-Roman panegyrics, the chapter argued that these functions of Greco-Roman panegyrics provide a plausible framework for interpreting the function of the Sermon in its original social context.

In the fourth chapter the dissertation argued that the literary context, the language, ethos and content of the Sermon reflect its Greco-Roman setting. Such an understanding set the stage for an exegesis of the text of the Sermon using the paradigm of praise and blame.

In the fifth chapter, the dissertation offered an exegesis of the Sermon from a panegyric perspective. It argued that the Sermon had different implications for the different members of an Easter festival in which it functioned. For new members like Theophilus and his fellow new converts, the Sermon had an integrative function; it gave the new members a fresh understanding of what it meant to be a follower of Jesus. Like Greco-Roman victors, the new followers are celebrated for their appointment into Jesus' discipleship and integrated into the adoption of new values of powerlessness, dependency and vulnerability. This type triumphalism, while seeming to be a contradiction to prevailing Greco-Roman panegyric celebration of victory, entails a new dependence on the Lord and therefore the freedom to share with others knowing that in the Kingdom God is the principal provider. At the heart of the Sermon is the call to new and old believers to live out the values of the Kingdom. This living was to be in a communion that transcends social boundaries. The need for communion and fellowship among different members of Christ-groups becomes one of the central motifs in Jesus' proclamation of salvation in the Third Gospel.

In the sixth chapter, the dissertation demonstrated how Luke continues the motif of praise and blame which he had commenced in the Sermon. The chapter argued that the paradigm of praise and blame inherent in the Sermon is not only discernible across the Gospel but also serves the Third Gospel's overall purpose. The chapter, therefore, demonstrated how, across the Gospel, both God and Jesus' magnanimity including Jesus' praise of generosity and reproach of stinginess, demonstrates Luke's interest in interpersonal relationship between the rich and poor. According to this dissertation, the demonstration of God and Jesus' magnanimity and generosity reflected Luke's overall vision of the community of Christ-followers. Therefore, those who call themselves followers of Jesus the Christ are to reflect the values he stood for. Thus, apart from the Sermon, the whole of the Third Gospel demonstrates a panegyric outlook.

In the seventh chapter, the dissertation considered the implications of the panegyric reading of the Sermon within the context of the gospel community debate. The continued stalemate in the scholarly conception of gospel audiences has implications for how the gospels are approached and interpreted. Therefore, through a fresh understanding of both primary evidence and secondary literature, the chapter argued that the local audience thesis remains the most plausible way of reading the Gospels. From this analysis a panegyric reading of the Sermon provides an example of the community reading of the Gospel, one that takes seriously both the text and the social context of the Sermon.

8.3. CONCLUSIONS

In concluding this dissertation, I would like to offer some reflection on the relationship between the rich and the poor and how Luke's Gospel deals with it. First, we must acknowledge that the relationship between the rich and the poor has historically been a vexing social question. It has been and remains one of the reasons for social strife and broken communities in the world. For the author of Luke's Gospel, the relationship between the rich and poor is not only social but also spiritual with eternal consequences. The stories of the shrewd steward and the rich man and Lazarus (Lk 16:1-5; 19-31) demonstrate the eternal implications of the broken relationships between the rich and the poor. Therefore, for Luke, to be a disciple of Jesus was and remains not only relational but also ontological. To be a disciple of Jesus had significant implications on how one defined one's neighbourliness, kinship and friendship. The Gospel demonstrates that the practical outworking of salvation was experienced in the crucible of community encounters in all its diverse forms. In a community where reciprocity governed human relationships, like the Greco-Roman context of the Lucan communities, the Sermon and the whole of the Third Gospel challenge such a limited view of social exchange. For such communities, the models for establishing harmonious and flourishing human communities are God and Jesus. In presenting God as the first giver in the infancy narrative, and Jesus' magnanimity and generosity across the Gospel, Luke provides to Theophilus and his fellow converts a picture of the community to which they have committed themselves to belong.

The symbolic significance of the relationship between riches and poverty, which forms the major thrust of the Sermon, and the whole of the Third Gospel, also needs to be put in perspective. In the Greco-Roman world, being rich was tantamount to being powerful, independent and having a sense of security. The maintenance of this status depended on belonging to the right group. Such a sense of security had an alienating effect on human relationships, especially between the rich and the destitute. Inversely, being destitute was equivalent to being powerless, dependent on others, and therefore vulnerable. While the evangelist does not extol the status of destitution, he calls upon those who have decided to be followers of Jesus to adopt the values associated with destitution. The acquisition of new identity and values of powerlessness, dependency and vulnerability are presented as critical to the redefinition of neighbour, kin and friend among the community of Christ-followers. These values offered to both the rich and the poor the ability to be unconditionally generous with the assurance that in the Kingdom their ultimate security was in the Lord. Thus, the practical outworking of Jesus' paraenesis in Lk 6: 27-49 and across the Gospels is largely dependent on the Christ-followers' adoption of the values associated with destitution.

Another pertinent issue arising from the message of the Sermon is the role of the woes in the fate of the rich. In other words, does the Sermon suggest that the rich are damned and, therefore, outside the pale of the Kingdom of God? It needs to be acknowledged that a panegyric reading of the Sermon suggests that although the message would affect the different social groups differently, the Sermon is directed at the same community. The Sermon serves as a manifesto and an expression of the commonly held values in the community. The makarisms and woes in the Sermon represent the magnification of the virtues expected of those who belong to the Kingdom and the disapproval of those values deemed antithetical to the ethos of the community of God's people. The makarisms concretise community norms and identity-description and, therefore, create the image of "what the community is", while the woes, like epideictic blame, create the image of "what the community is not."[1103] Yet in Lk 6: 27-49 the Sermon provides the practical means to achieve the ideal community envisaged in the whole Gospel.

It can also be said that although the paradigm of praise and blame was an important pedagogical tool in the Greco-Roman world, its continued use in the modern-day civil discourses demonstrates its time-honoured significance.[1104] The genre underscores the importance of the psychology of praise in the inculcation of commonly held values in a community context. Its use in the Third Gospel demonstrates Luke's broader awareness of the cultural and rhetorical conventions of his time and the need to communicate Jesus' message in culturally relevant ways to achieve the desired effect. Therefore, understanding the Sermon from a panegyric perspective helps to rescue the Sermon from its historical Matthean shackles. The Sermon's revolutionary stance on the relationship between the rich and the destitute represents Jesus' persistent call on Christian communities to be models of the Kingdom. In the Sermon and the whole Gospel, to use Oakman's language, Jesus brokers a new community by bringing the relationship between the haves and the have-nots into a new relationship of mutual sharing.[1105] Thus, in the Sermon, Jesus underscores the fact that if the rich and poor are equal members of the "new *polis*" which is the Kingdom of God, then their understanding and practice of kinship must transcend the contemporary Greco-Roman world's normative values and practices.

The importance of the new conception of community was critical to the realisation of God's universal plan of salvation in the Greco-Roman world. With the Christ-groups as model "subversive communities" or countercultural groups, the expansion of the Christian movement (Lk. 11:20; 13:20-12) would have had wide-spread influence on the relationship between the

[1103] For more information on the epideictic construction of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, see Sullivan, (1999), 49-76.
[1104] The significance of epideictic praise in modern times is underscored by Petersen, (2010); Sheard (1996), 765-794 and Villadsen, (2008: 25-45).
[1105] Oakman, 2014: 5, 16.

great and small (Lk 22:25-30), masters and slave, and men and women across the whole Greco-Roman world. Through the transformation of the kinship ideology, the marginalised such as widows, orphans, the sick, and slaves, would experience a realised eschatology implicit in the whole of Luke's Gospel. As a result, in the spirit of Acts 2:47, the Lord would add to their number many that were to be saved. Therefore, for Luke, the social and interpersonal dynamics within the early Christ-groups had significant missiological implications for the growth of the early Christian movement within its Greco-Roman context.

Thus far, I hope the dissertation has offered a new reading of Jesus' Sermon in Luke's Gospel. It is hoped that the analysis provided so far will offer useful methodological and theoretical insights not only to the reading of other NT speeches, but also to the relationship between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and the original communities they served.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Robert Browning www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0003:ca

Aeschylus, *Eumenides,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by Herbert Weir Smyth, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0006

Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Herbert Weir Smyth, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0010

Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Charles Darwin Adams www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0002:speech=3

Arrian, *Anabasis*, Perseus Digital Library, edited by A.G. Roos, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0530

Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. Anonymous, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0240:card=496

Aristophanes*, Birds*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Eugene O'neill, Jr. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0026

Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae*, translated by Eugene O'Neill, ww.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0030

Aristophanes*, Frogs,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by Matthew Dillon, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0031

Aristophanes*, Wasps,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by Eugene O'Neill, Jr. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0043

Aristophanes, *Plutus,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by Eugene O'Neill, Jr. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0040

Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by H. Rackham www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=aristot.+ath.+pol.+22

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by H. Rackham, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0054

Aristotle, *Rhetoric,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by J. H. Freese, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0060

Athenagoras*, Legatio,* Ante-Nicene Christian Library/Plea for the Christians https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ante-Nicene_Christian_Library/Plea_for_the_Christians, accessed, 20.09.2018

Bacchylides, *Epinician Odes 1-5*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Diane Arnson Svarlien, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Bacchyl. Ep.

Bion of Phlossa, *Fragmenta,* 8, translated by John Maxwell, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0673:poem=8

Chrysostom Dio, *Orations*, Perseus Digital Library, edited by J. de Arnim, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0567.

Cicero, *Against Catiline*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by C.D. Young, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0019:text=Catil.:speech=1.

Cicero, *Brutus*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. A. S. Wilkins, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0544.

Cicero, Cicero, *De Finibus*, Perseus Digital Library, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a2007.01.0036

Cicero, *For Ligarius*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by C.D. Young, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0011:text=Lig.:section=1.

Cicero, For *King Deiotarus*, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hoppe Perseus Digital Library, translated by C.D. Young r/text.jsp?doc=Perseus: abo: phi,0474,034.

Cicero, *For Marcellus*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by C.D. Younge, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Cic. Marc.

Cicero, *Phillipic*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by C.D. Young, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0011:text

Crates, *Elegy and Iambus*, Vol. II, 2.15.2, Perseus Digital Library, translated by J.M. Edmonds,www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0480:volume=2:text=15.

Democritus, Fragment *255*, Demonax Hellenic Library, http://demonax.info/doku.php?id=text:democritus_fragments.

Demosthenes, *Against Midias*, Perseus Digital Library, edited by S. H. Butcher and W. Renniewww.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Dem. 21.

Demosthenes, *Philippic*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by J. Vince, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0070:speech=4

Dio Chrysostom, *Orations*, Perseus Digital Library, edited by, J. de Arnim. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0567.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. (2017*). Complete Works*. Sussex: Delphi Publishing.

Epictetus, *Discourses*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by George Long, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0236:text=disc

Euripides, *Bacchae*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by T.A. Buckley, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0092

Euripides, *Helen*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by E.P. Coleridge, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0100.

Euripides, *Trojan Women*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by E.P. Coleridge www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0124

Euripides, *Orestes*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by E.P. Coleridge, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0116

Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Perseus Digital Library, edited by Kirsopp Lake, J.E.L. Oulton, H.J. Lawlor, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0640:book=5...

Empedocles *Beatitudes Frag* 132. Tr. Demonax Hellenic Library, http://demonax.info/doku.php?id=text:empedocles_fragments

Herodotus, *The Histories*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. by A. D. Godley, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0126:book=3&force=y.

Hesiod, *Works and Days*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Hugh Evelyn-White, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Hes. WD

Hesiod, *Theogony*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Hugh Evelyn-White www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0130

Homer, Odyssey, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Samuel Butler, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0135

Homer, *The Iliad*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Samuel Butler, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0133

Homeric Hymn to Mother Earth, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White,www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:corpus:perseus,au thor. 30.

Homeric Hymn to Demeter, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:corpus:perseus,a uthor. 13.

Isocrates, *Against Lochites*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by George, Norlin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0144:speech=20:section=4.

Isocrates, *Areopagiticus*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by George Norlin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0144:speech=7 .

Isocrates, *Evagoras*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. George Norlin, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0144%3Aspeech%3D9%3Asection%3D1.

Isocrates*, Panathenaicus*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by George Nolin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0144:speech=12

Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by George Nolin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0144:speech=4

Isocrates, *On the Peace*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by George Nolin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0144:speech=8

Josephus, *Agains Apion*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by William Whiston www.perseus.tufts.edu › hopper › text › doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0216

Josephus*, Antiquitates Judaicae,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by William Whiston www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0145

Lucian*, Mortuorum Dialogue,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by Karl Jacobitz www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0524

Lysia, *Olympic Orations*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by W.R. Lamb, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0154:speech=33

Lewis, Charlton T. and Short Charles, *A Latin Dictionary*, Perseus Digital Library, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0059

Plautus, *Sinarius*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Henry Thomas Riley, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0093

Pindar, Pythian, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Diane Arnson Svarlien, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0162:book=P.1-5

Pindar, *Nemean*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Diane Arnson Svarlien www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0162:book=1-5

Pindar, *Olympiad*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Diane Arnson Svarlien www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0162.

Plato, Crito, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Harold North Fowler, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0170:text=Crito

Plato, *Republic,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by Paul Shorey www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0168,

Plat. *Laws,* Perseus Digital Library, translated by R.G. Bury. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=plat.+laws+1.624a

Plato, *Alcibiades*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by W.R.M. Lamb, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0176:text=Alc

Plutarch, *Amatorius,* Perseus Digital Library, edited by William W. Goodwin www.perseus.tufts.edu*/hopper/text?doc=Plut.*

Plutarch, *De Se Ipsum Citra Invidiam Laudando*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. William W. Goodwin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0300.

Plutarch, *Dion*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Bernadotte Perrin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0041

Plutarch, *Cleomenes*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Bernadotte Perrin www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0018

Plutarch, *Numa*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Bernadotte Perrin, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0052 translation Bernadotte Perrin.

Plutarch, *Lucullus*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Bernadotte Perrin www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0117.

Plutarch, *Lysander*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Bernadotte Perrin www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0048.

Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*, DOI: 10.4159/DLCL.plutarch-lives_cicero.1919.

Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Charles Darwin Adams,www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0002:speech=3.

Polybius, *Histories*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0234%3Abook%3D12%3Achapter%3D26.

Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphoses*, Perseus Digital Library, edited by Hugo Magnus (ed), www.perseus.tufts.edu*/hopper/text?doc=*Perseus*:text:1999.02.0029*.

Russel Donald A. and Wilson Nigel G. (1981). *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Seneca, *Moral Epistles*, The Loeb Classical Library, translated by Richard M. Gummere, https://www.loebclassics.com/view/LCL075/1917/volume.xml

Suetonius, *Domitianu*s, Perseus Digital Library, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0132:life=dom.:chapter=12.

Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by F. Storr. www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0191.

Theognis, *Elegy and Iambus, Volume I*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by J. M. Edmonds,www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0479:volume=1:text

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by Thomas Hobbes, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0200.

Tyndale House, *Step Bible*, https://www.stepbible.org/ viewed 20.10.2019.

Virgil, *Aeneid*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by John Dryden, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0055

Virgil, *Fourth Eclogues*, Perseus Digital Library, tr. H. Butcher and W. Rennies, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0056:poem=4.

Virgil, *Georgics*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by J. B. Greenough www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0058.

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, Perseus Digital Library, translated by C.L. Brownson, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0206

Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, Perseus Digital Library, translated b E. C. Marchant, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0208.

2. Secondary Sources

Adams, S. A. (2016). "Luke and Progymnasmata: Rhetorical Handbooks, Rhetorical Sophistication and Genre Selection" in *Ancient Education and Early Christianity LNTS Series 533,* edited by Pitts, A. W. and Hauge, M. R. (Eds). London; Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 137-154.

Adams, A. Sean. (2006). "Luke's Preface and Its Relationship to Greek, Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander". JGRChJ, 3. 177-91.

Adewale, Olubiyi Adeniyi. (2013). "An Understanding of the Parable of the Shrewd Manager (Luke 16: 1-13)." *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol. 16, No.6, 125-130.

Adkins, A. W. H. (1971). "Homeric Values and Homeric Society." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 91, 1-14 https://doi.org/10.2307/631365

Alexander, Loveday. (1998). "Ancient Book Production and Circulation of the Gospels." In

The *Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking Gospel Audiences*, edited by Bauckham Richard. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 71-112.

Alexander, Loveday. (1986). "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing." *Novum Testamentum*. Vol. 28, No.1. 48-74.

Alexander, Loveday. (1990). "The Living Voice: Scepticism towards the Written Word in Early Christian and in Greco-Roman Texts." In *The Bible in Three Dimensions*, editted by D.J.A. Clines, S.E. Fowl, S.E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 221-47.

Allison, Dale C. (1999). *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. New York: Crossroad Publications.

Allison, Dale C. (1988). "Was There a "Lucan Community?" *IBS,* 10, 1988, 62-70.

Anaoutoglou, Ilias. (1998). "Between Koinon and Idion. In *Cosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Athens*, editted by Paul Cartledge, Paul Millet and Sita von Reden. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 68-83.

Ascough, Richard S. (2002). "Greco-Roman Philosophic, Religious, and Voluntary Associations." In *Community Formation in the Early Church and the Church Today*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson., 3-19.

Aune, David. (2007). "Christian Beginning and Cognitive Dissonance Theory." In *Other Words; Essays on Social Science Method& the New Testament in Honour of Jerome H. Neyrey*, Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix School, 12-41.

Aune, David E. (1998). *Greco-Roman Literature and the NT*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Aune, David Edward, and Westminster John Knox Press. (2003). *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Autero, Esa. (2011). "Social Status in Luke's Infancy Narrative: Zechariah the Priest." *Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Vol 41, No.1, 36–45.

Baergen, A. Rene. (2006). "Servant, Manager or Slave? Reading the Parable of the Rich Man and His Steward (Luke 16:1-8a) Through the Lens of Ancient Slavery." *Studies in Religions*, 35/1, 25-38.

Balch, David L. (2003). "Luke." In ECB, edited by James D.G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1104-1160.

Barclay, John. (2004). "Poverty in Pauline Studies: A Response to Steven Friesen", *JSNT* 26.3 (2004), 363-366.

Barney, Rachel. (2016). “Gorgias’s Encomium of Helen.” *Oxford Scholarship Online.* DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199928903.003.0001

Barton, Carlin. (2001). *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barton, John. (1998). *Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauckham, Richard. (1998). “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?” In *The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking Gospel Audiences*, edited by Bauckham Richard. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1-12.

Baum, Armin Daniel. (2008). “The Anonymity of the New Testament History Books: A Stylistic Device in the Context of Greco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature.” *Novum Testamentum*, 50, No. 2, 120-142.

Beale, Walter H. (1978). “Rhetorical Performative Discourse: A New Theory of Epideictic.” *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 221-246.

Beard, Mary. (2014). *Laughter in Ancient Rome: On Joking, Tickling, and Cracking Up*. California: University of California Press, 2014.

Beasley-Murray, G. (1972*). Baptism in the New Testament*. Exeter England: Paternoster Press.

Beavis, Mary (2004). “The Kingdom of God, 'Utopia' and Theocracy.” *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, Vol. 2. No 1 91–106, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/147686900400200104.

Bergren, Ann L.T. (1989). “The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Tradition and Rhetoric, Praise and Blame.” *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 8 No.1, 1-41.

Betz, Hans Dieter and Adela Yarbro Collins. (1995). *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain* (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49). Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Bird, Michael F. (2006). “The Markan Community, Myth or Maze? Bauckham’s the Gospel for All Christians Revisited.” The *Journal of Theological Studies*, 57, 474-86.

Biblical World Editorial. (1903). "The Beatitudes of Jesus." *The Biblical World*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 83-87. https://doi.org/10.1086/473236.

Blaisdell, Bob. (2014). *Greek and Roman Oratory*. New York: Dover Publications.

Blank, G.M. Thomas. (2013). “Isocrates on Paradoxical Discourse: An Analysis of Helen and Busiris.” *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, Vol. 31, No. 1,1-33.

Blundell, Mary Whitlock. (1989). *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bock, Darrel. (1994). *Luke*, Vol 1: 1-950. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.

Bodel, John. (2015). "Status Dissonance and Status Dissidents in the Equestrian Order." In *Social Status and Prestige in the Greco-Roman World*, edited by Annika B. Kuhn. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 29-44.

Botha, Pieter J. J. (2012). *Orality and Literacy in Early Christianity*. Eugene: Cascade Books.

Bovon, Francis. (2002). *Luke 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Bowman, Alan and Wilson Andrew. (2009). *Quantifying the Roman Economy: Methods and Problems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brawley, R.L. (1990). *Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts*. Westminster: John Knox Press.

Broyles, C.C. (1992). "Gospel." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* edited by Green J.B., McKnight and Marshall I.H. Leicester: Intervarsity Press.

Bradshaw, P.F. (1995). "Diem Baptismo Sollemniorem': Initiation and Easter in Christian Antiquity." *Living Water*, edited by Maxwell Johnson, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 137–47.

Brandt, J. Rasmus. (2012). "Content and Form, Some Consideration on Greek Festivals and Archaeology." In *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice,* edited by J. Rasmus Brandt, Jon W. Iddeng. Oxford: Oxford University Press,139-198.

Braundi, Susanna Morton. (1998). "Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric." In *Propaganda of Power*, edited by Mary Whitby. Leiden: Brill, 53-76.

Braun, Will. (2007). "Our Religion Compels us to Make a Distinction: Prolegomena on Meals." In *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean: Jews, Christians and Others: Essays in Honour of Stephen G. Wilson*, edited by Zeba A. Crook and Philip A. Harland. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Braun, Willi. (1992). "Symposium or Anti-Symposium? Reflections on Luke 14:1-24." *Toronto Journal of Theology*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, 70-84 DOI: 10.3138/Tjt.8.1.7.

Brown, Peter. (2002). *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*. Hanover: University Press of New England.

Brown, E. Raymond. (1997). *Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Double Day.

Brown, E. Raymond. (1977). *The Birth of the Messiah*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Bruce, F.F. (1998). *Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans.

Budelmann, F. (2010). *Epinician and the Symposion: A comparison with the Encomia*. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139017626.014

Burke, Kenneth. (1969). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burket, Delbert. (2018). "The Parable of the Unrighteous Steward (Luke 16.1–9): A Prudent Use of Mammon Delbert Burkett (A1)." *NTS*, Vol. 64, Issue 3, 326-342.

Burridge, Richard. (1998). "The Gospel Genre and Audiences." In *The Gospel for all Christians: Rethinking Gospel Audiences*, edited by Bauckham, Richard (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 113-45.

Burridge, Richard. (1995). *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byrne, B. (2008). "Beatitudes and Poverty of Spirit in the Ignatian Exercises," *The Way*, 47/1–2, 29–46.

Byrne, Brendan. (2000). *The Hospitality of God*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

Cadbury, Henry J. (1958). The *Making of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK.

Carmichael, Calum. (2006). "Passover Haggadah." In *The Historical Jesus in Context*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine, Dale Allison Jnr and John Domminic. Crossan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 343-357.

Carrol, John T. (2012). *Luke: A Commentary*. Kentucky: John Knox Press.

Carson, D.A., France R.T., Motyer J.A and Wenham G.J. (1994). *New Bible Commentary*. Downers Grove: Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Carter, Michael. (1991). "The Ritual Function of Epideictic Rhetoric: The Case of Socrates Funeral Oration." *Rhetorica*: *Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, Vol. 9, No.3, 209-23.

Carter, Warren. (2009). "The Sheep of the Fold by Edward Klink, Book Review." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol 71, No.2, 403-405.

Cavanna, A.E, Cavanna S. and Cavanna A. (2010). "Epileptic Seizures and Spirit Possession in Haitian Culture." *Epilepsy & Behaviour*, 19 (1), 89-91.

Center for Hellenistic Studies. (2019). "Poetry of Praise, Poetry of Blame." Harvard University Https://Chs.Harvard.Edu/CHS/Article/Display/5450 Accessed 17/05/2019.

Chase, J. R. (1961). "The Classical Conception of Epideictic." *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 47 (3), 293-300.

Chisholm, Hugh. (1911). "Panegyric." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 676–677.

Choi, Jongwa. (2013). "Models of Local Control within the Roman World." In *Jewish Leadership in Roman Palestine from 70ce to 135bce*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 117-52.

Christ, Matthew R. (2012). *The Limits of Altruism in Democratic Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christ, Matthew R. Christ. (2006). *The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Kenneth W. (1960). "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70." NTS, 6, No 4, 269-80.

Collins, Adela Y. (1995). "Review: Genre and Gospel: What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography by Richard A. Burridge." *Journal of Religion*, Vol. 75, 239-46.

Condit, Celeste Michelle. (1985). "The Function of Epideictic: Boston Massacre Orations as Exemplar." *Communication Quarterly*, Vol 33, No.3, 284-298.

Conzelmann, Hans. (2007). *Acts of the Apostle*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Covino, Ralph. (2011) "The Laudatio Funebris as a Vehicle for Praise and Admonition." In *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric*, edited by Christopher Smith and Ralph Covino. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 69-81.

Creamer, J.M., Spencer A.B. Spencer, and Vijoen F.P. (2014). "Who Is Theophilus? Discovering the Original Reader of Luke- Acts." *In Die Skriflig*, 48(1), Http:// Dx.Doi.Org/10.4102/Ids. V48i1.1701.

Cribiore, Raffaella. (2008). "Menander the Poet or Menander Rhetor? An Encomium of Dioscoros Again", 95-109, Https://Grbs.Library.Duke.Edu/Article/ViewFile/821/901, 15.10.2018.

Crook, A. Zeba .(2009). "Honour, Shame, and Social Status Revisited."*JBL*, Vol. 128, No. 3, 591-611.

Crook, A. Zeba and Halland Phillip. (2007). *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Crook, Zeba, J. (2001-2005). "The Divine Benefactions of Paul the Client." *GRChJ.* 2, 9-26.

Culpepper, Allan. (1995). "Luke" in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol IX. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1-490.

Crook, Zeba. (2004*). Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyer.

Daise, Michael. (2016). "Christ Our Passover" (1 Corinthians 5:6-8): The Death of Jesus and the Quartodeciman Pascha." *Neotestamentia*, Vol. 50, No.2, 507-526.

Danker, Frederick. (1988). *Jesus and the New Age*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Danker, Frederick W. Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. (2000). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davids, Peter H. (1990). *The First Epistle of Peter. The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Davies and Alison, (2004). *Matthew 1-7*. London: T and T Clarke.

De Heer, C. (1969). *Makar, Eudaimon, Olbios, Eutuches, A Study of the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the End of the 5th Century BCE*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

Desmond, William. (2006). *The Greek Praise of Poverty*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.

Davis, W.D. and Allison, D.C. Jr. (1998). *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

De Bouvre, Synnove. (2012). "Greek Festivals and the Ritual Process." In *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*, edited by J. Rasmus Brandt, Jon W. Iddeng. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 253-293.

Desilva, David A. (1994). "Despising Shame: A Cultural-Anthropological Investigation of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JBL*, Vol. 113, No. 3, 439-461.

DeSilva, David Arthur. (2004). *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

Desmond, William. (2006). *The Greek Praise of Poverty*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.

Detiene, Marcel. (2005). "Anthropology and Classics." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and Classics*, Vol.1, No. 2, 63-74.

Diehl, A. Judith. (2011). "What Is a Gospel? Recent Studies in the Gospel Genre." *Currents in Biblical Research*. 9, 171-99.

Dodd, C.H. (1968). *More New Testament Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dominik, William J. and Smith, Christopher. (2011). "Praise and Blame in Roman Oratory." In *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric*, edited by Christopher Smith and Ralph Covino. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 1-16.

Donfried, Karl. (2002). *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dorey, T. (1956). "Aristophanes and Cleon." *Greece and Rome*, 3(2), 132-139.Doi:10.1017/S0017383500015151.

Downing, F.G. (1999). "Honour among Exegetes." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 61. No.1, 53-73.

Downing, Gerald F. (1997). "Word Processing in the Ancient World: Social Production and

Performance of Q.", *JSNT*, Vol. 19, No. 64, 29-48.

Dowling, E. V. (2011). "Luke-Acts: Good News for Slaves?" *Pacifica*, 24, 23-140.

Drake, A.H. (1976). *In Praise of Constantine, A Historical Study and New Interpretation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. Berkeley: University. of California Press.

Draper, Jonathan A. (1999). "The Genesis and Narrative Thrust of the Paraenesis in the Sermon on the Mount." *JSNT*, 17, 25-48.

Duffy, Bernard K. (1983). "The Platonic Functions of Epideictic Rhetoric." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 79-93.

Dukes, H. B. (2013). "Between Athens and Jerusalem: King Lear and the Morality of Tragedy. *FIVE: The Claremont Colleges Journal of Scholarship*, Vol. 2, No. 2 |claremont.edu, accessed 20.5.2019.

Dunn, J. (1990). *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (2nd ed.). London: SCM Press.

Duranti, Alessandro. (2001). *Linguistic Anthropology, A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Dybikowski, J. (1981). "Is Aristotelian Eudaimonia Happiness?" *Dialogue,* 20, (2), 185-200. Doi: 10.1017/S0012217300023295.

Edwards, James. (1992). *Romans*, NIBC. Peabody: Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Edmunds, Lowell. (1987). "The Aristophanic Cleon's Disturbance of Athens." *The American Journal of Philology,* Vol. 108, No. 2, 233-263.

Elliot, John. (2003). *Social-Scientific Criticism*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Elliot, John. (1993). *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Elliott, J.H. (1991). "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions." *HTS,* 47/1, 88-120.

Elliott, John H. (1991). "Household and Meals Vs. Temple Purity Replication Patterns in Luke-Acts." *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, Vol. 21. No. 3, 102-108.

Ellis, Earl. (1973). *The Gospel According to Luke.* London: Oliphant.

Eng, Daniel K. (2019). "The Widening Circle: Honour, Shame, and Collectivism in the Parable of the Prodigal Son." *The Expository Times*, Vol. 130, (5), 193 –201.

Esler, Philip Francis. (2012). *Sex, Wives, and Warriors: Reading Old Testament Narrative with its Ancient Audience.* Cambridge: James Clarke.

Esler, Philip F. (2017). *Babatha's Orchard: The Yadin Papyri and an Ancient Jewish Family Tale Retold*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2017.

Esler, Philip Francis. (2000). "Jesus and the reduction of intergroup conflict: The parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory." *Biblical Interpretation :A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, 8 (4):325-357. DOI: 10.1163/156851500750118953.

Esler, Philip Francis. (1998). "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospels for All Christians." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 51, (1235-48.

Esler, Philip Francis. (1987). *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Esler, P. (1994). *The First Christians in their Social Worlds: Social-scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. London: Routledge.

Edward, R. James .(2015). *The Gospel According to Luke*. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Evans, Craig. (1990). *Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

Farris, Stephen. (1985). *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives, Their Origin, Meaning and Significance JSNT Supplementary Series*. Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press.

Finegan, Jack. (1992). *New Testament Archaeology: The Life of Jesus and the Birth of the Church*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Finley, M. (1977). *The World of Odysseus.* London: Chatto and Winks.

Finley, M. I. (1959). "Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour?" *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte,* Bd. 8, H. 2, 145-164.

Finn, Thomas M. (1989). "Ritual Process and the Survival of Early Christianity: A Study of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus." *Journal of Ritual Studies,* 3/1, 69-89. Http://Www.Jstor.Org/Stable/44368406.

Finn, T.M. (1967) "The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John Chrysostom. *Studies in Christian Antiquity*, 15, 50–54.

Fitzgerald, William. (1996). "Labor and Laborer in Latin Poetry: The Case of the Moretum." *Arethusa*, Vol. 29, No. 3,389-418. Doi: 10.1353/Are.1996.0020.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. (1981). *The Gospel According to Luke*. New York: Double Day.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (2002). *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Publishers.

Flower, I. Harriet. (2013). "Laudation Funebris." *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient History*, Edited by Roger S. Bagnall, Kai Brodersen, Craige B. Champion, Andrew Erskine, and Sabine R. Huebner, page 3927. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. DOI: 10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah08099.

Flower, Harriet I. (1996). *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Foster, Paul. (2002). "In Defence of Q." *Expository Times*, Vol. 144, No. 3, 295-300.

Fox, Robin Lane. (2005). *The Classical World, An Epic History of Greece and Rome*. London: Penguin.

Franklin, Eric. (2001). "*Luke."*In Oxford Bible Commentary, edited by John Barton and John Muddiman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 922-959.

Freyne, Sean. (2002). *Galilee and Gospel*. Leiden/Boston: Brill Academic.

Freyne, Sean. (1988). *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels. Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Friesen, J. Steven. (2004). "Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-Called New Consensus." *JSNT*, 26/3, 323-361.

Fuks, Alexander. (1984). *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece.* Jerusalem: Magness Press.

Furnish, V. (2007). *1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Gallia, Andrew and Bryn, Mawr. (2012). "Pliny's Praise, the Panegyrics in the Roman World." *Classical Review,* 44.

Gamble, Harry Y. (1995). *Books and Readers in the Early Church.* New Haven: Yale University.

Garland, David. (2011). *Luke*, ECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Gerard, A. Hauser, (1999). "Aristotle on Epideictic: The Formation of Public Morality." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 5-23.

Gasti, Helen. (1992). "Sophocles' "Ajax": The Military Hybris" *Quaderni Urbinati Di Cultura Classica*, 40, No. 1, 81-93.

Geraty, Lawrence T. (1965). "The Pascha and the Origins of Sunday Observance", *Andrews University Seminary Studies*. https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/auss/vol3/iss2, accessed 20.02.19

Gerstenberger, E. (1962). "The Woe Oracle of the Prophets." *JBL*, 81, 249-263.

Gibson, Craig. (2014). "Better Living through Prose Composition? Moral and Compositional Pedagogy in Ancient Greek and Roman Progymnasmata." *Rhetorica*, Vo. 32 No.1,1-30.

Gillihan, Yonder. (2012). *Civic Ideology, Organisation and Law in the Rule Scroll*. Leiden: Brill.

Goff, J. Matthew. (2007). *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol. 116. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Goodacre, Mark. (2002). *The Case Against Q*. Harrisburg, Pens. Trinity International Press.

Goodacre, Mark. (2001). *The Synoptic Problem, A Way Through the Maze*. London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Gordley, E. Matthew. (2007). *The Colossian Hymn in Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Goulder, M. D. (1978). “On Putting Q to the Test.” *NTS*, 24, 218-34.

Goulder, Michael. (1989). *Luke, A New Paradigm*. *JSNT*, Supplementary Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Grant, F.C. (1957). *The Gospel’s Origin and their Growth*. London: Faber and Faber.

Green, J. B. (2014). “Good News to the Poor: A Lucan Leitmotif.” *Review and Expositor*, 11 (2), 173-179.

Green, Joel B. (1997). *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Green, H. (2001). *Matthew, Poet of the Beatitudes*. *JSNT,* Supplement series, 203. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Grethlein, J. (2010). “The Rise of Greek Historiography and the Invention of Prose.” *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, Vol. 1., edited by Feldherr A. and Hardy, G. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 148–70.

Gutierrez, G. A. (1991). *Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. USA: Orbis.

Guynn, Noah. (1999*). “*Historicizing Shame, Shaming History: Origination and Negativity in the Eneas.” *L'Esprit Créateur*, Vol. 39. No.4. 112-127.

Halliwell, Stephen. (1991). “The Uses of Laughter in Greek Culture”, *Classical Quarterly,* 279-296. Doi: 10.1017/S0009838800004468.

Halsaw, Guy. (2007). *Barbarian Migration and Roman West*, 376-568. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hanson, K.C. (1996). “How Honourable! How Shameful! A Cultural Analysis of Matthew’s Makarisms and Reproaches.” *Semeia,* 68, 81-111.

Hare, Douglas R.A. (2000). “How Jewish is the Gospel of Matthew?” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Vol. 62, No. 2, 264-77.

Harrington, D. (2007). *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina series, 1). Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

Harrison, James R. (2003). *Paul’s Language of Grace in its Graeco-Roman Context.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publisher.

Hatton, H., & Clark, D. (1975). “From the Harp to the Sitar.” In *The Bible Translator*, 26, (1), 132-138. doi:10.1177/026009357502600104

Hawheee, Debra. (2017). “Looking Beyond Belief: Paradoxical Encomia and Visual Inquiry”, Chicago Scholarship Online: DOI: 10.7208/Chicago/9780226398204.001.0001.

Hemer, C. (1978). “The Addressees of 1 Peter.” *Expository Times*, Vol. 89, No.8, 239–243.

Hieke, T. and International Q Project. (2001). *Q 6:20-21:The Beatitudes for the Poor, Hungry, and Mourning (Documenta q)*. Leuvven: Peeters.

Hock, F. Ronald. (2003). “The Parable of the Foolish Rich Man (Luke 12:16-20) and Graeco-Roman Conventions of Thought and Behaviour.” In *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White. Leiden: Brill, 181-96.

Hogeterp, Albert L A. (2013). “Immaterial Wealth in Luke between Wisdom and Apocalypticism: Luke’s Jesus Tradition in Light of 4Q Instruction,” *Early Christianity*, 4, No. 1, 41-63.

Holladay, Carl R. (2008). “The Beatitudes: Jesus’ Recipe for Happiness.” *Between Experience and Interpretation*, edited by Foskett, Mary F; Allen, O. Wesley; Johnson, Luke Timothy. Nashville: Abingdon, 83-104.

Hornblower, Simon, and Spawforth Antony. (1996). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hornblower, Simon. (2006). *Thucydides and Pindar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horsley, A. Richard, (2003). *Jesus and the Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Horsley, Richard A. (2004). *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order*. London: Trinity International Press.

Howell, Justin R. (2008). “The Imperial Authority and Benefaction of Centurions and Acts 10.34-43: A Response to C. Kavin Rowe.*” JNTS,* 31/1, 25-51.

Howes, Llewellyn. (2015). *Judging Q and saving Jesus - Q’s contribution to the Wisdom-Apocalypticism in Historical Jesus Studies*. Durbanville:Oasis.

Hoyt Jr, T. (1980). “The poor/rich theme in the beatitudes.” *Journal of Religious Thought*, 37(1), 31-41.

Jehne, Martin. (2011). “Blaming the People in Front of the People.” In *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric,* edited by Christopher Smith and Ralph Covino. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 111-125.

Jeremias, J. (1966). *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.* London: SCM Press.

Johnson, L.T. (1992). *Acts of the Apostles*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.

Johnson, L.T. (2013). "Jesus and the Philosophers." In *Contested Issues in Christian Origins and the New Testament,* edited by L.T. Johnson. Boston: Brill, 93-110.

Johnson, L.T. (1991). *The Gospel of Luke*, Vol. 3. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. (2013) "On Finding the Lucan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay." In *Contested Issues in Christian Origins and New Testament*, edited by Johnson, Luke Timothy. Boston: Brill, 129-143.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. (2010). *The Writings of the New Testament.* London: SCM Press.

Johnson, Samuel R. (1970). "The Non-Aristotelian Nature of Samoan Ceremonial Oratory." *Western Speech*. 34, 262-273.

Jones, Catherine. (2011). "Review of Bruce Longenecker's Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty and the Greco-Roman World." *Studies in Religion / Sciences Religieuses* 40/3, 394-395.

Jonquiere, T.M. (2007). *Prayer in Josephus.* Leiden: Brill.

Keener, Craig. (1993). *Luke, The IVP BBC*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.

Kennedy, G. (2001). "Historical Survey of Rhetoric." In *Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330BC-AD400* edited by Stanley E. Porter: Boston/Leiden: Brill, 3-42.

Kennedy, George A. (2003). *Progymnasmata, Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

Kennedy, George A. (1984). *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Kenneth, W. Clark. (1960). "Worship in The Jerusalem Temple After A.D. 70", *NTS,* 6, 269-80.

Kesich, V. (2007). *Formation and Struggles: The Church, A.D. 33-45*. New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.

King, J. Fergus. (2018). "A Funny Thing Happened on The Way to the Parable: The Steward, Tricksters and (Non) Sense in Luke 16:1–8."*Biblical Theology Bulletin*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 18–25.

Kittel G. (1967). *TDNT*. Vol.1V, Grand Rapids, Mich.:Eerdmans.

Kittel G. (1965). *TDNT*. Vol.111, Grand Rapids, Mich.:Eerdmans.

Kittel G. (1964). *TDNT*. Vol.1, Grand Rapids, Mich.:Eerdmans.

Klink, Edward. (2010). "*The Audience of the Gospels: Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity*. LNTS. London: T&T Clark.

Klink, Edward. (2007). *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origins of John's Audience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kloppenborg, J. (2019). Christ's Associations: Connecting and Belonging in the Ancient City. New Haven: Yale University Press

Kloppenborg, John S. (1996). "Collegia and Thiasoi: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership." In *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, edited by Wilson, John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. New York/London: Routledge, 16-30.

Kloppenborg, John S.V. (1987). *The Formation of Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kloppenborg, John S.V. (2000). *Excavating Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Klyne, Nodgrass. (2008). "Prophets, Parables and Theologians." *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 45–77.

Knight, Jonathan. (1998). *Luke's Gospel*. London: Routledge.

Konstan, David. (1985). "The Politics of Aristophanes' Wasps." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014)*, 115, 27-46.

Kosternberg, Andreas J. (2013). "The Genre of the Fourth Gospel and Greco-Roman Literary Conventions." In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, (Leiden/Boston: Brill: Brill, 435-62.

Kraut, Richard. (2018). "Aristotle's Ethics" *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* URL =<https://Plato.Stanford.Edu/Archives/Sum2018/Entries/Aristotle-Ethics/>accessed 20.9.2019.

Kuhn, K.A. (2015). *The Kingdom According to Luke and Acts: A Social, Literary, and Theological Introduction*. Grand Rapids, Baker Academic.

Kulp, Joshua. (2005). "The Origins of the Seder and Haggadah, Currents" *Biblical Research*, Vol. 4, Issue 1, 109-134.

Kurke, L. (2011). *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose.* Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Kurke, Leslie. (2001). "The Strangeness of 'Song Culture': Archaic Greek Poetry," In *Literature in the Greek World*, edited by Oliver Taplin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 58-89.

Kurke, Leslie. (1991). *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy.* Ithaca/London: Cornell University.

Laverdiere, Eugene A. and William G. Thompson. (1976). "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke." *Theological Studies*, 37, 567-97.

Lampe, P. (2016). "Social Welfare in the Greco-Roman World as the Background for Early Christianity." *Acta Theologica,* Supp. 23: 1-28 DOI: Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.4314/Actat.V23i1S.1.

Lampe, W.G. (1962). “Luke.” In *Peake’s Commentary*. London: Routledge, 820-843.

Last, Richard. (2012). “Communities That Write: Christ-Groups, Associations, and Gospel Communities.” *NTS*, 58, 173-98.

Lawrence, L. (2003). *An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew*. Tübingen: Mor Siebeck.

Lehtipuu, Outi. (2007). *The Afterlife in Luke’s Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*, (Leiden: Brill.

Levine, A. and Witherington, B. (2018). *The Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levine, Amy-Jill. (2007). “Matthew and Anti-Judaism.” *Currents in Theology and Mission*, Vol. 34, No. 6, https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-173101727/matthew-and-anti-judaism, accessed, 09/12/2019.

Libanius. (2008). *Progymnasmata Models, Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Translated by A. Gibson. Atlanta: SBL.

Liddell, H.G. and Scott R. (2007). *Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon*. No City: Simon Wallenberg Press).

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. (1996). *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Longenecker, B. (2009). “Exposing the Economic Middle: A Revised Economy Scale for the Study of Early Urban Christianity.” *JSNT*, 31.3, 243-278.

Longenecker, Bruce.(2010). W. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Loraux, N. (1984). *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division of the Sexes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Loraux, S.N. (1986). *The Invention of Athens, The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Lordkipanidze, Othar D. (1983). “The Greco-Roman World and Ancient Georgia (Colchis and Iberia).” *Actes Du Colloque de Cortone,* 67, 123-44.

Loubser, J. (2005). Invoking the Ancestors: Some Socio-Rhetorical Aspects of the Genealogies in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. *Neotestamentica*, 39(1), 127-140. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/43048531

Lygre, G. John. (2002). “Of What Charges? (Luke 16:1-2).” *Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Vol. 32. No. 1, 22-28.

Lyons, Vangeline Zephyr. (2011). *Hellenic Philosophers as Ambassadors to the Roman Empire: Performance, Parrhesia, and Power*. PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.

Macdonald, Dennis. (2015). *Luke and Virgil, Imitation of Classical Greek Literature*. London: Rowan and Littlefield.

Macdonald, Dennis. (2013). “Classical Greek Poetry and the Acts of the Apostles: Imitation of Euripides Bacchae.” In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, edited by Stanley Porter and Andrew Pitts. Leiden: Brill, 463-496.

Mackie, Hilary. (1996). *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield).

Mackie, Hillary. (2003). *Graceful Errors:Pindar and the Performance of Praise*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Mackil, Emily. (2013). *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of Greek Koinon*. Berkeley: Uni.of Carlifornia Press.

Maier, Paul. (2013). “Luke as a Hellenistic Theologian.” In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, editted by Stanley Porter and Andrew Pitt. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 413-34.

Malina, J. Bruce. (2001). *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*, 3rd Ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Manuwald, Gesine. (2011). “The Function of Praise and Blame in Cicero’s Philippics”, in *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric,* edited by Christopher Smith and Ralph Covino. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 199-215.

Marcus, Joel. (2009). *Mark 8-16*. New Haven/London: Yale University.

Markus, Donka. (2016). “Anagogic Love between Neoplatonic Philosophers and their Disciples in Late Antiquity.” *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, 10,1-39.

Marshall, I.H. (1978). *The Gospel According to Luke.* Grand Rapids/Carlisle: The Paternoster Press.

Martin, Michael W. (2008). “Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and other Bioi?” *NTS,* 54, 18–41.

Marxsen, Willi. (1996). *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Text,* NY: Abingdon.

Matson, Mark A. (2000). “Luke’s Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount”, *SBL Seminar Paper*, 39, 1-37.

May, Jonathan G. (2011). “The Audience of the Gospels: The Origin and Function of the Gospels in Early Christianity.” *Neotestamentica,* 45, 154-57.

Mazis, J.A. (2001). “The Greek Association of Odessa: Nationalist Politics on two Fronts.”

Balkan Studies, ojs.lib.uom.gr, 200-224.

McCown, Chester Charlton. (1927). “The Beatitudes in the Light of Ancient Ideals.” *JBL*, 46, 50-61.

McCready, Wayn O. (1996). “Ekklesia and Voluntary Associations.” In *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, edited by Wilson, John S. Kloppenborg, and Stephen Wilson. New York/London: Routledge, 59-73.

Mceleney, Neil J. (1981). “The Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mountain/Plain.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 43, 1-13.

McInerney, J. (2013). “Polis and Koinon: Federal Government in Greece” in *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, edited by H. Beck. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 466-479.

McLean, B. Hudson. (1996). “The Place of the Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos.” In *Voluntary Associations in the Greco-Roman World,* edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson. London: Routledge 186-225.

McNicol, Allan J. (1996). *Luke’s Use of Matthew*. Valley Forge: Pennsylvania: Trinity International Press.

Meadors, Gary T. (1985). “The ‘poor’ in the Beatitudes of Matthew [5:3] and Luke.” *Grace Theological Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 305-314.

Meeks, W. (1983). *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Meggitt, Justin J. (1998). *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Metzger, Bruce. (1997). *The Canon of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. (1988). *1 Peter. Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 49, Waco, Tex.: Word Books.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2010). “Invective at the Service of Encomium in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus of Panopolis.” *Mnemosyne,* 63, 23-42.

Miller, K. Henry. (1956). “The Paradoxical Encomia with Special Reference to its Vogue in England, 1600-1800.” *Modern Philology*, Vol. 103 No.3, 145-178.

Miller, Peter J. (2018). “In the Shadow of Praise: Epinician Losers and Epinician Poetics.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 61/1, 21-41.

Miller, Peter. (2015). *“*From Polis to Oikos: Ideology and Genealogy in Pindar’s Olympiad, 9.*” Sillecta Classica, 26, 1-20.*

Mitchell, Margaret M. (2005). “Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that ‘the Gospels Were Written for All Christians’”, *NTS,* 51, 36-79.

Moatti, Claudia. (2006). “Translation, Migration and Communication in the Roman Empire; Three Aspects of the Movement in History.” *Classical Antiquity*, Vol 25, 109-140.

Monoson, Sara. (2000). *Plato’s Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Moore, Mark Paul. (1988). “Rhetoric and Paradox: Seeking Knowledge from the ‘Container and Thing Contained” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 15-30.

Morris, L. (1998). *1 Corinthians*. Leicester: IVP.

Morris, Leon, (1988). *Luke*, TNTC. Leicester: IVP.

Morris, L. (1984). *The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Morrison, A.D. (2012). “Performance, Re-performance and Pindar’s audiences.” In Reading the Victory Ode, edited by Agócs, Peter, Carey Christ, and Rawles Richard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 111-133.

Morwood, James. (1994). *Oxford Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mounce, William, (1993). *The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Pub. House.

Moxnes, Havor. (2003). *Putting Jesus in his Place.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Moxnes, Halvor. (1994). “The Social Context of Luke’s Community.” *Interpretation*, 48, 379-89.

Moxnes, H. (1986). “Meals and the New Community in Luke.” *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok,* 51, 158-67

Mullins, T.Y. (1972/3). “Ascriptions as a literary form.” *NTS,* 19, 194-205.

Myers, Ched. (2012). “From Capitalism to Community: Disciples as Defection in Jesus Parable about a Manager of Injustice.” In *Radical Christian Voices and Practice: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*, edited by Zoë Bennet and David Gowler Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17-34.

Neils, Jenifer. (2012). “Political Process in the Public Festival”, in *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*, edited by J. Rasmus Brandt, Jon W. Iddeng. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 199-216.

Neyrey, Jeremy H. (2007). *Encomium versus Vituperation: Contrasting Portraits of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*. JBL.126, No. 3, 529-552.

Neyrey, J.H. (1998). *Honour and Shame in Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Neyrey, J.H. (1995). “Loss of Wealth, Family and Honour.” In *Modelling Early Christianity*, edited by Philip Esler. London: Routledge, 139-158.

Nightingale, Andrew Wilson. (1995). *Genres in Dialogue, Plato and the Construction of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nolland, John H. (1989). *Luke 1-9:20, WBC*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Nolland, John. (1989). *Luke 1-9:20, WBC*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Oakman, Douglas E. (2014). *Jesus, Debt and the Lord's Prayer*. Eugene: Cascade Books.

Oakman, Douglas E. (2012). *The Political Aims of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Oakes, Peter. (2004). Constructing Poverty Scales for Graeco-Roman Society: A Response to Steven Friesen' s Poverty in Pauline Studies." *JSNT* 26.3, 367-371.

Oravec, Christine. (1976). "Observation in Aristotle's Theory of Epideictic." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, Vol. 9, No.3, 162-174.

O'Toole, R.F. (1983). "Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts." In *Political issues in Luke-Acts,* edited by R. J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper. NY: Orbis Books,1-17.

Overman, J.A. (1990). *Matthew's Community and Formative Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Pagola, José A. (2009). *Jesus: An Historical Approximation*. Miami: Convivium.

Papanikolaou, Dimitrios. (2009). "The Aretalogy of Isis from Maroneia and the Question of Hellenistic Asianism." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, Bd. 168, 59-70.

Papademetriou, Kyriakoula. (2011). "From the arete of the Ancient World to the arete of the New Testament. A Semantic Investigation*." Septuagint Vocabulary. Pre-History, Usage, Reception, Septuagint and Cognate Studies*." edited by Eb. Bons and J. Joosten. SBL, Studies 58, 45-63.

Parry, Hugh. (1965). "The Second Stasis of Euripides Heracles (637-700)." *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 86, No. 4, 363-374.

Parsons, C. Mikeal. (2015). *Luke.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Parsons, C. Mikeal. (2003). "Luke and the Progymnasmata: Preliminary Investigations into the Preliminary Exercises." In *Contextualising Acts- Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Edited by Penner, T. and Stichele, C.V. Atlanta: SBL, 43-64.

Pease, Arthur Stanley. (1926) "Things without Honour." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 21 No.1, 27-42.

Penn, Michael Philip. (2005). *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. Philadelphia: University of Penn. Press.

Penner, T. (2012). "The Progymnasmata and Characterization in Luke's Parables: The Parable of the Rich Fool as a Test Case." *PRS, 39*, 349-360.

Penner, T. (2004). *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography*, *Emory Studies in early Christianity*. New York: T & T Clark International.

Penner, T. and Stichele, C.V. (2003). *Contextualising Acts, Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Atlanta: SBL.

Peregrine, Horden and Nicholas, Purcell. (2000). *The Corrupting Sea*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pernot, Laurent. (2014). *Epideictic Rhetoric, Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Perrin Norman. (1969). *What Is Redaction Criticism*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publisher.

Perrottet, Tony. (2004). *The Naked Olympics, The True Story of Ancient Games*. New York: Random House.

Petersen, Jerry Lamar. (2010). *Praise, Blame, and Oracle: The Rhetorical Tropes of Political Economy*. PhD Thesis, Washington State University.

Petridou, Georgia. (2013). "Blessed Is He Who Has Seen: The Power of Ritual Viewing and Ritual Framing in Eleusia." *Helios*, Vol. 40, No. 1-2, 309-241.

Phang, S.E. (2008). *Roman Military Service; Ideologies of Discipline in the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pitts, Andrew. (2013). "Source Citation in Greek Historiography in Luke (-Acts)." In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, editted by Stanley Porter and Andrew Pitt (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 349-88.

Pomeroy, S. B. Burstein, S.M, Donlan, W. J.T. Roberts J.T. (1999). *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History*. Oxford: Oxford Press.

Pomeroy, J. Arthur. (1991). "Status and Status Concern in Greco-Roman Dream-Books", *Ancient Society*, Vol. 22. 51-74

Poulakos, Takis. (1987). "Isocrates Use of Narrative in the Evagoras: Epideictic and Moral Action", *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 71, 317-28.

Powell, Mark Allan. (1993). *What Is Narrative Criticism? A New Approach to the Bible*. London: SPCK.

Prichard, David. (2012). "What Was the Point of Olympic Victory*?" Teaching History.* Vol. 36, No. 3,19-22.

Quintilian. (2001). *The Orator's Education*. Trans. by D.A. Russell Cambridge. Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Race, H.W. (1982). "Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns." *Greek, Roman* *and Byzantine Studies*, 23/1, 5-14.

Race, William. (1997). *Pindar Olympian Odes*, Loeb Classical Library. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Ranjar, Clifard Sunil. (2017). *Be Merciful Like the Father: Exegesis and Theology of the Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6,17-49)*. No City: Gregorian & Biblical Press.

Redfield, James. (1991). "Anthropology and Classics." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and Classics*, Vol. 1 No.2, 5-23.

Rees, Rogers D. (2019). *Words of Praise in Roman Politics, Words of Praise in Roman Politics*. DOI: 10.1515/9783110223057.9.

Rhoads, David M. (2004). *Reading Mark: Engaging the Gospel*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Fortress.

Rhodes, Peter John. (2004). *Athenian Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rice, Peter. (2013). "The Rhetoric of Luke's Passion: Luke's Use of Common-Place to Amplify the Guilt of Jerusalem's Leaders in Jesus' Death." *Biblical Interpretation*, 21/3, 355–76. Doi: 10.1163/15685152-1070A0005.

Robbins, Vernon. (1995). "Social-Scientific Criticism and Literary studies." In Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context, edited by Phillip Esler. London: Routledge. 274-289.

Robbins, Vernon. (1989). "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honour of Joseph B. Tyson*, edited by R.P. Thomson and T.E. Phillips. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 191-214.

Robinson, M. James, Hoffman Paul, and Kloppenborg S. John. (2002). *The Sayings of the Q Gospel in Greek and English*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Roche, P. (2011). "Pliny's Thinking: An Introduction to the *Panegyricus*." In *Pliny's Praise, Panegyricus in the Greco-Roman world*, edited by Roche P. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-28.

Roll, Israel. (1995). "Roads and Transportation in the Holy Land in the Early Christian and Byzantine Times." In *Akten Des XII Internationalen Kongresses Für Christliche Archäologie*, 1166-1170.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. Jr. (1990). *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae*, Leiden: Brill.

Sahlins, Marshall. (1972). *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton Inc.

Salazar, Christine F. (2019). *Classical Tradition*, Brill Online<http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1163/1574-accessed, 20.4.19.

9347.

Sanders, Henry A. (1913). "The Genealogies of Jesus." *JBL*, Vol. 32, No. 3, 184-193.

Sarris, P. (2013). "Integration and Disintegration in Late Roman Economy: The Role of Markets, Emperors and Aristocrats." *Late Antique Archaeology*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 167-88.

Scharfstein, Ben-Ami. (1980). The Philosophers: Their Lives and the Nature of their Thought. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scheide, Walter. (2009). "A Peculiar Institution? Greco–Roman Monogamy in Global Context." *The History of the Family*, 14:3, 280-291, DOI: 10.1016/j.Hisfam.2009.06.001.

Schellenberg, Ryan S. (2008). Which Master? Whose Steward? Metalepsis and Lordship in the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Lk. 16.1-13). *JSNT. 30.3*, 263-288.

Sheard, Cynthia Miecznikowski. (1996). "The Public Value of Epideictic Rhetoric." *College English*, Vol. 58, No.7. 765-794.

Sim, David C. (1995). "The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles." *JSNT*, No.57. 19-48.

Sim, David C. (2002). "Matthew's Anti-Paulinism: A Neglected Feature of Matthean Studies." *HTS*, Vol. 58, No. 2, 767-783.

Sim, David C. (2001). "The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham." *JSNT,* 84, 3-27.

Sim, David C. (1998). *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Slater J.W. (2013). "The Victor's Return, and the Category of the Games." In *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century*, edited by P. Martzavou, and N Papazarkadas. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 139-164.

Slater, J.W. (1996b). "Futures in Pindar." *Classic Quarterly*, 19, 86–94.

Smalley, Stanley. (1979). "Redaction Criticism." *New Testament Interpretation*: *Essays on Principles and Methods,* edited by I.H. Marshall. Carlisle: Paternoster Press,181-195.

Smith, Christine. (1989). "Christian Rhetoric in Eusebius' Panegyric at Tyre." *Vigiliac Christianae*, 434, 226-246.

Smith, Justin. (2011). *Why Bíos? On the Relationship between Gospel Genre and Implied Audience*. PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews.

Smith, W. William Wayte and Marindin W. G. E. (1890). *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman, Antiquities*. Perseus Digital Library www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0063.

Songer, H. (1992). The Sermon on the Mount and its Jewish foreground. *Review & Expositor*, 89/2, 165-177. Doi:10.1177/003463739208900202

Sparks, F.D. (1989). *Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (1989). "Agonistic Festivals in Roman Greece", 193–197 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-5370.1989.tb02070.x

Spinks, Brayn. (2001). "Book Review of the Passover and Easter; Origins to Modern Times." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 52, No.2, 338-340.

Squires, J.(1993). *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. SNTS Monograph series 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanton, Graham. (1993). *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew.* Louisville, KY.: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Stanton, Graham. (1985). "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-1980", *ANRW* II, 25, 1889-951.

Stegman, S.J. and Thomas D. (2007). "Reading Luke 12:13-34 as an Elaboration of a Chreia: How Hermogenes of Tarsus Sheds Light on Luke's Gospel." *Novum Testamentum*, 49 (4), 328–52.

Stein, Robert H., (1991). *Gospel and Tradition: Studies on Redaction Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*. New York: Baker Books.

Steinbock, Bernd. (2011). "A Lesson in Patriotism: Lycurgus Against Leocrates, the Ideology of the Ephebeia, and Athenian Social Memory." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 30, No. 2, 279-317.

Strait, Drew J. (2009). *Luke's Sermon on the Plain and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 6:12-20 as Prolegomenon*. Master of Art Theology Thesis. 32. https://scholar.csl.edu/ma_th/32.

Stuhlmueller, Carroll (1970). "The Gospel According to Luke." In *The Jerome Biblical Commentary.* Edited by Brown, R., Murphy, R., & Fitzmyer, J. London: G. Chapman, 115-164.

Strand, Kenneth A. (1990). "Sunday Easter and Quartodecimanism in the Early Christian Church." *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 127-136.

Strange, James F. (1983). "Diversity in Early Palestinian Christianity, Some Archaeological Evidences." *Anglican Theological Review*, 65, 14-24.

Sullivan, Dale. (1999). "Identification and Dissociation in Rhetorical Expose: An Analysis of St Irenaeus Against Heresy." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, Vol 29, No.1, 49-76.

Sullivan, Dale. (1993). "The Epideictic Character of Rhetorical Criticism." *Rhetoric Review*, Vol. 11, No.2, 339-349.

Sullivan, Francis A. (1961). “Some Virgilian Beatitudes.” *The American Journal of Philology*. Vol. 82, No. 4, 394-405. Doi: 10.2307/292020.

Sweeney, Naoise Mac. (2015). *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talbert, Charles H. (2003*). Reading Luke-Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Talbert, C. (2002). *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel.* Macon: Smith and Helways.

Talbert, C. (1986). *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroads.

Talbert, Charles H. (1977). *What Is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Tannehill, Robert. (1996). *Luke*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Theissen, Gerd. (2004). *Gospel in Context: The Social and Political History of the Synoptic Tradition*. London/New York: T and T Clark.

The Jewish Federation of North America. (2019). *The Passover Haggadah, Guide to the Seder*. 2019 jewishfederation.org/images/uploads/holidayimages/39497.pdf.PDF file. Accessed 20.10.2019.

Thermos, E. (1974). “Ta Prolegomena of Alexander’s Homonoia”, *Επιθεώρηση Κοινωνικών Ερευνών*. Issue 21-22, 163-172. Doi:Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.12681/Grsr.223.

Thiselton, Anthony. (2000). *The First Epistle to the First Corinthians*, Carlisle: W.B. Eerdmans.

Thompson, James W. (1999). “The Background and Function of the Beatitudes in Matthew and Luke.” *Restoration Quarterly*, 41, No. 2, 109-116.

Thomson, M.B. (1998). “Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation.” In *The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking Gospel Audiences,* edited by Bauckham, Richard. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 49-70.

Tober, Daniel. (2017). Greek Local Historiography and its Audiences. *The Classical Quarterly*, 1 (2017) 1–25. Doi:10.1017/S0009838817000519.

Topel, J. (1981). “The Lukan Version of the Lord’s Sermon.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 11, 48-53.

Topel, L. (2001). *John Children of a Compassionate God*. Collegeville, Mine. Liturgical Press.

Tuckett, M.C. (1984). "On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke." *NTS,* Vol. 30. No.1. 139-142.

Tuckett, C. and Goulder M. (1983). "The Beatitudes: A Source-Critical Study." *Novum Testamentum,* 25(3), 193-216. Doi:10.2307/1560814.

Umurhan, Osman and Penner, Todd. (2013). "Luke and Juvenal at the Crossroads." In *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture*, edited by Stanley Porter and Andrew Pitt (Leiden/Boston: Brill), 165-93.

Uro, Risto. (2016). *Ritual and Christian Beginnings.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van, Aarde Andries G. (2019). "Syncrisis as Literary Motif in the Story about the Grown-Up Child Jesus in the Temple (Luke 2:41–52 and the Thomas Tradition)." *HTS: Theological Studies,* 75 (3): 1–9. Doi:10.4102/Hts.V75i3.5258.

Verheyden, J. (1999). "Unity of Luke Acts." *HTS*, Vol. 55, No. 4, 964-979.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre. (1962). *The Origins of Greek Thought.* New York: Cornell University.

Vickers, Brian. (1983). "Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance." *New Literary History*, Vol 14, No. 3, 497-538.

Villadsen, Lisa Storm. (2008). "Speaking on Behalf of Others: Rhetorical Agency and Epideictic Functions in Official Apologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 38, No.1, 25-45.

Vine, Cedrick. (2014). *The Audience of Matthew: An Appraisal of the Local Audience Thesis*, LNTS. London: T&T Clark.

Vinson, R.B. (2014). "The God of Luke-Acts." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, Vol. 68, (4), 376–388.

Von, Reden Sitta. (1998). "Commodification of Symbols: Reciprocity and its Perversion in Menander." In *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece,* edited by Christopher Gill and Norman Postlethwaite and Richard Seaford (Eds). Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 180-197.

Walters, K.R. (1980). "Rhetoric as Ritual: The Semiotics of the Attic Funeral Oration." *Florilegium*, Vol. 2, 1-27.

Wasdin, Katherine. (2018). *Eros at Dusk: Ancient Wedding and Love Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilcock, Michael. (1979). *The Message of Luke*. Nottingham: IVP.

Willcock M.M. (2005). Pindar: *Victory Odes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

William-Nightingale, Andreas. (2007). “The Philosopher at the Festival: Plato’s Transformation of Traditional Theôria.” *Elsner and Rutherford*, 151–80. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199237913.003.0007.

Wilson, W. (2001). “Urban Legends: Acts 10:1-11:18 and the Strategies of Greco-Roman Foundation Narratives.” *JBL*, 120/1, 77-99. doi:10.2307/3268594.

Wikan, U. (1984). “Shame and Honour: A Contestable Pair.” *Man*, 19(4), New Series, 635-652. doi:10.2307/2802330.

Witetschek, S. (2010). “Going Hungry for a Purpose: On Gospel of Thomas 69.2 and a Neglected Parallel in Origen.” *JSNT,* 32.4, 379-393.

Witherington, Ben III. (1998). *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Yang, Yan. (2012). “The Rich Ruler (Luke 18:18-30) and Chreia Rhetorical Practice in Roman Empire – Luke’s Strategy to Exhort the Rich Ordo in Roman Society.” *Asia Journal of Theology*, 26, 3-28.

Yuval, Israel Jacob. (1999). “Easter and Passover as Early Jewish-Christian Dialogue.” In *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Time*, edited by Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 98-124.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. (1982). “Easter and Passover: On Calendars and Group Identity.” *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 47, No. 2, 284-289.