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ABSTRACT

The topic is approached from the perspective of table fellowship, the primary focus being Jesus' commensality with toll collectors and sinners. The fundamental hypothesis is that Jesus typically arrived ἀκλητος at meals as an itinerant stranger, and that this explains the epithet "glutton and drunkard."

Part One sets the parameters, and delineates the materials, methods, and approach adopted in the study. In Part Two, ancient traditions of hospitality and feasting are examined, providing the background material for exegesis of relevant NT texts in Part Three.

It is found that toll collectors represent hosts to Jesus, while "sinners" gain entry to meals as his umbrae. Both groups are eligible for the kingdom, as are παιδια, (young slaves/servants), who exemplify humility. Some possible reasons are advanced for Jesus’ criticism of Pharisees, but it is emphasised that they are not implicated in his death.

The importance of hospitality is indicated by the fact that reception of Jesus and/or his disciples necessarily entails an invitation to a shared meal. In contrast, merely giving alms to strangers/wayfarers who seek hospitality signifies rejection. Any such breach of hospitality mores will incur harsh punishment at the final judgment.

The supposition that Jesus was a guest at the Last Supper allows for an innovative interpretation of his words and actions, particularly since it is proposed that as well as the Twelve, ἄκλητοι were present, viz. women, slaves/servants, and possibly Gentiles.

It is suggested that the depiction of Jesus in the Synoptics may have been influenced by a pre-existing literary archetype that facilitated the combination of some fictional characteristics with historical elements. The proposed reconstruction of the historical Jesus demonstrates the centrality of hospitality, commensality, and humility in his teaching and practice, a finding that is consistent with the ideals and table fellowship of early Christian communities. The apparent dichotomy between hospitality and hostility indicates a need to follow Jesus’ injunction to love one’s enemies, i.e. to practise ἐργα λατρεία.
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PART ONE

PARAMETERS OF THE STUDY
Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Preamble:
This thesis is part of the vast area of scholarship termed the “quest for the historical Jesus,” a branch of scholarship dating back to the 18th century work of Reimarus.¹ The meaning of “historical Jesus” is variable, but in current scholarship and in this study, it signifies the figure of Jesus as reconstructed by historians or theologians in accordance with their specific perspectives and parameters.² The present topic is introduced in four sections:

- an overview of recent research on the historical Jesus, to locate this study within the larger field;
- an outline of the principles to be used for the reconstruction effort, to set the frame of reference;
- a review of the pertinent work of several scholars, indicating areas where further examination or an alternative approach may be required; and
- an assessment of the study’s value.

The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

1. Overview of historical Jesus research:

In the last two decades, there has been a pronounced resurgence in scholarly attempts to reconstruct the historical Jesus. The impetus for these recent studies probably results largely from the accessibility of additional literary resources,³ and the

---

¹ N. T. Wright, “Quest for the Historical Jesus,” ABD 3:796.
² Ibid.
³ For instance, Terence L. Donaldson discerns the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the light they shed on Jesus’ religious and social milieu [“Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Context,” in Whose Historical Jesus? (ed. William E. Arnal and Michel Desjardins; Studies in Christianity and Judaism 7; Waterloo: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion, 1997), 188]; and in the following chapter,
availability of new data, particularly those deriving from the disciplines of archaeology and sociology. Moreover, one may sense a certain optimism based on the belief that, whereas earlier attempts were deemed to have failed, modern methodologies might succeed in constructing an accurate portrait of the elusive Jesus of Nazareth.4

The approaches to the task are manifold and have produced a startling variety of results.5 In the main, current research appears to have two divergent foci. On the one hand, significant emphasis is placed by scholars upon the influence of Hellenisation in first-century Palestine, and on the historical Jesus in that light;6 whilst on the other, the Jesus of history is placed firmly in a Jewish milieu.7 The resultant reconstructions have been delineated by Loader as, respectively, "the Cynic sage non eschatological model and the Jewish eschatological model."8

N. T. Wright has suggested that for the most part, scholarship in the former stream falls under the category of the "New Quest," whilst that in the latter stream is included under the "Third Quest."9 However, as Wright indicates, there is now

---

Wayne O. McCreadie discusses studies on the similarities between Jesus and the Qumranites, such as in their criticism of institutional religion, and shared meals ("The Historical Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 204–205).

4 Ben Witherington, The Jesus Quest: Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1995), 12.


9 See N. T. Wright, Jesus and the Victory of God (vol. 2 of Christian Origins and the Question of God; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 34–35; idem, “Jesus, Quest,” 798–801. For Wright’s first use of
considerable overlap between the renewed "New Quest" and the "Third Quest," and the generic term *Jesus research* is preferable.\(^\text{10}\)

The controversies that have developed within this field of research, and the variation in materials accepted as authentic, signal the need for a methodology by which diverse perspectives and traditions may be objectively evaluated. The following section moves stepwise through some of the central issues entailed in Jesus research to demonstrate where the present study fits within the broad field of scholarship. Comments are offered on methodologies and approaches that are considered inappropriate, and reference is made to several aspects of methodology that will be detailed further in Chapter Two.

2. **Principles for reconstruction of the historical Jesus:**

2.1. *Inclusion of all relevant material:*

Following his brief survey of the disparate historical Jesus reconstructions produced by eight prominent scholars, Hurtado draws attention to the problems associated with selection of data, observing that:

> even among the lengthiest studies there are omissions of relevant issues and/or inadequate attention to relevant critical questions, or what look like arbitrary or ill-explained choices on what sources to privilege, what issues to omit and theories to accept. ("Taxonomy," 292)

His suggestion for processing such a diversity of evidence about the historical Jesus is to use a method akin to that used in NT textual criticism. The method requires that attention be given to all relevant material, to the various traditions, and to historical

---

and sociological factors, and thus overcomes the tendency scholars have of favouring one "variant" in the Jesus tradition over another. The approach taken in this study ultimately has a slightly different analytical focus from that proposed by Hurtado, but is similarly based on the premise that all relevant sources and material must necessarily be taken into account. Hurtado’s focus is on what reconstruction best accounts for the traditions derived from the most reliable sources, while the present thesis investigates the traditions and conditions underlying the synoptic accounts of Jesus’ table fellowship.

The inherent problems in the methodology of the Jesus Seminar highlight the necessity for the inclusion of all relevant sayings sources. For instance, Loader observes that a major weakness of the methodologies of Mack and Borg, members of the Jesus Seminar, is their attempt to eliminate material preserving Jesus’ eschatological focus. Likewise, Wright is critical of the Jesus Seminar’s practice of selecting sayings as “authentic” on the basis of a predetermined depiction of Jesus, that rests almost entirely on sayings from Q and the Gospel of Thomas. He correctly discerns that their preformed portrait depends on a cluster of assumptions that relegate apocalyptic, eschatological and prophetic material to a secondary layer of Q, thus allowing for a sapiential, non-apocalyptic, and virtually non-Jewish Jesus. It is clear that studies seeking to limit the number of relevant sayings in this way will produce a prejudiced depiction of the historical Jesus.

11 “Taxonomy,” 294–95. The principle behind the concept is that the fields of NT textual criticism and Jesus research have a similar objective, i.e. to endeavour to recreate the equivalent of a no longer extant original from evidence that exists only in the form of subsequent traditions. He proposes that preference be given to reconstructions of the historical Jesus that account most satisfactorily for the variation in the best and earliest sources. For Hurtado’s explanation of his procedure see ibid. 294 n. 105.
12 “Jesus Puzzle,” 142.
13 Wright, Victory of God, 33.
14 Ibid. 33, 41.
In the present investigation of the tradition regarding Jesus’ table fellowship, all relevant material, whether canonical or non-canonical, will be employed in discussion and exegesis. In fact, however, the majority of significant material for this area of study is derived from the Synoptic Gospels. Reference to John will be made occasionally, e.g. in discussion of the anointing accounts and the Passion Narrative, although the tradition regarding Jesus’ commensality with toll collectors and sinners does not occur in that Gospel.

2.2. **Employment of an appropriate data base:**

Paul Eddy has rightly noted that the data base of “Jesus material” deemed to be authentic is a crucial determinant of the resultant construct. He utilises the example of the Jesus Seminar’s initial stance of privileging the sayings of Jesus over his acts, and compares the outcome with the very different direction taken by Sanders, who favours Jesus’ deeds over his words. The latter approach simply acknowledges that there can be more certainty regarding the historicity of Jesus’ deeds than his sayings.

As it is not possible to be definitive in the selection of authentic data, the best course is to follow Sanders’ methodology of classifying material according to degrees of probability. This furnishes a substantial body of material about which

---

15 J. P. Meier is convincing in his conclusion that none of the non-canonical gospels represents a source independent of the NT, but that reference to the Gospel of Thomas may be helpful [The Roots of the Problem and the Person (vol. 1 of A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 112–66, esp. 140–41]. James Robinson’s assessment that the Gospel of Thomas is crucial for the purpose of comparison with the Synoptics is also important (“The Study of the Historical Jesus After Nag Hammadi,” Semeia 44 (1988): 45–55, esp. 53). E.g. on the basis of Robinson’s evaluation, John W. Marshall has contributed significantly to Jesus research by testing the Cynic Jesus hypothesis against Gospel of Thomas sayings [“The Gospel of Thomas and the Cynic Jesus,” in Arnl and Desjardins, Whose Historical Jesus? 43, n. 27]. Of the non-canonical gospels, only the Gospel of Thomas will be utilised for comparison with synoptic traditions. Use of non-canonical sources is further discussed in Chapter Two, §2.1.2.


17 The reference to Sanders’ methodology is based on Jesus and Judaism, 3–13.

18 Jesus and Judaism, 3–10 (explanation of method), 11 (“facts” about Jesus’ career and its aftermath), 307, 321–22 (“facts” pertaining to the kingdom of God), 326 (summary of certain or virtually certain information about Jesus).
one can be reasonably certain, and thus provides a starting point for reconstructing the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{19}

2.3. \textit{Focus on the relevant era:}

There is a noticeable tendency in recent research to draw conclusions based on material from the late first century, or from the second century or even beyond, and then to extrapolate them to make assumptions about the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{20} A pertinent example is a claim made by Ron Cameron that in Q 7:33–34, John the Baptist and Jesus are characterised respectively as ascetic and hedonistic Cynics.\textsuperscript{21} The assertion is based on Malherbe’s paper “Self-Definition among Epicureans and Cynics,”\textsuperscript{22} but Cameron does not mention that the stated objective of that article is “to examine the Cynics, and . . . the Epicureans, of the second and third centuries CE.”\textsuperscript{23}

Caution is also needed with respect to the analysis of a synoptic text as if it were indubitably created from a chreia. The practice is methodologically questionable because the elaboration technique supposedly utilised is derived from the second half of the first century at the earliest, and very likely later.\textsuperscript{24} It might be claimed, despite that factor, that the method is legitimate owing to the late first century dating attributed to the Gospels. However, the results of such analysis will always be speculative since assumptions must be made as to what might have

\textsuperscript{19} Note Meier’s appreciation of Sanders’ emphasis on Jesus’ deeds in relation to the miracle tradition, but also his criticism of the practice of separating Jesus’ deeds from his words [\textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles} (vol. 2 of \textit{A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus}; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 618, 465 n. 52, respectively].


\textsuperscript{23} Ibid. 46, emphasis added.

\textsuperscript{24} Issues concerning chreia elaboration and Graeco-Roman rhetoric are further considered below, in Chapter Two, §3.3.
constituted the original *chreia.* A further weakness of the method is that it fails to take sufficient account of the rhetorical devices which Jesus himself may have utilised.

2.4. *Focus on the correct context:*

In recent NT research it has become popular to refer to the *Mediterranean* as an umbrella term implying that all the nations encompassed thereby were culturally homogeneous. This has been particularly evident following Crossan’s 1991 publication characterising the historical Jesus as a Mediterranean Jewish peasant, and the illumination provided through studies in cultural anthropology, into the Graeco-Roman system of patronage. Crossan asserts that such patron–client and honour–shame relationships were prevalent throughout the Mediterranean region, a claim crucial to his notion that Jesus’ primary objective was a “brokerless kingdom.”

Yet there are sound reasons for questioning the validity of the argument for cross-cultural uniformity in the region. The spread and adoption of Hellenisation in the first century C.E. were not uniform across the Mediterranean, nor was the population of the region homogeneous culturally. Further, in relation to Jesus

---

25 Note, however, that one may be more confident in isolating underlying *chreiai* in Mark than in the other Synoptics. See Chapter Two, §§3.3.6, 3.3.7; Chapter Six, §4.1.2.3.
research, Witherington demonstrates that Crossan’s “Mediterranean construct”\textsuperscript{31} is not relevant to lower Galilee in the early first century.\textsuperscript{32} Freyne, likewise, is critical of Crossan’s approach, and sees a need to place Jesus into his proper geographical, political, and theological context.\textsuperscript{33} By placing Jesus in a Galilean setting, and grounding him in Judaism,\textsuperscript{34} Freyne arrives at a very different construct from that obtained by means of Crossan’s “Mediterranean” perspective.\textsuperscript{35} Hence it is clear that in order to produce an accurate reconstruction, the search for the Jesus of history must be centred in the social world of early first century Galilee.\textsuperscript{36}

2.5. **Expectations of both dissimilarity and continuity:**

As Charlesworth has observed,\textsuperscript{37} the idea of the “uniqueness” of Jesus has tended to lead scholars astray, so that there is a need for refinement in the use of the criterion of dissimilarity.\textsuperscript{38} Together with an acknowledgment of Jesus’ Jewishness has come the realisation that his teachings should not be regarded in contradistinction to contemporary Judaism, but rather as being contiguous to some extent.\textsuperscript{39}

Furthermore, Hurtado rightly argues with respect to the relationship between Jesus and early Christianity, that following Jesus’ execution the vigorous growth of

---

\textsuperscript{31} *Jesus Quest*, 83, referring to Crossan, *Jewish Peasant*, 7.
\textsuperscript{32} *Jesus Quest*, 82–83.
\textsuperscript{33} Seán Freyne, “Galilean Questions to Crossan’s Mediterranean Jesus,” in Arnal and Desjardins, *Whose Historical Jesus?* 75. Crossan discusses these issues in detail in his more recent publication *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998). A critique of his position is given below, in §3.2 of this chapter.
\textsuperscript{34} The issue of Jesus’ Jewishness is discussed in §2.7.2.1 below.
\textsuperscript{35} “Galilean Questions,” 75.
\textsuperscript{37} Charlesworth, *Judaism*, 6.
\textsuperscript{38} The stance I take on this matter should not be interpreted as non-acceptance of the criterion of dissimilarity or of its value, although Sanders justly observes the difficulties involved with its application (*Jesus and Judaism*, 16). Authenticity criteria are further discussed in Chapter Two, §3.2.
\textsuperscript{39} Charlesworth, *Judaism*, 5–6.
his movement was an historical fact that must be taken into account in reconstruction
attempts.\textsuperscript{40} Sanders, likewise, recognises the continuation of Jesus’ disciples as an
identifiable movement, although he notes that an inherent connection has not
definitely been established between Jesus’ preaching, and the formation of his
followers into a distinctive group.\textsuperscript{41} Nevertheless, he himself believes implicitly that
such a thread exists, linking Jesus’ perception of his mission and the kingdom of God
to his execution and subsequently to the church.\textsuperscript{42} Indeed, it is logical to accept the
probability that such a connection existed, and that there is some degree of continuity
between Jesus’ proclamation and the religious movement that ultimately arose. By
contrast, Mack’s proposal that Mark fabricated a myth of Christian origins\textsuperscript{43} lacks
credibility, and has several major weaknesses.\textsuperscript{44}

The present thesis incorporates an understanding of Jesus as a Jewish prophet
and sage, thus preserving his continuity with Judaism, as well as acknowledging the
innovative elements in his ministry.

\textsuperscript{40} "Taxonomy," 295. Morton Smith also sees a firm connection between Jesus’ ministry and the
subsequent rise of Christianity [\textit{Jesus the Magician} (New York: Gollancz, 1978), 5].
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, 11, 321. Sanders explores in particular (ibid. 19–22, 359 n. 65), the argument
of Henry J. Cadbury, [\textit{The Peril of Modernizing Jesus} (London: Macmillan, 1937; reissued London:
SPCK, 1962), 141] i.e. that “Jesus probably had no definite, unified, conscious purpose” (cited by
Sanders, ibid. 20). However, Sanders himself believes that Jesus had a definite programme, and reads
the evidence as demonstrating a causal relationship between his intention, activity and death. (ibid.
21–22).
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid. 334–35.
\textsuperscript{43} See Mack, \textit{Lost Gospel}, esp. 237–43; idem, \textit{A Myth of Innocence} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988),
esp. 12, 315–24.
\textsuperscript{44} E.g. see the critique of Wright, \textit{Victory of God}, 35–44, esp. re Mack’s error in assuming that the
population of first century Galilee was largely Gentile (37, n. 32), and for a summary of the flaws in
Mack’s methodology (43). See also Loader, who succinctly comments: “The weakness of Mack’s
position is that he has to explain away too much of the rest of the Jesus tradition.” (“Jesus Puzzle,”
142).
2.6. Clarification of terminology:

The meanings of the terms *apocalyptic* and *eschatological* are a matter of significant controversy and need clarification. Sanders notes that the terms have erroneously been used almost interchangeably, and that in recent times an effort has been made to define them more exactly. He himself eschews the term *apocalyptic* in favour of *eschatological*, which he defines as referring to “the expectation of an imminent end to the current order.” The advantage of using this terminology is underscored by Meier’s valid comment that Jesus should not be regarded as an apocalyptist since “he had no interest in detailed time tables or cosmic journeys.”

In this work then, the terms *eschatology* and *eschatological* are used, except in discussions embracing the utilisation of *apocalyptic* by other scholars. The meaning applied to *eschatological* is that employed by Sanders; i.e. it refers not to an expectation of the end of world history, but rather to the end of the old order and the in-breaking of a new era.

---

45 Whilst Charlesworth correctly notes that *apocalyptic* is an adjective and should not be used in place of the noun *apocalypticism* (Judaism, 33), this error is so widespread that it is most convenient to overlook it.

46 *Jesus and Judaism*, 375 n. 3. He explains how Schweitzer’s use of the term *eschatology* became confused with the traditional understanding of apocalyptic literature as “including an urgent expectation of the end” (375 n. 3).

47 Ibid. 376 n. 3.

48 “Reflections,” 94. Meier seems here to be referring to the fact that the term *apocalyptic* is derived from the Greek title Αποκάλυψις, i.e. the title of The Revelation to John. Thus, writings belonging within the genre of *apocalyptic literature* are properly referred to as *apocalypses*. They are mostly pseudonymous, being ascribed to ancient heroes of the faith, and may be roughly divided into two types. The *historical* apocalypses, such as Revelation and Daniel, have been written during times of severe historical crisis. History is usually divided into a predetermined number of periods, and events up to the time of composition described as if prophesied beforehand. The emphasis is then on the approaching *eschaton*, and a period of great upheaval is prophesied as imminent. The second type in the genre is characterised by the ascension of the visionary through the heavens, with an angel as guide, and usually includes a vision of the underworld. See John J. Collins, “apocalyptic literature,” *HBD* 39. The subject of eschatology is explored further in Chapter Eight.

Finally, it must be stated that it is inappropriate to place apocalyptic and sapiential categories in opposition on the grounds of a supposed stratification of Q.\textsuperscript{50} In prophetic writings, as well as in Q, sapiential and apocalyptic motifs are often combined. For instance, Freyne refers to the way in which wisdom motifs are integrated into Jewish apocalypse in \textit{I Enoch},\textsuperscript{51} and Humphrey notes that a common feature in the perspectives of Borg, Wright, and Schüessler Fiorenza is their understanding of sapiential and apocalyptic themes as coexistent.\textsuperscript{52} Again, in the wisdom poem 4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse), occurrences are described that are anticipated at the eschaton.\textsuperscript{53} Thus ample evidence exists to confirm the summary statement that "there is no necessary antithesis between 'apocalyptic' and 'sapiential'."\textsuperscript{54}

2.7. Establishment of parameters:

Outline:

An attempt will be made in this section to gain a clearer image of the historical Jesus by exploring a range of topics suggested by the directions taken in recent research. The particular foci are: (1) where the historical Jesus appears to fit within his

---

\textsuperscript{50} See Freyne's comments on the work of Crossan, Mack, and others ("Galilean Questions," 73). The hypothesis pertaining to Q stratification is derived primarily from John S. Kloppenborg, \textit{The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections} (SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) [editorial note in Freyne, "Galilean Questions," 73 n. 34]. It is worth noting here that Kloppenborg considers it probable that some of the prophetic eschatological sayings in Q may be very old or even dominical, and some of the wisdom sayings not so old. He emphasises that his stratification of Q concerns literary history, not tradition-history (Kloppenborg, \textit{Formation of Q}, 244–45).

\textsuperscript{51} "Galilean Questions," 74–75.

\textsuperscript{52} "Apocalypse," 222–24. See also the comments of William E. Arnal on the stratification of Q, and the need for further investigation into its content of both sapiential and apocalyptic motifs ["Making and Re-Making the Jesus-Sign: Contemporary Markings on the Body of Christ," in Arnal and Desjardins, \textit{Whose Historical Jesus?} 315–16].

contemporary society; (2) whether or not he should be regarded as eschatological; and (3) the possibility of Cynic-Stoic influence on his attitudes. Inferences will be stated at the end of each topic or subtopic, and in the final two parts the overall findings will be summarised and then discussed. The issues are examined under the categories of:

Social rank and behaviour
Religious stance:
   Attitude to Torah
   Views on marriage
Identifiable motifs in teachings:
   Proclamation of the kingdom of God
   Cynic parallels
Conclusions
Discussion of findings.

2.7.1. Social rank and behaviour:

Some recent socio-anthropological studies of early first century Galilee have produced theories such as Crossan’s, envisaging Jesus as peasant and/or Cynic. Yet the characterisation of Jesus and his immediate disciples as peasants\(^{55}\) does not cohere with the impression given by the Gospels that the group was somewhat higher in social rank.\(^{56}\) A more plausible background is provided by Freyne, who discerns that the environment in Galilee was one of adequate sufficiency, and infers that Jesus, as τέκτων, would have had a position of both status and mobility.\(^{57}\) Freyne also

---

55 Crossan, Jewish Peasant; idem, Birth of Christianity, esp. 216–17, 223, 346–50.
56 Loader, “Jesus Puzzle,” 141. Crossan’s reconstruction of Jesus is discussed further in the review of his work below.
57 Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 39, 241. See also Meier, “Reflections,” 88, on the alternative meanings of τέκτων (stonemason, smith), and the likelihood that Jesus was a carpenter; David Flusser, “Jesus, His Ancestry, and the Commandment of Love,” in Charlesworth, Jesus’ Jewishness, 162, re the reputation of carpenters as learned. But see also Chapter Eight, §5.4, esp. n. 410.
points to examples of typical disciples, such as the sons of Zebedee, and toll
collectors, who certainly did not rank among the destitute.\textsuperscript{58}

An argument against the hypothesis of a Cynic Jesus is the behaviour that
traditionally was characteristic of Cynicism. Much emphasis has been placed on the
boldness of speech that was common to Cynicism and early Christianity, but the
factor of Cynic shamelessness has been played down. The absence of evidence
suggesting Jesus or his followers indulged in the intentionally shocking conduct that
was typical of the tradition weighs against the argument for a Cynic reconstruction.\textsuperscript{59}

2.7.2. Religious stance:

2.7.2.1. Attitude to Torah:

One of the points against the notion of a Cynic Jesus is that the only Cynic recorded
as religious in any sense was Antisthenes.\textsuperscript{60} By contrast, Jesus is portrayed in the
Synoptic Gospels very largely as a pious Jew. However, there are some substantial
differences in the evangelists' portrayals of Jesus. He is depicted in all stages of his
life and ministry as grounded in Judaism,\textsuperscript{61} and for the most part as Torah-observant,
although Mark depicts Jesus as dismissing a significant portion of the Law.\textsuperscript{62} Loader

\textsuperscript{58} Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 241. See also James H. Charlesworth, “Jesus Research: A

\textsuperscript{59} The point is made well by Derek Krueger who remarks frankly: “It is not surprising that studies
attempting to draw parallels between texts about Diogenes and texts about Jesus are unlikely to focus
on stories of Cynics’ [public] spitting, farting or defecating.” [“The Bawdy and Society: The
Shamelessness of Diogenes in Roman Imperial Culture,” in The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in
Antiquity and its Legacy for Europe (ed. B. Branham; Hellenistic Culture and Society 23; Berkeley:
University of California Press, 1997), 229]. See also ibid. 229 n. 53, re Downing’s work. On the
disparity between Jesus and Cynics on the basis of Cynics’ shamelessness, see Ben Witherington,
Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 124–25; and Kloppenborg,
Formation of Q, 324. Re Crossan’s views see n. 104 below.

58, 67–69, 79.

\textsuperscript{61} See esp. William R. G. Loader, Jesus’ Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels (WUNT
429; and also Sanders, Historical Figure of Jesus, 223; and idem, Jesus and Judaism, 19, 359 n. 63,
112; Vermes, Religion of Jesus, 11–45, 188–89.

\textsuperscript{62} Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 135–36, 518–24. Jesus’ break away from Torah as depicted by
Mark is most conspicuous in 7:1–23, esp. v. 19c in which all foods are declared clean (ibid. 125–26).
The issue is discussed in depth in Chapter Six, §4.1.
discerns that Mark's Jesus differentiates between those elements of Torah that were valid, and those that were invalid. Food and purity laws, and those concerned with the sacrificial cult, were regarded by Mark's Jesus as irrelevant.\(^6\) The tension visible here in the Marcan Jesus' standpoint on the Law might have its roots in the historical Jesus, who, while he probably came from a fairly conservative Jewish background, may have been influenced by Hellenistic popular preachers of his day.\(^6\)

2.7.2.2. Views on marriage:

In his well-attested proclamation against divorce,\(^5\) Jesus' stance is clearly contrary to that of Cynicism, which traditionally viewed philosophy as the highest calling and regarded marriage with the utmost negativit\(^6\) On the other hand, Jesus' evidently single status and presumed celibacy could be interpreted as consistent with the Cynic concept that pursuing philosophy was a full-time occupation, requiring the individual to forgo conventional responsibilities.\(^6\)

The tension here may perhaps be resolved by reviewing the issues in terms of the ancient Cynic-Stoic marriage debate. Deming summarises the crux of the debate thus: "It pitted Stoic dedication to traditional Greek life in the city-state against the

---

\(^6\) Ibid. 125–36, esp. 132–36.
\(^5\) Ibid. 522–24. Loader perceives common ground between Jesus' teaching and that of "popular preachers of the time, who attacked excessive preoccupation with cult and ritual and promoted individual ethics of love, friendship, self control and trust," (ibid 522).
\(^5\) Mark 10:2–12 and parr., esp. vv. 10–12 and parr. Jesus' views on marriage are relevant to the discussion on Matt 21:31b–32, in Chapter Five, §3.4.3.
\(^6\) Henry A. Fischel, "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a Chria," in Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough (ed. J. Neusner; SHR 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 389; Will Deming, Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7 (SNTSMS 83; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 60. For instance, Diogenes of Sinope, the stereotypical Cynic (fourth century B.C.E.), rejected the institution of marriage in favour of the notion that several men should together take responsibility for a number of women and their children (ibid. 64, 68, citing respectively Diogenes Laertius 6.72; and 7.33, 131). He also seems to have recommended masturbation in lieu of sexual intercourse [Deming, ibid. 64, n. 37, citing Eduard Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung [5th ed.; Leipzig: Fues (Reisland), 1922–1923], 2.1.322–23], and regarded the latter activity as appropriate only to those with "time to waste" (Diogenes Laertius 6.51, cited in Deming, Paul on Marriage, 64 n. 38). Deming considers Diogenes' position on the issue of marriage as being close to that of later Cynics (ibid. 64).
\(^6\) Ibid. 60–61.
Cynic calling to the philosophical life.⁶⁸ In his examination of the literary evidence, Deming finds the epitome of the Stoic position exists in the ethical system compiled by Arius Didymus at the end of the first century B.C.E.⁶⁹

Like his predecessors, Arius stressed the allegiance an individual owed both to nature, and to the cosmos, the latter being regarded as embodying the will of nature. Unlike earlier Stoics, however, Arius perceived the cosmos in a global sense rather than as incorporating a hierarchy composed of married couples, households and city-states. Thus a man’s role as a world citizen might take precedence over his obligation to marry and create a household.

Marriage was classified by Arius as “indifferent” (ἀδιάφορον). This meant that in normal circumstances it was appropriate to marry, but that it was “sin” (ἀμάρτημα) if a man’s life circumstances rendered the marriage impractical or detrimental to wellbeing.⁷⁰ Stoics might now legitimately forgo marriage in the interest of pursuing philosophy.⁷¹

Hence, it would have been consistent with contemporary Stoic attitudes for Jesus to maintain an exalted view of the institution of marriage, but to shun it himself, in the belief that he must wholeheartedly pursue his particular calling.⁷² This would require his self-understanding to have been that of a world citizen, and his personal sense of calling to have ranked more highly than the conventional obligation to marry.⁷³ Alternatively, however, Jesus’ situation may be considered as

---

⁶⁸ Ibid. 61.
⁶⁹ Ibid. 73.
⁷⁰ Ibid. 73–74. Deming explains that it was at this stage of development that Stoic ethics were able to absorb Cynic views, a situation he terms “an ‘inner-Stoic’ marriage debate,” (ibid. 74).
⁷¹ Ibid. 74–75.
⁷² The conflation of Cynic and Stoic attitudes is acknowledged, esp. with regard to the writings of Cicero and Seneca. See, respectively, ibid. 74–75; 76–77. However Deming sees the ambivalence of both writers as reflecting the dynamics of the inner-Stoic marriage debate (ibid. 74, 77).
⁷³ In view of Matt 19:12 however, a choice of celibacy could stem from a commitment to kingdom values that might be associated with Jewish apocalypticism rather than Stoicism.
comparable with that of Jeremiah, for whom the call to celibacy was a component of his prophetic calling.⁷⁴

2.7.3. Identifiable motifs in teachings:

2.7.3.1. Proclamation of the kingdom of God:

According to synoptic traditions, it is certain that Jesus taught about the kingdom of God,⁷⁵ and that its advent was believed to be imminent.⁷⁶ Sanders convincingly demonstrates how very highly these points rate in terms of probability,⁷⁷ and concludes that it is inescapable that Jesus’ ministry was situated in a framework of restoration eschatology.⁷⁸ Furthermore, warnings of eschatological catastrophe in many of the Q sayings, as well as in elements from the triple tradition, are

---

⁷⁴ Jer 16:1–2. On this possibility see Meier, “Reflections,” 88–89.
⁷⁵ Freyne affirms Bruce Chilton’s emphasis [in “Kingdom Come, Kingdom Sung: Voices in the Gospels,” FF 32 (1987): 51–75] on the need to understand the concept of the kingdom of God in terms of contemporary Jewish thought as expressed in the Targumim, i.e. “as referring to God’s definitive, yet present, intervention on behalf of his people now,” (“Galilean Questions,” 74, n. 36). Note, however, that the dating of the Targumim is debated, as Freyne acknowledges (Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 205). E.g. Vermes considers that probably none of the redacted Palestinian Targumim can be dated before 200 C.E. [Jesus and the World of Judaism (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 76–77]. Meier, too, considers the dating of the Targumim as a major problem (Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 262). In addition, he finds, against Chilton’s claims, that the eschatological thrust in the relevant prophetic passages is undeniable (ibid. 264, 287 n. 113). However, he does concur with Chilton on understanding the “kingdom of God” as “‘God come in strength’ to save his people,” and that the term does not refer to a political or social programme (ibid. 287 n. 113). Loader’s view is persuasive. He sees the term “kingdom of God” as frequently linked with Jesus’ eschatological perspective, and explains its meaning as “the expectation and hope that there will come a time when God will rule, restoring Israel to wholeness, liberating her from her oppressors, and bringing righteousness and peace to the land,” (“Jesus Puzzle,” 146). Although Loader observes that this vision for Israel would involve leadership changes and liberation from oppressive rule, he considers that no military or political strategies were envisaged (ibid.).
⁷⁶ Ibid. See also Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 289–397, esp. 350–51, 389 n. 180. As Meier demonstrates, Mark 1:15 cannot be used to argue for Jesus’ belief that the advent of the kingdom was imminent, since its historicity is doubtful, and it is uncertain as to whether a realised or a future eschatology is implied (ibid. 430–34, 483–88 nn. 145–64). Clearly, the fact that the Parousia did not eventuate within the lifetime of the first disciples does not necessarily mean that Jesus did not believe it to be imminent.
⁷⁷ See Jesus and Judaism, esp. 91–95, 156, 307, 326.
⁷⁸ Ibid. 329–30. Sanders’ argument is based on two significant factors that he sees as most secure: that at the beginning of his ministry Jesus was closely connected with John the Baptist, and that after his death, the Gentile mission was generated. See esp. ibid. 91–95, 212.
undeniable, although it is necessary that these be critically evaluated. Hence, it is logical to conclude that Jesus should be viewed as an eschatological prophet.

2.7.3.2. Cynic parallels:

An important issue is that some aspects of the Cynic tradition have been shown to correspond closely to the synoptic portrayal of Jesus and his disciples. For example, the themes Mack has derived from Marcan and Q sayings appear to correlate well with the Cynic ethos. The most significant are:

- a criticism of the rich and their wealth;
- a critique of hypocrisy and pretension;
- fearlessness in the presence of those in power and authority;
- a call to voluntary poverty;
- nonretaliation;
- disentanglement from family ties;
- single-mindedness in the pursuit of God's kingdom;
- confidence in God's care; etc.

---

79 Note esp. Tuckett's comments highlighting the dominance of the eschatological element in Q, ""A Cynic Q?"" *Biblica* 70 (1989): 369–70; and similar remarks in Freyne, ""Galilean Questions,"" 73.

80 The issues pertaining to historicity need to be debated in relation to each particular unit. With respect to the eschatological element in Q, see also the discussion in §§2.1, 2.6 above. It is worth repeating here that Kloppenborg acknowledges that some prophetic eschatological logia may date back to the historical Jesus, and that the issues concerning his stratification of Q are literary, not about tradition-history. See n. 50 above; Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 244–45.

81 Tuckett draws attention to the pervasiveness of the eschatological element in Q and the close parallels of both form and content between Q and the prophetic tradition (""Cynic Q?"" 369–70). See also Sanders, *Historical Figure of Jesus*, 238.

82 Burton L. Mack, ""Q and a Cynic-like Jesus,"" in Arnal and Desjardins, *Whose Historical Jesus?* 32–33. Mack lists a total of sixteen themes. The remaining items are: a challenge to renounce the supports usually considered necessary for human life; a challenge to fearless and careless attitudes; etiquette for responding to public reproach; a strong sense of independent vocation; concern for personal integrity and authenticity; a challenge to live naturally at any cost; a reliance on the natural order. The article ""Q and a Cynic-like Jesus"" is quoted and discussed by Boyd (*Cynic Sage*, 103–108, 321–22 nn. 64–86) as a then unpublished paper.
All of these motifs cohere quite well with the general impression created by synoptic depictions of Jesus.\textsuperscript{83} However, it is noted that Mack employs his own paraphrased versions of the sayings in order to compile his list, and to maximise the resemblance to Cynicism.\textsuperscript{84} Moreover, the similarity between Cynic discourse and the Q and Marcan logia holds good only when the sayings are isolated from the synoptic texts, and even Mack acknowledges "the lack of fit between the Cynic data and the gospel accounts."\textsuperscript{85}

When the Gospels are viewed in their entirety, the Cynic thesis is much less convincing. For instance: the healings performed by Jesus, and the inclusion of women among his associates, have no counterpart in Cynic traditions;\textsuperscript{86} the itinerancy principles prescribed in the missionary discourses cannot be equated with the Cynic style of begging;\textsuperscript{87} and Jesus' gregariousness and sociability are not consistent with the typical individualism of the Cynic.\textsuperscript{88} A further consideration is John Marshall's careful review of the \textit{Gospel of Thomas}, which finds for a figure who is less like a Cynic than the synoptic portrayals suggest.\textsuperscript{89}

Another factor that must be taken into account is that many of the themes delineated by Mack as characteristic of Cynics, fit equally and/or more appropriately,
with the prophetic ethos. This is certainly the case with the first three and the last two items on Mack’s list, as cited above.

The remaining three themes, *non-retaliation*, *voluntary poverty*, and *disentanglement*, form a group, since all involve radical change to established patterns of personal behaviour. They may be seen as pertinent to the changes expected at the *eschaton*, traditionally anticipated as an era of eternal peace.\(^\text{90}\) Thus with regard to interpersonal relationships, the theme of *non-retaliation*\(^\text{91}\) can be interpreted in terms of cessation of hostility\(^\text{92}\) as a prerequisite for the kingdom.

To derive the *voluntary poverty* theme Mack has employed, in separate lists, Luke 12:33a and 12:34 as examples of Cynic-style logia from Q,\(^\text{93}\) and Mark 10:25 as one of the core *chreiai* deemed comparable with Cynic anecdotes.\(^\text{94}\) He does not mention that Luke 12:33a has no Matthaean parallel and is therefore from L rather than from Q; nor does he acknowledge the thematic relationship between Luke 12:33–34 and Mark 10:25 in their original contexts.\(^\text{95}\) Nevertheless, the call to voluntary poverty is indeed a significant theme in the Gospels, and is exemplified in Mark 10:17–31 and its parallels.\(^\text{96}\) From the story of the Rich Man,\(^\text{97}\) the theme can be seen as a combination of motifs reminiscent of the OT prophetic tradition:

(1) critique

\(^{90}\) The idea of a coming order of peace was not limited to the Jews, but was significant in contemporary Roman thought, and may have been of Egyptian provenance. See Helmut Koester, “Jesus the Victim,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 11–13, nn. 24–25.

\(^{91}\) The theme is based on Luke 6:29, *turning the other cheek*, as cited by Mack, “Cynic-like Jesus,” 32.

\(^{92}\) E.g. as envisaged in Isaiah 2:2–4; 11; 35.

\(^{93}\) “Cynic-like Jesus,” 32, 31, respectively. Luke 12:33a (“Sell your goods and give to charity,”) is used as an example of an injunction recommending “a certain kind of behaviour,” while the following verse (“Where your treasure, there your heart,”) is listed as an aphoristic maxim.

\(^{94}\) “When asked if the rich could enter the kingdom, Jesus replied, ‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle,’ ” (ibid. 28).


\(^{97}\) Only the Matthaean version of the story describes the man as young (19:20, 22).
of the luxurious lifestyle of the rich, and anticipation of their destruction;\textsuperscript{98} (2) warning of the requirement for urgent action to avoid a threatening catastrophe;\textsuperscript{99} and (3) the call of Elisha, which necessitated the abandonment of customary lifestyle and of family.\textsuperscript{100}

\textit{Disentanglement from family ties}, like the \textit{voluntary poverty} theme, may be seen in the light of the Elijah-Elisha narrative, although Elisha’s abandonment of his parents is evidently less abrupt than Jesus seems to have expected of would-be followers in Luke 9:59–62.\textsuperscript{101} In addition, this theme, together with that of \textit{non-retaliation}, may be connected with the eschatological expectation of harmonious relationships between all creatures, and a consequent diminishment of the priority of \textit{filial} ties.\textsuperscript{102} Although it is not represented in Mack’s listings, the episode related in Mark 3:31–35\textsuperscript{103} has a meaning consistent with this global understanding of “family.”

The discussion of Cynic parallels has shown that in order to gain a comprehensive depiction of the synoptic Jesus, it is necessary to include the narrative elements of the Gospels, as well as selected aphoristic sayings. It has also been demonstrated that sayings posited as Cynic parallels exhibit a style and content that are redolent of the OT prophets.

2.7.4. Conclusions:

The social rank and behaviour of Jesus as depicted in the Synoptic Gospels are not consistent with him having been regarded as either a peasant or a Cynic.\textsuperscript{104} The case

\textsuperscript{98} E.g. Amos 3:12–4:3, 6:1–7.
\textsuperscript{99} E.g. Jer 21:12–14.
\textsuperscript{100} 1 Kgs 19:19–21.
\textsuperscript{101} But note Hengel’s suggestion that in Luke 9:60 the first reference to “dead” probably means \textit{spiritually dead} (\textit{Charismatic Leader}, 8).
\textsuperscript{103} And in parr. Matt 12:46–50; Luke 8:19–21.
\textsuperscript{104} Note that in his 1991 publication, Crossan characterised the historical Jesus as a “peasant Jewish Cynic” (\textit{Jewish Peasant}, 421). In his later work, though he expresses “chagrin” that this
against a Cynic Jesus has been argued convincingly by several scholars,\textsuperscript{105} and is supported by the above findings. The motifs that could most readily be viewed as Cynic are also explicable by their connection with the OT prophetic tradition or with Jewish eschatology, or both. It has also been shown that the notion of Jesus as Cynic is difficult to maintain when due weight is given to his deeds, as against his supposed sayings.\textsuperscript{106} It therefore seems reasonable to put aside reconstructions of Jesus which characterise him as either a peasant, or as \textit{totally} Cynic.

The findings also favour the identification of Jesus as a Jewish eschatological prophet,\textsuperscript{107} and indeed it is appropriate, with Witherington, to see Jesus as a "prophetic and eschatological sage."\textsuperscript{108} However, the results are not so clear-cut regarding the possibility of Cynic-Stoic influence on the historical Jesus.

As we have seen, Jesus' denunciation of divorce would have been at odds with the traditional \textit{Cynic} perspective towards marriage. On the other hand, his own reconstruction was interpreted too literally, he goes on to assert that Jesus would indeed have been considered, at least by pagan peasants, as some sort of Cynic (\textit{Birth of Christianity}, 334–35).

\textsuperscript{105} E.g. Eddy, "Diogenes?" 449–69; H. D. Betz, "Jesus and the Cynics: Survey and Analysis of a Hypothesis," JR 74 (1994): 453–75, esp. 470–74. There is a great deal of evidence even against Cynic hypotheses such as the proposals of Crossan and Downing, in which the Jewishness of Jesus is acknowledged. See n. 104 re Crossan, and re F. Gerald Downing, see his \textit{Christ and the Cynics}; idem, \textit{Cynics and Christian Origins} (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992). Downing's argument for a Jewish and eschatological Cynic Jesus raises a possibility for a modified approach to historical Jesus reconstruction. However, he has failed to provide convincing evidence to support the concept of an eschatological perspective among Cynics. See Boyd, \textit{Cynic Sage}, 336 n. 57; and also Tuckett, "A Cynic Q?" 369, n. 64, who refers to Downing, "Quite like Q: A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of Cynic Philosophers," \textit{Biblica} 69 (1988): 205 and n. 28; and idem, \textit{Christ and the Cynics}, 9. The conclusions of T. F. Glasson re the absence of Hellenistic parallels to the Jewish eschatological world view further undermine Downing's argument. See Boyd, \textit{Cynic Sage}, 336 n. 57, citing Glasson, \textit{Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology} (London: SPCK, 1961), esp. 75, and also 79–80, 83. A useful bibliography of early advocates of a possible relationship between Jesus and Cynics is given in Mack, \textit{Myth of Innocence}, 69 n. 11.

\textsuperscript{106} See §2.7.3.2 above.

\textsuperscript{107} The notion of the ingathering associated with the end time is redolent of the universal world view of Stoicism. Note therefore that even if Jesus is to be seen as an eschatological prophet, the two crucial strands of Arius' ethical system remain in sight: viz. the notion of world citizenship, and the belief that for one with a higher calling, marriage would be a sin.

\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Jesus Quest}, 187. Witherington makes a distinction between John the Baptist, who belongs among the classical prophets, and Jesus, whose utilisation of parables, aphorisms, beatiudes, etc. places him among wisdom teachers (\textit{Jesus Quest}, 118, 187). See ibid. 185–96, for Witherington's argument for Jesus as the embodiment of Wisdom; and idem, \textit{Jesus the Sage}, esp. 201–208, for an expansion of his theory.
marital status and positive view of matrimony would have been consistent either with contemporary Stoic attitudes, or with his Jewish heritage and prophetic role. Moreover, some influence on Jesus beyond a relatively conservative Jewish background would be consistent with the parallels shown to exist between well-attested sayings of Jesus, and Cynic attitudes. It seems best, therefore, to conclude that although the historical Jesus is to be seen as a Jewish eschatological sage and prophet, and not a Cynic philosopher, his attitudes may have been influenced by Cynic-Stoic elements within a predominantly Jewish milieu.\(^{109}\)

### 2.7.5. Discussion of findings:

This final stage of the reconstruction attempt considers whether the proposed concept of the historical Jesus coheres with historical and archaeological findings about his milieu.

The reconstruction of Jesus as Jewish, but possibly influenced by pagan elements, is consistent with some scholarship of the late eighties and early nineties. For instance, in his 1988 work, Freyne surmised that Jesus' itinerancy and the style and location of his teaching were almost certainly influenced by the Cynic-Stoic model, though his concerns remained essentially Jewish.\(^{110}\) Many scholars also think it probable that the historical Jesus had at least some knowledge of Greek.\(^{111}\)

---

\(^{109}\) The term "Cynic-Stoic" is used owing to the impossibility of differentiating precisely between the influences which might have impacted on Jesus. For comments on the hyphenated term see Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition* (SBLSBS 12; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 2; and re confusion of Cynics and Stoics by scholars, see idem, "Self-Definition," 50, 194 n. 27.


Nevertheless, there is no specific evidence for the presence of a Cynic-Stoic element in Galilee during Jesus’ lifetime, and doubt remains concerning the extent of Hellenisation in first century Palestine. Although earlier studies indicated that Hellenistic influence was probably substantial, particularly in the lake area of lower Galilee, some scholars are now urging caution regarding archaeological findings until a larger body of early material becomes available. Thus, in his later work, Freyne is more guarded than previously, and states that: “The kind of cultural ambience that is required to support the Cynic hypothesis, at least in rural areas, would appear to be missing.”

It is important to note here that Hellenisation is not to be equated with a particular philosophy, and does not of itself imply a Cynic presence. Hengel emphasises the significance of Greek language as an indicator of Hellenisation, and points out that all post-250 B.C.E. Judaism is Hellenistic. Similarly, Scott advises caution on “reconstructing an overly pure Jewish tradition in isolation from Hellenism,” and perceives a need for development of clearer concepts of Judaism and Hellenism, and the way in which they were blended. He considers that in the

---


115 “Archaeology and the Historical Jesus,” 138.
past, scholars may have overstated the disparity between them, and more recently may have blurred the differences. Notwithstanding, it seems clear that Jews maintained their distinctiveness in spite of Hellenistic influences.

In summary, a firm position cannot be reached on the extent of Hellenisation in first century Palestine, but it is prudent to weigh the available evidence carefully and draw tentative conclusions based on probabilities. Thus, whilst the notion of an entirely Cynic reconstruction may be rejected, it is necessary to remain open to the possibility of Hellenistic influences within Galilee and hence on the attitudes and values of the historical Jesus.

2.8. Preferred model for reconstruction:

Based on the discussion above, the following are included among data regarded as certain or virtually certain:

Jesus of Nazareth:

- was a Jewish prophet and eschatological sage;
- announced the imminence of the kingdom of God;
- was an itinerant teacher who called disciples;
- used parables and aphorisms in his teaching.

---

116 Judaism and Hellenism 1:104.
118 Sanders, Historical Jesus, 37–38, 104; idem, “Historical Context,” 437–38, 447–48; idem, Jesus and Judaism, 191; Freyne, “Galilean Questions,” 69; idem, “Archaeology and the Historical Jesus,” 136–38; Witherington, Jesus the Sage, 119.
119 E.g. see Freyne, Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 173.
120 Sanders is surely correct to infer that for Palestinian Jews, Homer would not have replaced the Bible (“Historical Context,” 448), esp. in light of Hengel’s observation that knowledge of Greek was of the spoken word, rather than of literature (“Hellenization” of Judea, 10). The earnest discussion of Torah would definitely have remained a topos at formal Jewish meals (see D. E. Smith, “Meal Customs,” ABD 4:652; Sir 9:16–16; Philo, Contempl. 75–78). However, since the Poet was known so extensively, it is likely that his works were quoted to some extent in Palestine as elsewhere, esp. in the context of symposia. See e.g. Michael Coffey, Roman Satire (New York: Methuen, 1976), 187–88, citing Seneca, Ep. 27.5–6; Alan Cameron, Callimachus and His Critics (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), 71–103, esp. 74, 76, 76 n. 36, 80; and also §2.2.7 of Chapter Two.
This list is by no means complete, and includes only items relevant to the present task of establishing a corpus of material that may be considered bedrock. It fully accords with Hurtado’s belief that traditions about Jesus emphasising the prophetic and eschatological elements in his ministry, as well as those concerning sapiential and aphoristic aspects, are to be regarded as authentic.\(^{121}\)

3. **Literature review:**

Preamble:

In the two preceding sections, reference has been made to the work of a significant number of scholars, and many current theories have been found unsatisfactory. The present section is a review of the findings of certain scholars whose hypotheses are particularly helpful, or which are at least partially relevant to the topic of Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. The work of each scholar is treated under the following topics:

(1) material that is relevant to this study; (2) debatable points in the thought or method of the scholar; (3) important issues or questions which arise during the review process.

3.1. **E. P. Sanders:**

3.1.1. Relevant material:

It will already be clear that Sanders’ approach to Jesus research is of major importance to this study. Though not all of his conclusions are accepted, his method has been adopted to establish the most secure details that can be deduced about the historical Jesus.

\(^{121}\) “Taxonomy,” 294.
Other relevant areas of Sanders’ work are:

- the assertions that Jesus’ main offence was his action against the temple,\textsuperscript{122} and that the priestly authorities were responsible for his arrest and execution;\textsuperscript{123}
- his exoneration of the Pharisees;\textsuperscript{124}
- his observation that the outrage of the religious authorities would have been exacerbated by Jesus’ offer to sinners of a place in the kingdom without requiring the proper acts of atonement;\textsuperscript{125}
- his perception that Jesus would have caused offence to most pious people by claiming authority regarding eligibility for the kingdom,\textsuperscript{126} and stating that sinners would precede the righteous;\textsuperscript{127}
- his denial that Jesus caused serious offence by any breach of the purity code arising from his commensality;\textsuperscript{128}
- his assertion that the יִשְׂרָאֵל הַנְּשׁוֹר as a group were not to be identified with “sinners”;\textsuperscript{129}
- the finding that by eating with toll collectors and sinners, Jesus was probably indicating proleptically that they would be included at the eschatological banquet.\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{122} Jesus and Judaism, 289–90.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid. 205, 289.
\textsuperscript{125} Jesus and Judaism, 288.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid. 240, 271, 287–88.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid. 288–89.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid. esp. 176–177, 186–90, 199.
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid. 174–211, esp. 176. Note that hereafter, the transliteration Am(me) Ha'arets is used for convenience.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid. 208. Sanders also seems to affirm Hengel’s view that Jesus “invites sinners to the messianic banquet,” (ibid. 238, citing Martin Hengel, Charismatic Leader, 68).
3.1.2. Points for debate:

3.1.2.1. The relationship between Jesus and the Pharisees:

Although Sanders expressed doubt in his earlier work, that there were any
"substantial points of opposition" between the Pharisees and Jesus,\textsuperscript{131} his subsequent
research on the Pharisees\textsuperscript{132} provides additional background material that places some
relevant issues in a different light.\textsuperscript{133} In fact, I think that there probably was some
form of dispute; i.e. that in the Synoptics, the polemic between the Pharisees and
Jesus is historically grounded, and not simply a retrojection stemming from early
church politics, as Sanders suggests.\textsuperscript{134} It is also likely that Jesus publicly expressed
criticism of some Pharisees, and compared them unfavourably with toll collectors.

3.1.2.2. The "sinners":

Sanders' views on Jesus' relationship with sinners are encapsulated well in two
summary statements:

\begin{quote}
[Jesus] could have been accused of being a friend of people who indefinitely remained
sinners.

Jesus . . . proclaimed the inclusion of the wicked who heeded him.\textsuperscript{135}
\end{quote}

Although his opinion is soundly argued, the statements do not take proper account,
respectively, of the elements of repentance and table fellowship. Therefore, further
investigation is required into Sanders' discussion on these areas.

\textsuperscript{131} Jesus and Judaism, 264. See also ibid. 265, 291.
\textsuperscript{132} I.e. as articulated in Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE (London: SCM, 1992),
380–451, cf. Jesus and Judaism, which was published seven years earlier.
\textsuperscript{133} This matter is further discussed in Chapter Six, §§3.1 and 3.2.
\textsuperscript{134} Jesus and Judaism, 265, 292; idem, Historical Figure of Jesus, 217–18. As Sanders points out, the
dispute in some of the controversy stories (Mark 2:18–20; 2:23–28; 7:1–23) is not with Jesus himself
but with his disciples, who could be representative of the later church.
\textsuperscript{135} Jesus and Judaism, 206.
Repentance:

Sanders has rightly observed there is little evidence in Jesus’ message, of an emphasis on repentance.\textsuperscript{136} Moreover, several references in Matthew and Luke support his contention that Jesus relied on the effect of John’s message.\textsuperscript{137} In these two Gospels there are many negative connotations about toll collectors and sinners, who are viewed as either separate groups or in combination.\textsuperscript{138} The crucial factor for their salvation is shown in Matt 21:31–32 to be their belief in John’s warning, and their consequent change of heart.\textsuperscript{139} The same point is made in Luke, with toll collectors and sinners being baptised by John (3:12), and shown in a positive light compared with the Pharisees and lawyers who had refused John’s baptism (7:29).\textsuperscript{140}

Hence, it could be inferred from Matthew and Luke that some sinners to whom Jesus offered the kingdom, had previously heard and understood John’s warning, had submitted to baptism, presumably after repentance, and had subsequently become followers of Jesus. Sanders correctly points out that such people would technically still have been categorised as sinners under the provisions of the Law;\textsuperscript{141} however, they cannot properly be categorised with the wicked.\textsuperscript{142} Thus Sanders’ proposal that Jesus offered the kingdom to non-penitents does not recognise sufficiently the history and presumed reformation of John’s former followers,\textsuperscript{143} or the possibility that they function paradigmatically for those who subsequently

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid. 110–13.
\textsuperscript{137} At least with respect to those who had already repented, if not to “all Israel” (ibid. 228) as Sanders supposes (ibid. 227–28).
\textsuperscript{139} Note that the prostitutes of Matt 21:31–32 would be included under the broader term sinners.
\textsuperscript{140} There is also implicit reference to the virtue of repentance in the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (Luke 18:9–14), although John does not feature here. Note that tax collectors are clearly identified as “sinners” in Luke 18:13 and 19:7, although from Luke 7:37 it is obvious that the scope of the latter term is not limited to that group.
\textsuperscript{141} Jesus and Judaism, 174–208, esp. 206.
\textsuperscript{142} See ibid. 206.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
became disciples of Jesus. Moreover, Sanders does not give enough credence to the constancy of the NT tradition regarding the necessity for moral renewal,\textsuperscript{144} and many scholars, perhaps most, would challenge his findings.\textsuperscript{145} Nevertheless, he has disclosed an important issue that requires further investigation.

Table fellowship:

Sanders has argued persuasively that any offence caused by Jesus’ open commensality was unrelated to the ritual impurity of his table companions.\textsuperscript{146} However, he concentrates to such an extent on refuting arguments concerning transgression of purity regulations, that there is scant attention given to issues surrounding the table fellowship tradition itself.\textsuperscript{147} While he agrees that Jesus’ followers included at least one tax collector,\textsuperscript{148} he is sceptical about the tradition of there being several,\textsuperscript{149} and particularly about their supposed table fellowship with Jesus as depicted in Mark 2:15–17.\textsuperscript{150} Again, though he affirms that Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners probably indicated their eligibility to participate in the eschatological banquet,\textsuperscript{151} he does not attempt to explain how invitations to the banquet were effected.

The prominence of table fellowship in passages connecting Jesus with tax collectors and sinners suggests that it has a central function in his relationship with

\textsuperscript{144} See Norman H. Young, “‘Jesus and the Sinners’: Some Queries,” \textit{JSNT} 24 (1985): 73–75, esp. 74.
\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, esp. 176–177, 186–90, 199.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid. 174–211, esp. 209–11.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid. 207, 391 n. 118.
\textsuperscript{149} Cf. Freyne’s rational explanation that numerous toll collectors would have been present in Galilee owing to its self-sufficient economy (\textit{Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels}, 41).
\textsuperscript{150} Sanders, \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, 392 n. 118.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid. 208.
them. This is applicable to: the call of Levi (Mark 2:13–17 parr.); the comparison between John and Jesus; the sinner who anoints Jesus (Luke 7:36–50); those who come to hear Jesus (Luke 15:1–2); and the story of Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1–10). Sanders misses the point in his observation that "the force which welded together the early Christian movement was not Jesus' table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners." As I will endeavour to demonstrate, the table fellowship itself is not the only significant issue. An additional focal point should be a determination of the means by which supposedly sinful people who ate with Jesus were invited to participate in the eschatological banquet. Such a study of Jesus at table with "sinners" can perhaps also provide the key to understanding why Jesus' message lacked an emphasis on repentance.

3.1.2.3. Hermeneutical approach:

Sanders shows an obvious preference for a policy which relies "more on general considerations than on the painstaking and always tentative assessment of the authenticity of one or more sayings." He uses this principle in his investigation of the Gentile mission, and the resultant findings, in a general sense, are probably correct: that Jesus directed his mission primarily to Israel, and that his actual contact

---

152 I assume that Matthew and Levi are identical. E.g. see Kurt Aland, ed., Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (8th corrected ed.; Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1987), 42. Sanders is correct to note that Luke has a particular interest in the theme of repentance (Jesus and Judaism, 203, 206), and that in his account of the call of Levi, he has modified the saying accordingly (ibid. 109). Though Sanders considers the charge that Jesus ate with tax collectors and sinners is authentic, he finds the setting of the story about the call of Levi unrealistic (ibid. 178).


154 Luke's account is utilised here because only he specifies that the woman is a sinner. However, in all the synoptic accounts, her possession of the ointment and her actions suggest that she was a prostitute. This matter and other aspects of the anointing accounts are discussed in Chapter Seven, §6.2.

155 Jesus and Judaism, 209.

156 Ibid. 219 (italics added).
with Gentiles was relatively insubstantial. However, his finding that "there are substantially no authentic materials" regarding Jesus' attitude to the Gentiles is of questionable validity. Perceived problems in his approach are firstly, a seemingly unwarranted preference for Matthew over Luke, and secondly, the premature dismissal of texts that may have an authentic core.

With regard to Sanders' predilection for Matthew over Luke, his treatment of the banquet parable provides a pertinent example. The basic form of the parable very probably derives from the historical Jesus, and the versions in Luke and the Gospel of Thomas are more likely to preserve a form close to the original than the Matthaean account. Yet, despite the extreme allegorisation of Matt 22:1–10, Sanders is unable to discard it in favour of the Lucan version.

With respect to the second matter, Sanders' dismissive treatment of Matt 8:11–12 and par. Luke 13:28–29 provides an apt example. Like the banquet parable, this passage pertains to both table fellowship and the eschatological ingathering. Although Sanders regards the Matthaean version as "potentially authentic," he makes no effort to determine the most probable form of the original legion. His doubts about the historicity of some portions of v. 12 then lead him to the conclusion that v. 11 may relate to the ingathering of the Dispersion, rather than of the

---

158 Jesus and Judaism, 220.
159 See ibid. 394 n. 38; Synoptic Gospels, 97, 113, 116–17.
160 The parable is considered in detail in Chapter Eight, §4.2.
162 Ibid. 754; Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 376 n. 104; James H. Charlesworth, "Jesus, Early Jewish Literature, and Archaeology," in idem, Jesus' Jewishness, 189.
163 Sanders does not acknowledge that Gos. Thom. 64 could preserve the parable in an early form (Synoptic Gospels, 180). Moreover, he does not appear to have noticed that the Lucan version mentions only one servant, not several as in Matt 22:2–14 (ibid.).
164 Jesus and Judaism, 219, 394 n. 38.
Gentiles.\textsuperscript{165} In contrast to this approach, Meier has demonstrated by means of his hypothetical reconstruction of the passage that the saying is very likely authentic, and that it probably refers to Gentiles. As we will see in Chapter Eight, §4, Matt 8:11–12 is significant in relation to the inclusion of Gentiles in the eschatological banquet, and the banquet parable at least deserves investigation in this regard.

3.1.3. Significant issues:

To avoid the problems discerned in Sanders’ hermeneutical approach, the method adopted in this study is to evaluate each relevant text critically, as well as taking into account the \textit{general considerations} surrounding a particular issue. The proper assessment includes, where necessary, an attempt at reconstruction of the text, and each case is determined individually, rather than by following any pre-existing preference for either Matthew or Luke.

The review of Sanders’ work has also raised three important questions:

- What is the significance of the fact that the emphasis is on table fellowship rather than repentance, in texts concerning Jesus’ relationship with toll collectors and sinners?

- How is Jesus’ open commensality to be interpreted?

- What is the means by which Jesus issues invitations to the eschatological banquet?

3.2. \textit{J. D. Crossan:}

Reference has already been made above to the inadequacy of Crossan’s “Mediterranean” perspective for Jesus research,\textsuperscript{166} and to his reconstruction, especially the inappropriateness of characterising the historical Jesus as a peasant.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{165} Ibid. 220.
\textsuperscript{166} See §2.4 above.
\textsuperscript{167} See §2.7.1.
Nevertheless, many of his views warrant further mention here because of the significance he assigns to table fellowship in the Jesus movement. The review of Crossan’s work refers mainly to The Birth of Christianity, which incorporates the most significant ideas from his 1991 publication, and attempts to reconstruct the events that occurred in the few decades immediately after Jesus’ death.

3.2.1. Relevant Material:

3.2.1.1. Proposed identity:

Although some aspects of Crossan’s reconstruction have been found wanting, several features of it cohere, at least superficially, with the basic profile of Jesus delineated above, viz.: he is Jewish, eschatological, itinerant, and a healer, he proclaims the kingdom of God; and may well have been influenced by Cynicism.

3.2.1.2. Eating/healing dyad:

Crossan understands the kingdom of God as a “brokerless,” egalitarian society being brought about according to a “corporate plan” for social change. He sees the strategy as dependent on a reciprocal understanding between the itinerant missionaries, and the householders who provided hospitality to them. The hypothesis is that the disciples brought healing to the home, and in return received meals, an arrangement that is termed a “dyad” of healing and eating.

---

168 Jewish Peasant.
169 See §§2.7 and 2.8.
170 Crossan, Jewish Peasant; idem, Birth of Christianity, 334.
171 Ibid. esp. 317–44.
172 Ibid. esp. 328, 377, 404, 406.
173 Ibid. 333.
174 Ibid. 326. Note that Crossan envisages the kingdom not as an eschatological event in the near future, but as “a mode of life in the immediate present,” (Jewish Peasant, 304).
175 Birth of Christianity, 333–35.
176 Jewish Peasant, 304.
177 Ibid. 345. Crossan also expresses the dyad as “magic/meal,” “miracle/table,” (ibid. 344), and “compassion/commensality” (ibid. 345). His hypothesis on commensality in early Christianity is well summarised in his “Itinerants and Householders in the Earliest Jesus Movement,” in Arnal and Desjardins, Whose Historical Jesus? 9–12. See also Birth of Christianity, 325–37, for a further explanation of the hypothesis, and of the “Common Sayings Tradition” unit he entitles “Mission and
3.2.1.3. The traditions of Jesus’ life and death:

Like a number of scholars, Crossan discerns two distinctive traditions behind the faith of the earliest Christians: one based on Jesus’ sayings and on his life, and the other on the kerygma concerning his death and resurrection. He sees them as of equal significance, and prefers the terminology of the “Life Tradition” and the “Death Tradition.” The identification of the traditions is significant for the present study also, but the objective here is not to present one over against the other. Rather, the aim is to elevate the table fellowship tradition to its proper place, in order to facilitate an accurate interpretation of Jesus’ deeds and sayings, and to shed light on relevant practices in early Christianity. Accordingly, the term Commensality Tradition is substituted for Crossan’s Life Tradition. Moreover, to avoid confusion with Crossan’s terminology, I refer to material concerning Jesus’ suffering, death, and resurrection, as the Passion Tradition. The importance of the Commensality Tradition will become evident in Chapters Seven and Eight.

3.2.1.4. Jesus and the Suffering Servant:

Crossan finds an important connection between references to Jesus in 1 Corinthians 11 and Didache 9–10, and to the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 52–53. The link exists not only in the parallels that Christians would soon have acknowledged between Jesus and the Servant, but also through the key words παίζεως and παρεδότεντο. The first,

---


178 Birth of Christianity, 408. Crossan cites the opinions of Helmut Koester, Stephen Patterson, John Kloppenborg, and Burton Mack on the relative importance of the two traditions (ibid. 408–14).

179 Ibid. 415.

180 Ibid. 439–41.
παῖς, occurs in both the Septuagint translation of Isa 52:13 and in Did. 9:2 and 10:2, 3;¹⁸¹ the second key word, παραδίδομι, occurs in Isa 53:12 and 1 Cor 11:23.¹⁸²

3.2.1.5. Persecution–Vindication genre:

Crossan argues that the Passion Narrative comprises the historicisation of biblical prophecies, rather than Christians’ remembrance of the actual events of Jesus’ death and resurrection.¹⁸³ Although his position exaggerates the extent to which OT material is utilised in the Passion Narrative, the significant point here is that he follows Nickelsburg in discerning that Mark 14–15 is shaped on an ancient wisdom tale involving the persecution and subsequent vindication of a righteous person.¹⁸⁴ Crossan differentiates between the two variations that developed from the Persecution–Vindication archetype. In the first of these, vindication occurs prior to the death of the righteous person; in the second type, the rescue occurs, or it is predicted that it will occur, following the person’s death.¹⁸⁵ Isaiah 52–53 and Mark 14–15 are cited as representative of the latter group.¹⁸⁶ Hence, the link already established between the Suffering Servant and Jesus by means of key words is underscored.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸¹ Ibid. 439–40.
¹⁸² Ibid. 439–41. Crossan insists that παραδίδετο should be translated as handed over, rather than betrayed as is customary for 1 Cor 11:23 (ibid. 439). He also asserts that the translation hand over for παραδίδομι is applicable to Mark 1:14; 3:19; 9:31; 10:33; 13:12; 14:10–44; as is already the norm for 13:9, 11; 15:1, 10.
¹⁸³ Birth of Christianity, 520–22. He considers that: “The individual units, general sequences, and overall frames for the passion-resurrection stories are so linked to prophetic fulfillment that the removal of such fulfillment leaves nothing but the barest facts . . . ” (ibid. 521). For further discussion on the origin of the Passion Narrative, see Chapter Eight, §3.1.
¹⁸⁶ 2 Maccabees 7 and Wisdom 2–5 also belong to the second type (ibid. 499).
¹⁸⁷ See §3.2.1.4.
3.2.2. Points for debate:

3.2.2.1. Source material:

A major weakness in Crossan’s methodology lies in his use of sources that, for one reason or another, may not be reliable. His argument depends heavily on what he terms the “Common Sayings Tradition,” (i.e. “that corpus of materials common to the Q Gospel and the Gospel of Thomas”), and on the Didache and the Cross Gospel.\(^{188}\) In his listing of six presuppositions concerning sources, Crossan admits that: “in general, they get more controversial as you descend the list.”\(^{190}\) Although the Q Gospel features in second place, his terminology implies not simply Q as it is normally understood, but an actual gospel, with discernible redactional layers.\(^{191}\) Since even the existence of Q remains hypothetical, the addition of further unproven features makes the notion of the Q Gospel more controversial. The positions of the Gospel of Thomas, the Didache, and the Cross Gospel as the lowest three on the scale are indicative of the continuing doubts about their reliability in at least a sector of the scholarly community.\(^{192}\)

3.2.2.2. Eschatology:

In an attempt to justify his reconstruction of Jesus as eschatological but non-apocalyptic,\(^{193}\) Crossan goes to great lengths to define a relevant eschatology.\(^{194}\) However, he achieves merely an idiosyncratic concept, ethical eschatology, which

---

\(^{188}\) Ibid. 254. Crossan has adapted the work of Stephen John Patterson [The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus (Foundations and Facets Reference Series; Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1993)] and has re-titled what Patterson called the Common Tradition (Birth of Christianity, 254).

\(^{189}\) Birth of Christianity, 120. The Cross Gospel refers to a Passion Narrative that Crossan claims can be isolated from within the Gospel of Peter (ibid.).


\(^{191}\) Ibid. 119.

\(^{192}\) See ibid. 103–120 for Crossan’s discussion on scholarly debate over sources.

\(^{193}\) Birth of Christianity, 257.

\(^{194}\) Ibid. 257–89.
appears specifically designed to fit a predetermined construct of Jesus.\textsuperscript{195} To do this he also has to propose a completely idealised, non-violent deity who correlates poorly with the multi-faceted God actually portrayed in the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{196}

Crossan’s understanding of the kingdom is that it represents “the will of God for this earth here and now.”\textsuperscript{197} On the question of the kingdom as both already present, and also expected in the imminent future, he is critical of Meier’s viewpoint.\textsuperscript{198} His criticism is not on the grounds of the concept itself, but about Meier’s inability to provide a precise explanation concerning Jesus’ eschatology.\textsuperscript{199} Crossan believes it is simple to explain the tension between a realised and a future eschatology by means of his interpretation of 1 Cor 15:20: Jesus represents “the first fruits of those who have died,” while the general resurrection is still to come.\textsuperscript{200} Yet his own methodology on this matter is flawed. His reading of Gos. Pet. 10:38–42 is that in the resurrection scene, the cross that follows Jesus and the two figures who accompany him, comprises a procession of righteous Israelites who have previously

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{195} Ibid. 273–89.
\item \textsuperscript{196} Ibid. 287. Crossan creates his construct of an ethical eschatological Jesus by degrees. He first asserts that divine justice is the equivalent of social justice (ibid. 182), and that the latter entails human equality, i.e. “radical egalitarianism” (ibid. 183). In Ch. 12 he interprets selected law codes, prophetic pronouncements, and psalm texts as wholly directed toward the attainment of social equality (ibid. 177–208). Those findings are used to affirm that God’s true nature is totally nonviolent, (ibid. 287). Finally he suggests that perhaps Jesus’ conviction of God as nonviolent came as a result of his failure to avenge the death of John the Baptist (ibid.). Jesus’ martyrdom may then be seen as “the final act of ethical eschatology” (ibid. 289). There are two major problems with Crossan’s theory. First, there is the expectation that if Jesus were so focused in a battle against systemic evil, he would surely have indicated his disapproval of slavery. However, there is no suggestion that Jesus expressed such criticism, and even though Crossan acknowledges that some of Jesus’ contemporaries denounced the practice, he does not attempt to explain Jesus’ apparent silence on the matter. See Birth of Christianity, 445, 447, 449 for the comments of Philo and Josephus on the “Therapeutics” and the Essenes; and ibid. 342–43 re Crossan’s use of slavery as an example of “systemic evil” in his critique of Sanders. The second problem is methodological: Crossan’s careful selection of OT texts which support his viewpoint, and disregard of any that would provide a more accurate and comprehensive characterisation of God; and then his insistence that his concept of ethical eschatology is what defines the true nature of the Jewish God. See esp. ibid. 287.
\item \textsuperscript{197} Ibid. 344.
\item \textsuperscript{198} Ibid. 145–46.
\item \textsuperscript{199} Ibid. 143.
\item \textsuperscript{200} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
died.\textsuperscript{201} He describes the occurrence as "communal resurrection-ascension," and asserts that it is affirmed by 1 Cor 15:20 in which Jesus, as the "first fruits," ushers in the general resurrection.\textsuperscript{202} However, there is a problem with Crossan's reasoning, in that 1 Cor 15:22, 51–52; and 1 Thess 4:13–17 make it clear that Paul believed the dead would be raised only at the second coming. The defect in Crossan's argument means that he cannot legitimately claim Jesus' resurrection as \textit{communal}.

There is also a noticeable imprecision in Crossan's explanation of the tension between a realised and a future eschatology. He certainly recognises the two separate eschatologies that are associated, respectively, with what he terms the Life Tradition and the Death Tradition.\textsuperscript{203} However, this differentiation is more pertinent to the question of the sayings vs. the deeds of Jesus. There is very little emphasis on future eschatology, and no clear distinction concerning the supposed "communal" resurrection, contemporary with Jesus' rising, and the \textit{general} resurrection expected in the imminent future.\textsuperscript{204} He claims that "Jesus' resurrection takes place only \textit{within} the general resurrection,"\textsuperscript{205} without explaining the gap between that event and the final \textit{eschaton}. The real problem is that his interpretation of the term \textit{eschatological} does not really refer to the \textit{eschaton} as it was understood in first century Judaism.

3.2.2.3. The eschatological banquet:

A further issue relating to Crossan's stance on eschatology involves Jesus' attitude to toll collectors and sinners, and the possibility that by virtue of their table fellowship with him, they were somehow invited to participate in the eschatological banquet. He is extremely derisive about Sanders' belief that Jesus offered the kingdom to

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid. 488–89. Re the notion of communal resurrection, see also ibid. xix, 145, 504, 550, 569.
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid. 489.
\textsuperscript{203} E.g., ibid. 405, 410–11.
\textsuperscript{204} Ibid 548–50.
\textsuperscript{205} Ibid. 549.
unrepentant sinners, and claims in addition that the relevant accusations against Jesus are simply a matter of name-calling, and should not be taken seriously. He also contends that the repentance of tax collectors and sinners is implied, emphasising the story about Zacchaeus, and the saying that Jesus came “not to call the righteous, but sinners.” However, he does not comment on the fact that according to Luke’s narrative, the table fellowship with Zacchaeus is arranged prior to any indication of repentance or promise of restitution.

Crossan pays little attention to the eschatological banquet, and serious consideration of it is confined to his thesis about the Common Meal Tradition: that God’s and Jesus’ presence is found “in food and drink offered equally to everyone.” That finding is the conclusion to a discussion in which he acknowledges the connection made in Didache 9–10 and 1 Cor 11:26 between eucharistic meals and the second coming. However, Crossan avoids any real focus on the Parousia or the eschatological banquet by asserting that these citations are “apocalyptic,” rather than “eschatological.” Thus he is able to adhere to his own sociological agenda, and fails to enter into assiduous debate about either the eschatological banquet, or the tradition of Jesus’ table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners.

---

206 Ibid. 337–42.
209 It is noteworthy, for instance, that although he has observed the strong links made between Jesus and the Suffering Servant passages in Isaiah 52–53, Crossan makes no reference to Isa 25:6–8.
210 Ibid. 444.
211 Ibid. 442–43.
212 Ibid. 442.
3.2.2.4. Interpretation of itinerancy:

According to Crossan’s theory, Jesus was leading a non-violent peasant resistance movement against the systemic injustice of rural commercialisation:213 he and his disciples were itinerant not because they had undertaken voluntary poverty, but because they were dispossessed and destitute.214 From this scenario, Crossan develops the notion of tension arising between the destitute itinerants and the poverty-stricken householders who received them.215

At issue here is the rationale behind the itinerancy of Jesus and his disciples. Crossan’s hypothesis is built around his notion of an eating/healing dyad, and his belief that Jesus’ directive to his followers was to imitate his lifestyle in order to extend the kingdom.216 By contrast, I understand the itinerancy of Jesus and the disciples simply as the combined result of voluntary homelessness, and the need to travel. Although Crossan’s notion contains some valuable truths about the hospitality extended to the disciples, I will argue that the underlying rationale for it is not reciprocity.217

3.2.3. Significant issues:

Crossan’s work raises many important issues requiring further investigation, especially:

- the possibility of a connection between healing, and the offer of meals to itinerants;
- the authenticity or otherwise of the tradition about Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners;

---

213 Ibid. 235, 281–82, 284, 330.
214 Ibid. 235, 281–82.
215 Ibid. 330.
216 Ibid. 280–82; 333; 376–77; 404–405.
217 The itinerancy of Jesus and his disciples is investigated in Chapter Seven, §3.1.
• the relationship between the Commensality Tradition and the Passion Tradition;
• the link between Jesus and the Suffering Servant, especially in relation to the Persecution–Vindication folktale.

3.3.  D. E. Smith:

3.3.1.  Relevant material:

3.3.1.1.  Meal customs:

The importance of Dennis Smith’s research for this study is clear, since it embraces the study of meals and relevant customs during the biblical period, as well as aspects of the Jesus movement pertaining to table fellowship. In his 1980 dissertation,218 and his subsequent studies on NT table fellowship,219 he contends that in broad terms, Graeco-Roman meal customs represent the proper background for interpreting relevant passages in the Synoptics and the Pauline corpus.

3.3.1.2.  Jesus’ table fellowship:

Smith’s findings on Jesus’ table fellowship include several important points that arise from his knowledge of Graeco-Roman meal customs and relevant NT texts, viz.:

• in his view, the characteristics of the meals as depicted in Mark 2:15–17 and Luke 7:31–35 are valid both socially and historically;220
• he acknowledges the tradition concerning table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners as early;221

220 Ibid. 161.
221 Ibid. 148.
• to some degree he believes the traditions regarding Jesus at table are consistent with the historical Jesus;\textsuperscript{222}

• he observes the ambiguity of Jesus’ status as depicted at meals;\textsuperscript{223}

• he acknowledges the importance of retaining the link between the dichotomies of fasting/feasting, and John/Jesus.\textsuperscript{224}

3.3.2. Points for debate:

3.3.2.1. Methodology:

Smith is correct to note the marked similarity between the meal customs of Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the NT period. However, he moves too readily to assume that synoptic references to meals are properly interpreted in the light of Graeco-Roman culture,\textsuperscript{225} and that the table customs of the various ethnic groups were “standardized.”\textsuperscript{226} For a more comprehensive perspective it is necessary to investigate the Hebrew marzeah,\textsuperscript{227} the Greek συμπόσιον, and the Roman cena, as separate entities,\textsuperscript{228} as well as to consider the possibility that meal customs relevant to each may have evolved differently.\textsuperscript{229}

A further methodological weakness is Smith’s tendency to cite the opinions of certain scholars inappropriately and/or without critical evaluation. For instance, his perspective appears to have been strongly influenced by Perrin’s theory that Jesus regularly dined with outcasts (i.e. tax collectors and sinners) as a symbolic gesture

\textsuperscript{222} Ibid. 162.
\textsuperscript{223} Ibid. 156, 156 n. 63, 162. Smith notes that a common conception is that table fellowship with Jesus must have communicated to his commensals a sense of being at the messianic banquet, a scenario that would require Jesus to be the host. He rightly sees two major problems with the notion, viz. Jesus’ itinerancy, and the fact that he is depicted as a guest.
\textsuperscript{224} Ibid. 158.
\textsuperscript{225} “Meal Customs,” 650–51.
\textsuperscript{226} Ibid. 651.
\textsuperscript{227} This form of spelling is adopted in accordance with scholarly convention. See John L. McLaughlin, “The marzeah at Ugarit: A Textual and Contextual Study,” UF 23 (1991): 265 n. 1.
\textsuperscript{228} As we will do in Chapter Four.
exemplifying their inclusion in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{230} He also observes that many other scholars have found the table fellowship traditions significant in their reconstructions of the historical Jesus, albeit with great variety in their results.\textsuperscript{231} On these grounds, Smith then poses a question as to “whether the picture of Jesus utilizing table fellowship with a symbolic meaning as integral to his teaching program can be plausibly reconstructed as a real event in first-century Palestine.”\textsuperscript{232} This approach does not do justice to Perrin’s original hypothesis, or to the reconstructions of other cited scholars.\textsuperscript{233} The main difficulty is that Smith has added a significant new element into Perrin’s theory on Jesus’ table fellowship, viz. his own presuppositions regarding Jesus’ “teaching program.”\textsuperscript{234} An overarching methodological problem here is that by accepting as legitimate the supposed link between Jesus’ table fellowship and his teaching, Smith has focused on the wrong issue. He has overlooked the possibility of there being no symbolic or parabolic meaning behind Jesus’ commensality with tax collectors and sinners, and/or the existence of an alternative rationale for the tradition.

\textsuperscript{229} E.g. with regard to bathing and handwashing. See Smith’s comments on these matters (“Meal Customs,” 651).


\textsuperscript{231} “Historical Jesus,” 137–38.

\textsuperscript{232} Ibid. 138.

\textsuperscript{233} See “Historical Jesus,” 137 n. 8. Other scholars listed are Breech, E. P. Sanders, Horsley, Borg, Crossan, and Chilton. Although Smith properly acknowledges the distinctiveness of their arguments, the way he poses the question (“Historical Jesus,” 138) suggests that it relates to the work of all of the scholars mentioned, not merely to his own individual viewpoint. Note that Smith sees not only the table fellowship, but also the tax collectors and sinners as symbolic, rather than as an historical entity (“Historical Jesus at Table,” 482, n. 68). In this he follows James D. G. Dunn, who regards the terminology as opposition slander (“Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” in The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism (ed. J. Neusner et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 276–80, esp. 278–79]. Smith believes the use of such slander is relevant to the definition of group boundaries (“Historical Jesus at Table,” 482, n. 68).

\textsuperscript{234} A further example of inappropriate citation is the use of Kelber’s work (ibid. 140 n. 13). Smith states that the anointing story in its various forms in the Gospels “most likely originated as a redaction by Mark” [ibid. 139–40, citing Werner H. Kelber, “Conclusion: From Passion Narrative to Gospel,” in The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14–16 (ed. Werner H. Kelber; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 153–80, esp. 173]. Kelber’s actual view is that Mark inserted the story into a particular context to suit
Smith considers that the table fellowship scenes in the Synoptics depict Jesus as teaching "by means of his table customs," and he analyses these traditions, focusing particularly on the meals with tax collectors and sinners as recounted in Mark 2:15–17 and par., and Luke 7:31–35 and par. Again, his methodology is open to criticism. In particular, the validity of some assumptions that he makes is questionable, viz.: that the tradition expressed in Mark 2:15–17 derives from the early church; that the chreia elaborations occurred in precisely the way he imagines; that Cynic traditions were used by Christians to idealise Jesus; and that Luke 7:31–35 is best understood in terms of a conflict situation that occurred in the social history of the Q community. A further criticism is that especially in view of its Lucan version, the anointing story should have been included in the category of "Meals with Tax Collectors and Sinners."

3.3.2.2. Overemphasis on the non-historical Jesus:

Probably the root cause of Smith's focus on the non-historical Jesus is the fact that his studies of eucharistic meals are based largely on his knowledge of dining customs pertaining to clubs and organisations in the Graeco-Roman period. The model that he uses is appropriate for examining 1 Corinthians, but not necessarily for interpreting Jesus' table fellowship practice. Whereas Smith describes the early

---

235 "Historical Jesus," 161, (emphasis added).
236 Ibid. 145. See also §3.3.2.2 below.
237 Ibid. 144–50. On the technique of chreia elaboration see the discussion below in §3.3.3 of Chapter Two.
238 Smith, "Historical Jesus," 159. Here Smith draws on the argument of Cameron, "Characterizations," 35–69. For a critical evaluation of Cameron's views see above, §2.3, and Chapter Two, §3.3.3 passim, esp. 3.3.3.5
239 Ibid. 149–50. See §3.3.2.2 below, and the discussion in Chapter Seven.
240 The anointing accounts are discussed, very briefly, under the category of "Meals with Disciples." See ibid. 139–40.
Christian groups as similar to the Essenes and Therapeuta,
the tradition of Jesus’
table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners does not suggest meals like those of
a club or association, religious or otherwise. Hence, it should not be assumed that the
elements of banquet ideology applicable to early Christian meals are necessarily
relevant to the historical Jesus at table.

Since Smith’s initial work focused on the sympotic background and
sociological aspects of early Christian meals, it is perhaps not surprising that he
analyses Gospel pericopae from a similar perspective. Thus he interprets passages on
Jesus’ table fellowship as based on literary motifs, especially in Luke, and
concludes that the meal settings in the Synoptics probably present an idealised
characterisation of Jesus. Moreover, his belief that the meal scenes in Luke are
styled on literary tradition leads him to label the dialogue, or “table talk,” as
“philosophical discourse,” which supposedly typifies the content of Jesus’ teaching
programme. Similarly, he describes the messianic banquet, which he sees as
essentially mythological, as “a literary idealization of the apocalyptic
consummation.”

There are several problems with Smith’s approach. Firstly, he makes much of
some of the literary traditions and motifs directly related to symposia, but does not
acknowledge others that are equally significant: e.g. the link very frequently drawn

\[242\] Ibid. 29–30.
\[243\] Smith categorises the “patterns of social relations that make up ancient banquet ideology” (ibid. 31) under the headings: (1) Social bonding; (2) Social obligation; (3) Social stratification; and (4) Social equality (ibid. 30–34).
\[244\] I.e. in his “Social Obligation.”
\[246\] “Literary Motif,” 616, n. 12.
\[247\] “Historical Jesus,” 162.
\[249\] “Historical Jesus,” 157.
between death and *symposia* in the NT period;\textsuperscript{250} and the Persecution–Vindication genre.\textsuperscript{251} Secondly, since Luke lends itself to such analysis, he focuses on this Gospel rather than on Q, which, as representative of an earlier tradition, is more likely to preserve historical elements.\textsuperscript{252} Thirdly, his convictions about redactional traits lead him to perceive most aspects of the table fellowship accounts as non-historical. The problems with this attitude are compounded owing to his preconceived notion of a symbolic meaning and didactic intention behind Jesus’ table practice,\textsuperscript{253} and his belief that Mark 2:15–17 is a “creation” of the evangelist.\textsuperscript{254} In light of these factors, it is not surprising that Smith concludes from his investigation that Luke 7:31–35 and Mark 2:15–17 portray an idealisation of Jesus deriving from the early church.\textsuperscript{255}

3.3.3. Significant Issues:

Important issues arising from Smith’s studies are:

- the need to investigate all relevant Hebrew and Graeco-Roman traditions that may be relevant to Jesus’ table fellowship, including those pertaining to hospitality, feasting and literature;

- the ambiguity of Jesus’ status at table as he is depicted in the Synoptics, i.e. whether he is host or guest;

- the dichotomy between fasting and feasting, especially in relation to John and Jesus;

---

\textsuperscript{250} Reference to this literary motif is made in §5, Chapter Four. It is significant with respect to the anointing accounts, and the idea of banqueting in the afterlife.

\textsuperscript{251} See §3.2.1.5 above.

\textsuperscript{252} Smith makes no attempt to reconstruct the original Q passage by comparing the Lucan and Matthean versions. (See his “Historical Jesus,” 148). Note also that his 1987 article focuses entirely on Luke (“Literary Motif,” 613–38).

\textsuperscript{253} See esp. “Historical Jesus,” 147.

\textsuperscript{254} Ibid. 145, n. 33. For an appropriate examination of Mark 2:13–17 see Loader, *Attitude towards the Law* 41–43, arguing for 2:15–17 as an independent unit, and for vv. 13–14 as redactional.

\textsuperscript{255} “Historical Jesus,” 161–62.
the question as to whether or not there is symbolic or parabolic meaning, and/or a
didactic function, in Jesus’ commensality with toll collectors and sinners.

3.4. Kathleen E. Corley:

3.4.1. Relevant material:

Working in the field of Graeco-Roman banqueting traditions, and following Dennis
Smith’s analytical model, Corley has produced several studies on the presence of
women at meals with Jesus. Her particular focus has been Jesus’ table fellowship
with tax collectors and sinners, and the variations between the synoptic presentations
of this tradition. She places much weight on the finding that from the outset,
Matthew emphasises women of poor reputation, having included five of them in his
genealogy, and she concludes on these grounds that the term πόρνη in Matt
21:31–32 preserves an authentic tradition.

An insight that is particularly helpful to the present study is Corley’s
recognition of the banquet imagery in Luke 7:31–34 and par., and her consequent
interpretation of the παῖδεα in Luke 7:32 and Matt 11:16 as connected with the hiring
of slaves in the marketplace. Other interesting points in her work are:

---

256 Personal communication from D. E. Smith, dated 17 August 1995.
257 Kathleen E. Corley, “Were the Women around Jesus Really Prostitutes? Women in the Context of
487–521; idem, “Jesus’ Table Practice: Dining with ‘Tax Collectors and Sinners,’ including Women,”
SBL Seminar Papers, 1993 (SBLSP 32: Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1993), 444–59; idem, Private
Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson,
1993).
258 Private Women, 147–52. The women are Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba, and Mary. Of the five,
only Rahab was a professional prostitute (Josh 2:1–21; 6:17–25), but both Tamar and Bathsheba
engaged in illicit sexual activity (Genesis 38; 2 Samuel 11), and Ruth showed herself as willing to do
so (Ruth 3). Even Mary is portrayed initially as if her moral character would be doubted (Private
Women, 151; Matt 1:18–19).
259 Ibid. 152–79.
• the observation regarding Luke’s avoidance of the term πόρνεια,\textsuperscript{261} which almost certainly occurred, coupled with τελωνεία, in the sayings source utilised by Matthew;\textsuperscript{262}

• the assertion that Luke has also avoided the use of the term ἁμαρτωλοί in 5:29;\textsuperscript{263}

• the possibility that the παιδία in Matt 14:21 and 15:38 are slaves or servants.\textsuperscript{264}

3.4.2. Points for debate:

3.4.2.1. The “tax collectors and sinners”:

Corley accepts as Smith does, that the pairing of tax collectors and sinners is an early tradition.\textsuperscript{265} She endeavours to find a connection between the two groups by identifying links between them, citing the systems that existed in ancient Greece for the registration and taxation of prostitutes.\textsuperscript{266} However, her argument is unconvincing, especially as she notes that in imperial Rome, prostitutes were not taxed until after Jesus’ death.\textsuperscript{267} Moreover, she acknowledges that attempts to obtain a literal identification of the tax collectors and sinners in the Synoptics have been inconclusive.\textsuperscript{268}

\textsuperscript{261} E.g. in Luke 7:29.
\textsuperscript{262} See Private Women, 157.
\textsuperscript{263} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{264} Ibid. 160–64, 162 n. 70.
\textsuperscript{265} “Really Prostitutes?” 519.
\textsuperscript{266} “Jesus’ Table Practice,” 446–47, 457; Private Women, 39–40, 89–92.
\textsuperscript{267} Corley observes that in ancient Greece, procurers had an association with tax officials via the πορνευόν τέλος, a state revenue collected by πορνευκέλων (ibid. 40, nn. 77–78). See also F. Hauck and S. Schulz, “πόρνη κτλ.,” TDNT 6:582, n. 15; Hans Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece (London: Routledge, 1932), 334. Aeschines (389–314 B.C.E.) referred to the prostitute tax in his accusation against Timarchus, 1.119 (Licht, Ancient Greece, 334). However, the evidence of a fourth century B.C.E. Athenian orator is very far removed, chronologically, geographically, and culturally, from Galilee and the toll collectors and sinners of Jesus’ era. Admittedly, there is a possibility that Suetonius’ evidence about the licensing and registration of prostitutes in Rome could also be applicable to Palestine (Corley, Private Women, 40 n. 80, citing Suetonius, Tib. 35). Nevertheless, it should be borne in mind that Suetonius was writing in the late first and early second century [Keith R. Bradley, “Suetonius (Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus),” OCD 1451–52]. In any case, there appears to be no evidence that toll collectors in early first century Galilee had any formal role requiring them to keep lists of harlots. On the identity of tax (toll) collectors, see Chapter Five, §3.
\textsuperscript{268} “Jesus’ Table Practice,” 446.
3.4.2.2. The “sinners”:

As well as trying to establish a formal link between tax collectors and prostitutes, Corley contends that these groups had a reputation for “bad behaviour generally,” especially in relation to dinner parties at which women were present. On this basis she attempts to make a connection between Matt 9:9–13, 11:18–19 and 21:31–32, arguing that the “sinners” who recline in Jesus’ company in 9:10–11 should be seen as synonymous with the πόρναι who will enter the kingdom. However, whilst she accepts the authenticity of the accusation made about Jesus’ table companions, she evidently sees the terms as rhetorical slander, rather than a reflection of Jesus’ actual practice. Corley ultimately concludes that the women in Matthew who are termed πόρναι represent women in his own community, as well as some of Jesus’ followers. However, she tempers this finding by maintaining that the term constitutes “sectarian slander.”

There are several weaknesses in Corley’s arguments. Firstly, there is no compelling evidence that the “sinners” should necessarily be interpreted as female, as she contends, even though there are sound reasons for seeing the woman in Luke 7:36–50 as a prostitute. Secondly, Corley fails to acknowledge that a masculine plural noun may refer to males or to a mixed gender group, and asserts

---

269 Private Women, 152, and also 39–43, 90–93, 130–33.
270 Ibid. 131 n. 126, 151–59.
271 Ibid. 152.
274 Ibid. 178.
275 Note that Corley asserts that the ἰδιωτατόλοι who dine with Jesus in Matt 9:9–13 are synonymous with the πόρναι of Matt 21:31–32 (ibid. 152), but elsewhere claims only that the term sinners would include women (ibid. 178).
276 Ibid. 124–25.
that οἱ γυναῖκες in Luke 23:49 refers exclusively to Jesus’ male friends, but that οἱ ἀμαρτωλοί in Mark 2:15 is a “general term.” Thus, she is not warranted in claiming that Luke endeavoured to identify Jesus’ dining companions as males only, or that Mark’s depiction of Jesus’ table fellowship “obscures” the presence of women among his commensals. Thirdly, Corley’s argument that women are portrayed as “reclining” with men at table in Matthew, but not in Mark and Luke fails on semantic grounds. Certainly, in the descriptions of Jesus’ table fellowship and the feeding miracles, there are some differences in the verbs utilised by the evangelists to indicate the posture of participants. Nevertheless, all have a similar meaning of reclining at table or reclining for a meal, and the ἀμαρτωλοί can be interpreted as including women who recline, in both Mark 2:15 and Matt 9:10. In addition, it seems extremely far-fetched to compare the scenario of a mixed crowd of thousands reclining at a picnic-style meal in the open, with that of a formal banquet in a dining room. Again, while Corley perhaps rightly sees Matthew’s accounts of the feeding miracles as pointing to the inclusiveness of his community, this finding does not in

---

277 I.e., as Corley claims, his “dining companions” (ibid. 156).
278 Ibid. 93.
279 Ibid. 156.
280 Ibid. 93, 156–57.
281 Ibid. 147.
282 The verbs are: ἀνάκειμαι (Matt 9:10), κατάκειμαι (Mark 2:15, Luke 5:29); συνανάκειμαι (Matt 9:10, Mark 2:15); ἀνακλίνω (Matt 14:19, Mark 6:39), κατακλίνω (Luke 9:14).
284 Corley takes the view that the gender-inclusive table fellowship with Jesus is relevant to Matt 14:13–21 and 15:32–39, since Matthew includes women and children as well as men, in his accounts of the feeding miracles (*Private Women*, 160–64). Note however, her suggestion that παρθεία in these passages may refer to slaves or servants (ibid. 160–64, 162 n. 70; and see §3.4.1 above).
fact depend on her interpretation of the traditions about Jesus’ table fellowship. The specification in Matt 14:21 and 15:38 as to the crowds’ constitution could independently point to that conclusion.

3.4.2.3. The source of the term πόρναί:

Corley is unconvincing with her suggestion that Matthew’s use of the term πόρναί implies any connection between its occurrence in his source, and the evangelist’s own community.285 The logical alternative is to accept: the authenticity of the tradition concerning Jesus’ table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners; that the latter may have included prostitutes; and that the reference to πόρναί derives from the historical Jesus.286

3.4.3. Significant issues:

Important points arising from the review of Corley’s studies are:

- the probable authenticity of the traditions that prostitutes were among the “sinners” who dined with Jesus, and that they were to be included in the kingdom;
- the identity of the παῖδεα in the marketplace as slaves or servants;
- the question as to whether the Q 7:33–34 accusations should be regarded as opposition slander.

4. The value of studying Jesus’ table fellowship:

It will be apparent from the discussion so far that Sanders’ reconstruction of the historical Jesus is considered the best to date, and that many, though not all, of his findings are accepted as accurate. One of his greatest achievements is the elucidation of the reason for Jesus’ execution: the offences that led to his death were his threat to

286 Rather than from either the Matthaean or the Q community, as Corley supposes (ibid.).
the temple and its authorities, and his claim to kingship, rather than his dining customs.  

However, the shift of focus away from Jesus’ table fellowship is an over-correction, since much of his teaching and ministry is depicted as taking place in the context of meals. Moreover, further investigation is warranted regarding the possibility of an actual dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees over the commensality issue. There is also a need to consider Jesus’ table fellowship as an entity in itself, rather than as if it were necessarily linked, symbolically or otherwise, to the eschatological banquet, and/or to ecclesiological by-products. It will therefore be necessary to examine in depth the traditions about Jesus at table, without being prejudiced by the concerns that usually constitute the major focus in Jesus research.

5. **Summary:**

The identification of sound principles to be used in this field of research led to a preliminary outline of a reconstructed historical Jesus. The material included at that initial stage envisaged Jesus as a Jewish, itinerant teacher who called disciples, who was regarded as an eschatological prophet and sage, who announced the imminence of the kingdom of God, and who taught using parables and aphorisms. Although he was portrayed for the most part as an observant Jew, he was reputed in Mark’s Gospel to have challenged the validity of the dietary restrictions imposed by the Torah. Moreover, it was found that Jesus’ values might well have been influenced by Cynic-Stoic concepts.

Although many points for debate were identified in the critique of works reviewed, the persuasive arguments of the scholars identified several more features

---

about the historical Jesus which may now be added to those considered virtually certain. These are that Jesus’ chief offence was his action against the temple, and that this led to his arrest and execution, and that he was regarded as a healer. Moreover, several significant issues arose from the literature review, and will be addressed in Part Three, viz.:

- the emphasis on table fellowship rather than on repentance, in Jesus’ relationship with toll collectors and sinners;
- the authenticity or otherwise of the tradition of Jesus’ commensality with toll collectors and sinners, the meaning behind it, and whether it functioned didactically;
- whether Jesus somehow issued invitations to the eschatological banquet by his table fellowship, and if so, by what means;
- the possible relationship between eating and healing;
- the categories of the Commensality Tradition and the Passion Tradition;
- the Persecution–Vindication folktale, especially with regard to the perceived link between Jesus and the Suffering Servant;
- the dichotomies between fasting and feasting, and between John and Jesus;
- the possibility that the παιδία in the marketplace (Luke 7:32 and par. Matt 11:16) were slaves or servants rather than children;
- whether the accusations cited in Q 7:33–34 should be seen as opposition slander. The literature review also highlighted the need for careful investigation of Hebrew and Graeco-Roman hospitality, feasting, and literary traditions of possible relevance to Jesus’ table fellowship.

---

289 See §3.1.1 in the review of Sanders’ work.
290 See §3.2.1.1 in the review of Crossan’s work.
CHAPTER TWO

MATERIALS, METHODS, AND APPROACH

1. Introduction:

This chapter is devoted mainly to the two broad topics of materials and methods, each of which is subdivided into smaller categories. The section on materials refers only to literary sources,¹ and is subdivided into two parts: (1) writings which have at least some claim as primary sources for the historical Jesus; and (2) literature which may provide indirect information about Jesus and/or his milieu. Comments are made as to the relative usefulness of literature in the second category.

§3, on methods, includes three main areas which impact on exegesis of significant texts: (1) the presuppositions about the Synoptic Problem; (2) authenticity criteria; and (3) rhetoric in the Gospels.

§4 outlines firstly, the approach to be adopted in this study, and secondly, the structure of Parts Two and Three of the thesis. The chapter closes with a summary.

2. Materials:

2.1. Primary sources:

2.1.1. Canonical Gospels:

The main sources for investigating the tradition of Jesus’ commensality with toll collectors and sinners are the canonical Gospels. In fact, since John does not include that aspect of Jesus’ table practice, the Synoptic Gospels furnish the most specific texts for the study.

¹ And so does not include evidence from the disciplines of archaeology, history, or anthropology. Discussion on these areas is inserted as necessary.
2.1.2. Extra-canonical gospels:

In his comprehensive discussion of the non-canonical sayings attributed to Jesus, Meier concludes that none of these is independent of the canonical Gospels.\(^2\) Nevertheless, in view of the many scholars who think otherwise, he recognises the need to make occasional reference to some of this material.\(^3\) Meier’s commentary on the apocryphal NT sources is valuable, but he errs in giving to the *Gospel of Thomas* only the same minor consideration that he allocates to the remainder of the material.\(^4\)

For the most part, I concur with his conclusions, but differ with him concerning the value of the *Gospel of Thomas*. Hence, in this study, no consideration will be given to the *agrapha*, nor to any apocryphal gospels other than the *Gospel of Thomas*, although non-canonical gospels may occasionally be mentioned in discussion.

The view that at least some portions of the *Gospel of Thomas* are independent and early is now widely held, and means that this source cannot be ignored in Jesus research. Indeed, for research in this field, Robinson regards the use of the *Gospel of Thomas* as an indicator of academic respectability.\(^5\) Similarly, Koester and Patterson argue that no current Jesus research is complete without “due consideration” being given to the *Gospel of Thomas*.\(^6\)

\(^2\) *Roots of the Problem*, 112–66, esp. 140. The sources are discussed by Meier under the categories of *agrapha*, apocryphal gospels, and the Nag Hammadi material. The controversy surrounding such material is mentioned briefly in my review of Crossan’s work. See above in Chapter One, §3.2.2.1. For a detailed survey on the arguments for and against the independence of the *Gospel of Thomas*, see Francis T. Fallon and Ron Cameron, “The Gospel of Thomas: A Forschungsbericht and Analysis,” *ANRW* 25.6:4195–251, esp. 4213–24.

\(^3\) *Roots of the Problem*, 139.

\(^4\) Viz. “the rabbinic material, the *agrapha*, and the other apocryphal gospels” (ibid.).

\(^5\) Robinson, “After Nag Hammadi,” 53. A relevant example of such a critique is Hurtado’s comment on Witherington’s failure to take the *Gospel of Thomas* into account [“Taxonomy” 280, n. 34, referring to the lack of reference to any extra-canonical evidence in *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990)]. It should be noted, however, that in his 1995 publication on the historical Jesus, Witherington discusses the *Gospel of Thomas* as part of his critique of the Jesus Seminar’s methodology (*Jesus Quest*, 40–57, esp. 48–53), and finds, correctly, that “all such sources should be evaluated with critical scrutiny” (ibid. 50).

The dating of the Gospel of Thomas remains a matter of debate, but it is increasingly recognised that some of its components may perhaps be from the late first century. A point that could be significant in this study, perhaps for the examination of the banquet parable (Luke 14:15–24; Matt 22:1–10; Gos. Thom. 64), is that some of the parables in the Gospel of Thomas may have a higher probability of authenticity than their parallel forms in the Synoptics.

2.2. Secondary sources:

2.2.1. Introduction:

There are no further sources providing possibly direct information about the historical Jesus. However, there is abundant literature that will be utilised for understanding first century Judaism and early Christianity, and for the investigation of ancient hospitality and feasting customs and conventions, and religious mores pertaining to them. This body of literature includes, of course, works by contemporaries of Jesus, such as Josephus and Philo, and if necessary, comments as to the dating and reliability of these sources will be made when they are cited.

---

7 Charlesworth, Judaism, 84, 100 nn. 19–20; idem, “Jesus, Early Jewish Literature,” 188–89; Craig A. Evans, Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 30, n. 84; Bruce Chilton, “The Gospel According to Thomas as a Source of Jesus’ Teaching,” in The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels (ed. David Wenham; Gospel Perspectives 5; Sheffield: JSOT, 1984), 155–75; Marshall, “Thomas and the Cynic Jesus,” 45, re the binary logia. However, while some elements of the Gospel of Thomas contain traditions that may predate their synoptic equivalents, the same should not be claimed for the entire gospel. Even Crossan admits that: “there may be traces” of the influence of the canonical Gospels on the Gospel of Thomas from “later transmission and transcription,” (Birth of Christianity, 119). In contrast, Koester and Patterson seem to assert that the whole of the Gospel of Thomas is independent and early. Their failure to differentiate between the part and the whole is particularly noticeable in “Authentic Sayings of Jesus?” esp. 32, 37. In reference to the gnosticising tendency of the Gospel of Thomas, Koester and Patterson comment that Gnosticism arose “much earlier than the second century,” and on those grounds apparently believe it is acceptable to attribute a first century dating to the gospel in its entirety (ibid. 37).


However some authors and literature require specific attention here, and these are discussed under the following headings:

NT writings other than Gospels
Rabbinic literature
Plutarch
Athenaeus
Literature relating to the Cynic Jesus hypothesis
   Cynic epistles
   Lucian
Homer

2.2.2. NT writings other than Gospels:

Reference will often be made to NT writings other than the Gospels, since they furnish information pertinent to early Christianity. The undisputed Pauline letters\textsuperscript{10} and Acts are of particular importance in this regard, providing a valuable supplement to Gospel material.

2.2.3. Rabbinic literature:

The vast body of rabbinic literature includes the Mishnah, the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, the Tosefta, the Targumim, and the midrashim.\textsuperscript{11} As Meier has demonstrated persuasively,\textsuperscript{12} this material cannot furnish any reliable information concerning the historical Jesus, since the Mishnah, which is usually considered the earliest of the rabbinic sources, dates from the late second or early third century.\textsuperscript{13}

---

\textsuperscript{10} Especially Galatians and 1 Corinthians.
\textsuperscript{11} Meier, \textit{Roots of the Problem}, 94.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid. 94–98, 105–111 nn. 38–63.
\textsuperscript{13} Meier, \textit{Roots of the Problem}, 94, 106 n. 39; see also David Noy, “The Sixth Hour is the Mealtime for Scholars: Jewish Meals in the Roman World,” in \textit{Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World} (ed. Inge Nielsen and Hanne Sigismund Nielsen; Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 1; Oxford: Aarhus University Press, 1998), 136, 142 n. 13. Meier does not acknowledge in the cited reference that some Targumim are considerably earlier than the Mishnah. However, he does mention elsewhere that Targumim of Job and Leviticus have been found at Qumran, proving that some existed in written form by the first century of the Common Era (\textit{Roots of the Problem}, 263–64; idem, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 262); he differentiates between these and the “later ‘classical’ targums” (\textit{Roots of the Problem}, 263, 265; idem, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 262). The Targumim are of little significance for the present study, other than re Jewish understanding of the kingdom of God at the time of Jesus. See §2.7.3.1 in Chapter One.
Nevertheless, some NT scholars, notably Charlesworth\textsuperscript{14} and Vermes,\textsuperscript{15} believe that
the rabbinic corpus constitutes an important source for understanding first century
Judaism, and hence for Jesus research.\textsuperscript{16} Regardless of the late dating of the Mishnah,
this approach may well be legitimate on the grounds that rabbinic decrees could
simply have been reflections of common practice.\textsuperscript{17} In other words, "the rabbis
codified the law as it was actually practiced."\textsuperscript{18} The concept gains credibility from
the evidence of correspondence between rabbinic law and papyri, showing that the
actual law predated rabbinic decisions, and was independent of them.\textsuperscript{19}

Furthermore, the Tosefta, i.e. \textit{Additions}, should also be taken into account for
Jesus research, since it contains materials that may be from the first and second
centuries.\textsuperscript{20} The dating and origin of the Tosefta are controversial. However, it is
possible that its compilers had access to the same Tannaitic sources as the redactors
of the Mishnah, and that the form of some of its tractates is earlier than in the
responding mishnaic halakoth.\textsuperscript{21}

Owing to uncertainty about the dating of rabbinic literature, its use as a
source is kept to a minimum in this study. The Mishnah and Tosefta are used to some
extent in Chapters Five and Six in relation to Pharisaic practices, and brief reference

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item \textsuperscript{14} "Jesus, Early Jewish Literature," 196.
\item \textsuperscript{15} \textit{Religion of Jesus}, 7–10, esp. 8–9.
\item \textsuperscript{16} On Neusner's work, see Chapter Six, esp. nn. 20–21, 23, 36. Many scholars consider the rabbinic
literature a dubious source for research on the historical Jesus. See e.g. Craig A. Evans, \textit{Jesus and His
Contemporaries}, 40.
\item \textsuperscript{17} E. P. Sanders, \textit{Practice and Belief}, 465.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid., citing Martin Goodman, \textit{State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132–212} (Oxford Centre
\item \textsuperscript{19} Sanders, \textit{Practice and Belief}, 465, following Goodman, \textit{State and Society}, 159–63. Seeing the
matter in this light may adequately address Hurtado’s concern that Vermes in fact uses the Gospels “to
illuminate and accredit the rabbinic sources as often preserving traditions much earlier than the dates
of the rabbinic works,” rather than the opposite that is the intention, i.e. to use “rabbinic materials to
\item \textsuperscript{20} Eduard Lohse, \textit{The New Testament Environment} (London: SCM, 1976), 176; Helmut Koester,
\textit{History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age} (vol. 1 of \textit{Introduction to the New Testament}; 2d
\end{thebibliography}
is made to midrashim in Chapter Four with respect to the marzeaḥ. However, none of the rabbinic literature is actually crucial to the fundamental hypothesis.

2.2.4. Plutarch:

The Greek author and biographer Plutarch (b. ca. 46–d. after 119 C.E.)\(^\text{22}\) is significant for two major reasons. Firstly, the span of his life indicates that his early works are roughly contemporaneous with the canonical Gospels. Secondly, his *Moralia* includes the nine “table talk” books, which provide considerable illumination of hospitality practices during the NT era.\(^\text{23}\) However, since one cannot assume that customs were precisely the same across the Mediterranean region, and Plutarch’s writings may postdate the Gospels by several decades, caution must be exercised, and his work will be used only as supporting evidence.

Extra caution is warranted by the facts that in *Moralia*, Plutarch was evidently influenced by the satirist Menippus (third century B.C.E.), and that he quoted frequently from Greek poetry, especially that of dramatists such as Euripides (ca. 484–406 B.C.E.).\(^\text{24}\) Thus his work consists of a *mixture* of traditions from several centuries, and is not necessarily applicable to the NT period. Moreover, he made a distinction between biography and history, and did not claim historicity for his characterisations in *Lives*.\(^\text{25}\) It is also noteworthy that the order in which Plutarch’s works were composed is indeterminable, so that *Quaestiones Convivales* cannot be


\(^{25}\) Walbank, “Plutarch,” 578.
dated with accuracy.\textsuperscript{26} Hence, there is no guarantee that the table talk books represent genuine first century sympotic conversation and hospitality practices.

2.2.5. Athenaeus:

The Greek grammarian Athenaeus was born in Naukratis, Egypt, at around the beginning of the third century C.E.\textsuperscript{27} His only extant work, \textit{Deipnosophistae}, provides extremely valuable information about banqueting in the ancient world despite its late dating, since it consists largely of quotations from many hundreds of writers.\textsuperscript{28} The citations are from a very wide period, from as early as Homer\textsuperscript{29} to authors of the Common Era, such as Plutarch.\textsuperscript{30} Hence they provide a wealth of data about the Graeco-Roman world, and insights into various aspects of feasting and hospitality. Of particular importance for this study is the background material provided by \textit{Deipnosophistae} on ἄκλητοι, the uninvited guests who feature prominently in comedy and in the literary symposium tradition.\textsuperscript{31}

2.2.6. Literature relating to the Cynic Jesus hypothesis:

2.2.6.1. Cynic epistles:

The Cynic letters are regarded as a significant source for understanding Cynicism,\textsuperscript{32} and have therefore been given considerable attention in NT scholarship since the notion of a Cynic Jesus became popular.\textsuperscript{33} Yet the Cynic epistles are actually of limited use in historical Jesus studies owing to uncertainties over dating. Malherbe's

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.; Donald A. Russell, “Plutarch,” \textit{OCD} 1200–1201.
\textsuperscript{27} Walter M. Edwards, Robert Browning, and Nigel G. Wilson, “Athenaeus (1),” \textit{OCD} 202.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29} E.g. Athen. 185a–188d.
\textsuperscript{30} E.g. Athen. 13a.
\textsuperscript{31} See Coffey, \textit{Roman Satire}, 188, 268 n. 54, on the literary tradition behind Petronius’ inclusion of an uninvited guest in his \textit{Satyricon}.
\textsuperscript{32} Malherbe, \textit{Cynic Epistles}, 1; idem, “Cynics,” \textit{IDBSup} 202.
\textsuperscript{33} See e.g. Crossan, \textit{Jewish Peasant}, 80–84; Cameron, “Characterizations,” 56; Downing, “Quite like Q,” 198 n. 7; D. E. Smith, “Historical Jesus at Table,” 475 n. 39; Leif F. Vaage, “Q: The Ethos and Ethics of an Itinerant Intelligence,” (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1987), 379.
statement that “most of the letters come from the Augustan age” is misleading,
since the writings derive from a very wide time span, and attempts to date them are
speculative and controversial. It is generally conceded that Cynicism declined
during the last two centuries B.C.E., and according to Malherbe, the Cynic epistles
are of particular value for the evidence they furnish about Cynicism during its
revival. This may be so, but particularly because of the difficulties involved with
dating, they do not provide any evidence for the existence of Cynicism in Galilee
during Jesus’ era. The significant issue is the gap in evidence pertaining to
Cynicism between Meleager of Gadara (ca. 135–50 B.C.E.) and Demetrius of Rome,
who cannot realistically be dated before the mid-first century C.E.

2.2.6.2. Lucian:

Lucian, the Greek satirist and rhetorician, was born in Samosata in ca. 120 C.E. and
died some time after 180. The precise outline of his life is uncertain, and the order
and dating of his works is therefore speculative, although some details can be
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34 Cynic Epistles, 2. See also idem, “Cynics,” 202.
35 The epistles of Ps.-Anacharsis are traditionally dated from the early Empire, but it now seems
probable that they are from the third century B.C.E., with the exception of Epistle 10, which is thought
to be earlier (Malherbe, Cynic Epistles, 6–7). The authorship and date of the Epistles of Crates remain
unresolved, but they are most likely from the first or second century C.E. (Ronald F. Hock,
“Introduction to the Epistles of Crates,” in Malherbe, Cynic Epistles, 10–11). The Epistles of
Diogenes are thought to comprise two, three, or four strands from different periods and multiple
authors; dates for the different collections are given as: group 1: (Epistles 8, 30, 31, 33, 35–38) first
century B.C.E.; group 2: (Epistles 1, 2, 4–7) unstated; group 3: second or third century C.E.; group 4:
from soon after 28 B.C.E. (Epistle 19 only) up to the fourth century C.E. (Malherbe, Cynic Epistles,
14–15). Alternatively, Epistles 1–29 may date from the first century B.C.E. or earlier, and Epistles
30–40 from about the second century C.E., and there may have been a further collection, Epistles
41–51 (ibid. 17). The Epistles of Heraclitus are all believed to be from the first century C.E., with
Epistle 3 as a possible exception (ibid. 22–25). Of the letters attributed to Socrates, Epistles 1–7 are
probably from the first century C.E. (ibid. 24; idem, “Self-Definition,” 50) but may be earlier (first
century B.C.E.), or later (second century C.E.) [idem, Cynic Epistles, 30 n. 11], while those attributed
to Socrates’ disciples (Epistles 8–27, 29–34) are likely to be from about 200 C.E. or later (ibid. 28–29).
Considering the wide-ranging and unconfirmed dates assigned to the Cynic epistles, it cannot
reasonably be claimed that a majority of them date from the Augustan age, i.e. the period 43 B.C.E. to
18 C.E. (See “Augustan Age,” Britannica, I:649.)
37 Cynic Epistles, 2.
38 Tuckett, “Cynic Q?” 355.
surmised. He is believed to have had Cynic sympathies, which are apparent in his characterisation of Demonax and Peregrinus, and in his satires.

Some background information on Lucian is necessary in this section owing to the inappropriate use of his work by a few NT scholars, particularly regarding Luke 7:18–35 and par. For instance, R. D. Cameron cites Lucian’s Hermotimus, (which he dates between 160 and 180 C.E.), regarding the reference in Luke 7:24 to “a reed shaken by the wind.” There may be a similarity here, but it is not a significant parallel. There is certainly no warrant for Cameron’s claim that the passage “confirms” the meaning of the Lucan phrase, especially considering the disparity of perhaps almost a century in the dates of composition. In the same article, Cameron draws indirectly on Lucian’s work by applying Malherbe’s identification of two types of Cynic—“ascetic” and “hedonistic”—to John and Jesus respectively. In so doing, he fails to acknowledge either that Malherbe’s argument relies heavily on Lucian’s Demonax for defining the divergence of the Cynic types, or that it focuses on Cynicism of the second and third centuries C.E.

40 Samosata, now modern Samsat, in Turkey, had at that time been within the Roman province of Syria since 72 C.E. (Robert Browning, “Lucian,” Britannica, 11:172).
41 Ibid.
42 Harold W. Attridge, “The Philosophical Critique of Religion under the Early Empire,” ANRW 16.1:62 n. 119; Malherbe, “Self-Definition,” 50–51. But cf. the opinion of Crossan, that “Lucian did not like Cynics, and the more Cynic they were, the less he liked them,” (Jewish Peasant, 86).
43 Cameron, “Characterizations,” 45.
44 I consider that the reed here is connected with the reference to flute-playing in v. 32, since it is wind (i.e. breath) causing a reed to shake (vibrate) that produces the sound of the instrument. The question “What did you go out to see . . . ?” is ironic, since people clearly went into the desert to hear John’s message, not to look at him. There is also humour in the notion that a reed shaken by wind could of itself produce a sound as it does in a flute. The contrast here between hearing and seeing also underlines the John/Jesus comparison which comprises the main motif in Luke 7:18–35. While John’s message was merely heard, Jesus’ ministry consisted of signs as well as proclamation, i.e. it was both seen and heard (v. 22).
45 The variation in dating could be up to 150 years if the phrase comes from the historical Jesus, which I think is likely.
46 “Self-Definition,” 50–51.
47 Cameron, “Characterizations,” 60. In this he is followed by Corley, Private Women, 157.
48 “Self-Definition,” 50–52.
49 Ibid. 46.
It should be mentioned here that Lucian is known to have used Eupolis and Aristophanes as models, and some of his borrowings are probably almost verbatim. Thus it is arguable that at least some excerpts from his writings predate the Gospels. However, no such claim can be made regarding the examples given above, and they clearly demonstrate that Lucian’s works are too late to be relevant for Jesus research. On the other hand, they may provide some useful insights on second century dining practices.

2.2.7. Homer:

There is substantial evidence that Homer’s works continued to be highly influential in the Roman period. Virgil, in his Aeneid, drew on mythology from Iliad, and Seneca wrote of the freedman whose slaves had to learn Homer and other major works by heart so that they could prompt him. Likewise, the many references to Homer in Petronius’ Satyricon testify to the continuing popularity of his works in the mid-first century C.E. Again, Plutarch and Athenaeus indicate Homer’s standing in the late first through early third centuries, by designating him as simply “the Poet.” Hengel witnesses to the significance of Homer in Palestine, and to knowledge of his work in Jerusalem, while Peter Marshall emphasises the importance of Homer’s writings for NT interpretation, and warns against distancing his influence from the

---

50 Both comedians of the late fifth century B.C.E. [Kenneth J. Dover, ‘Eupolis,’ OCD 571; idem, ‘Aristophanes (1),’ OCD 164 respectively].
52 Virgil (70–19 B.C.E.) died before completing the Aeneid, commenced ca. 30 B.C. (Don P. Fowler and Peta G. Fowler, ‘Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro),’ OCD 1602–07).
53 Koester, “Jesus the Victim,” 11.
54 Coffey, Roman Satire, 187–88, re Seneca, Ep. 27. 5–6.
55 See e.g. Petronius, Sat. 2, 5, 48, 58, 118, 139. Note also the reference to pictures in the hall depicting scenes from Iliad and Odyssey (Petronius, Sat. 29).
56 E.g. Plutarch, Mor. 8F; Athenaeus, Deipn. 487f. See also Athenaeus, Deipn. 493, for use of the title by Sosibius, historian of Sparta in the third century B.C.E. Theon, too, referred to the epithet “the Poet” [R. O. P. Taylor, The Groundwork of the Gospels (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), 77], but note that the period of his lifetime is uncertain (see below in §3.3.3.3).
world of Paul. Thus, it seems safe to assume some familiarity with Homer in Palestine in the first century C.E., at least among the literate sector of society.

Although there were obviously differences between Homeric dining customs and those of the NT period, the Poet's works and their continuing influence in that period are of particular importance for the examination of hospitality traditions, which appear to have remained constant through the centuries.

3. **Methods:**

3.1. *Relationships among the canonical Gospels:*

Crossan rightly stresses the need to clarify one's presuppositions concerning the Synoptic Problem. He opts for: Marcan priority; the existence of the "Q Gospel"; and the dependence of John on the Synoptic Gospels, especially for the Passion Narratives and resurrection account. The methodology used in this study is likewise based on the two-source hypothesis, though it differs from Crossan's. Q is treated with much more caution and as a merely hypothetical document, and some aspects of John's dependency on the Synoptics are regarded as uncertain.

The theory espousing Marcan priority and a common source for Matthew and Luke is not accepted universally but is still favoured by the majority of NT scholars. An important dissident is Sanders, who considers that Matthew was known to Luke,
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57 *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:86, 1:103 respectively.
58 *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (WUNT 2/23; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), x.
60 *Birth of Christianity*, 109–14.
61 On this matter I share Meier's scepticism as to the notions currently being postulated about Q (*Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 178).
62 I concur with Meier re the possibility that some of the details supplied by John may be historically accurate, esp. with regard to the Last Supper and the day on which Jesus died (*Roots of the Problem*, 45). See also Chapter Eight, §3.3.1.
63 Meier, *Roots of the Problem*, 43–45, 50–53 nn. 8–22, esp. bibliography in 51–52 nn. 11–12. See also Loader, "Jesus Puzzle," 137, n. 17, for a brief summary of the current debate, and some useful bibliography on recent alternative views.
and that there was a degree of cross-influence between each of the Synoptic Gospels. However, as we have seen in the review of Sanders’ work, his preference for Matthew over Luke is not always convincing. We will therefore consider textual parallels on a case by case basis, and where necessary, will attempt to reconstruct the most primitive form of Q passages from the parallel texts in Matthew and Luke. Sondergut passages (i.e. special Luke and special Matthew) will be referred to as L and M respectively.

Whereas the presuppositions held about the Gospel of John are of little relevance to the present topic, those on Q are highly significant, and require further comment. Q remains a hypothetical document of uncertain provenance and genre, yet for three decades it has been the focus of rigorous study, with Kloppenborg’s work on stratification being of particular importance for Jesus research. His division of Q into three layers has been misused by some NT scholars, who have

64 Jesus and Judaism, esp. 394 n. 38, 399 n. 59 and also 143, 380 n. 87, 144–45, 377 n. 45. See also idem, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition (SNTSMS 9; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), esp. 278–79, re Sanders’ view that many scholars hold too rigidly to the two-source hypothesis, which he believes does not warrant the degree of certainty accorded to it.

65 See §§3.1.2.3 and 3.1.3 in Chapter One.

66 Braun notes the uncertainty as to the provenance of Q (Feasting and Social Rhetoric, 124 n. 80). Koester believes it was redacted in a Greek-speaking environment rather than a place where Aramaic was the predominant language, and suggests this occurred in Galilee within three decades of Jesus’ death [Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 164, 170]. Tuckett refers to the debate concerning Q’s provenance but accepts Galilee as probable (“Cynic Q?” 356). Downing comments on the suggestion that Q was composed in Aramaic, and translated into Greek (“Quite like Q,” 197 n. 5). Kloppenborg and Horsley both believe Q derives from Galilee, although opting for different locales [John S. Kloppenborg, “The Formation of Q Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley,” SBL Seminar Papers, 1989 (SBLSP 28; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989), 212].


68 E.g. the Society of Biblical Literature’s Q Seminar, and the International Q Project.

69 Formation of Q.
ignored his warning that the distinction between strata is purely literary, and not relevant to tradition history.\textsuperscript{70} Such misappropriation has probably contributed to the rejection of Kloppenborg’s findings by a few NT scholars,\textsuperscript{71} since, as Chilton has argued, the notion of stratigraphy in the Gospel texts is fallacious.\textsuperscript{72} He states that:

The analogy of texts to tells presupposes that inert matter overlays the “original” object beneath, which only needs to be discovered in its pristine primitivity. But a text is not a tell . . . [W]e only have access to Jesus insofar as the texts that claim to convey him in fact do so. There is no “primitive,” “historical,” “authentic,” or otherwise real Jesus apart from what the texts promulgate.

(\textit{Temple of Jesus}, 114)

Although the identification of disparate blocks of material in Q appears entirely valid, I share Chilton’s view that the historical Jesus cannot be retrieved by the removal of allegedly later “strata.” Therefore, although the now conventional designations for “layers” in Q may be utilised in discussion, no components of Q will be regarded as necessarily earlier than others, and textual units will be examined in their entirety.\textsuperscript{73}

3.2. \textit{Authenticity criteria:}

The notion of texts as “tells” is conspicuous in Polkow’s methodology for determining the supposedly authentic words of Jesus. He designates the three layers of words attributed to Jesus as “redactional,” “traditional,” and “original”, and the

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid. 244–45. See also Marshall’s comment re Kloppenborg’s results not always being used appropriately (“\textit{Thomas} and the Cynic Jesus,” 39–40, nn. 11–12).


\textsuperscript{73} Kloppenborg himself has emphasised that “[s]ayings cannot be treated in isolation of their redactional context,” and that “[t]he order of Q must be respected,” (“\textit{Formation of Q Revisited},” 211).
method involves working from the outside stratum to the inside, like “peeling away layers of an onion.” \(^74\) Hooker has in view such representations of texts in her critique of the conventional authenticity criteria,\(^75\) in which she argues that the *tools* used in the attempt to identify dominical sayings are inadequate for the task.\(^76\) The notion that by removing layers of material, the historical Jesus and/or his actual sayings can be recovered with any certainty has already been dismissed,\(^77\) and no such attempt is made in this study. However, key passages will be examined with the object of identifying which sayings, parables, or deeds are most likely to be authentic.\(^78\) This process will be conducted with a view to the possibility that the original form and/or context may be irrecoverable.\(^79\) Noteworthy here is the concept that the employment of authenticity criteria is an art rather than a science, and so requires sensitivity to each specific instance.\(^80\)

A useful coverage of the authenticity criteria is that of Meier, who describes five primary and five secondary criteria.\(^81\) The primary criteria are:

(1) embarrassment; (2) discontinuity; (3) multiple attestation; (4) coherence; and (5) rejection and execution. The criteria are designed for use in concert, and according to Meier, none should be applied singly.\(^82\)


\(^76\) Ibid. 570.

\(^77\) See §3.1 above, and also Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 133, 148; Meier, *Roots of the Problem*, 174.

\(^78\) Here I follow Sanders’ interpretation of “authentic” as applicable to a saying “which we have good reason to believe is as close to something Jesus said as we can hope for” (*Jesus and Judaism*, 357 n. 30).


\(^80\) Meier, *Roots of the Problem*, 184, 195 n. 69. See also Boring’s opinion that discussion of authenticity criteria can properly proceed only in relation to designated texts [“The Historical-Critical Method’s ‘Criteria of Authenticity’: The Beatitudes in Q and Thomas as a Test Case,” *Semeia* 44 (1988): 24].

\(^81\) *Roots of the Problem*, 167–95, esp. 168–84. The secondary criteria are regarded as dubious (ibid. 168), and are not utilised in the current study.

\(^82\) Ibid. 184.
The criterion of embarrassment is particularly important for the present study since it is applicable to some key texts. Notably, these include the accusation that Jesus was a glutton and drunkard; his table fellowship with tax collectors and sinners; and his pronouncement that sinners would precede the righteous into the kingdom. The principle behind the criterion is that since such texts would have caused embarrassment, they could not have been created by the early church.

The criterion of discontinuity (or dissimilarity) has the basic thrust that: “material which stands in contrast to both Judaism and Christianity is likely from Jesus.” This is one of the most utilised and highly ranked criteria, although it also attracts much criticism. For instance, Charlesworth points out that systematic employment of the criterion by Perrin and others led to a portrayal of Jesus as non-Jewish. However, some of the criticism of the method is undeserved, and probably stems from a misunderstanding of the principle as it was used and stated by Bultmann. As Boring has demonstrated, Bultmann did not employ the principle in isolation from other criteria; moreover, he cited it as an observation relevant to parables, and not as a general principle. Hooker has defined the crux of the problem as the inherent confusion arising from the fact that the English word distinctive may imply either the “dissimilar” (verschieden), or the “peculiar”
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83 For some other examples see ibid. 169–70; Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 91. For the application of the criterion to Luke 7:31–34 see James Breech, The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 22–31. However, note Meier’s harsh critique of Breech’s work (Roots of the Problem, 185 n. 2).
84 Ibid. 168.
85 Boring, “Criteria of Authenticity,” 17. Note also 17 n. 13, re the views of James Robinson and Dennis Polkow in relation to this definition.
87 Judaism, 167. See also Meier, Roots of the Problem, 172.
88 J. Howard Marshall, Last Supper and Lord’s Supper (The Didsbury Lectures; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1980), 169 n. 20.
89 Boring, “Criteria of Authenticity,” 17–18. Bultmann’s statement concerns Gleichnisse und Verwandtes, i.e. “similarities and related forms” (ibid. 18 n. 16). Bultmann was not the first to use the principle, but his formulation and employment of it were highly influential (ibid. 17, n. 14).
qualities of a person. In her opinion, the method can only determine the former, although the target is the latter, i.e. what is characteristic or typical of Jesus. Meier has a more optimistic attitude to the use of the criterion, based on the modest aim of determining the sorts of things that Jesus generally did and said, rather than his precise actions or words. Ultimately, the method cannot determine anything with certainty, and is merely a tool for ascertaining degrees of probability as to the authenticity of a particular text.

The explanation of the remaining three primary criteria is less complex than for the first two. The criterion of multiple attestation applies to words or deeds of Jesus occurring in more than one independent source, and/or more than one genre or form. When a motif occurs in several forms as well as in multiple sources the probability of its authenticity is enhanced. Conversely, however, attestation in only a single source or form does not rule out the possibility of authenticity. The criterion of coherence (or conformity or consistency) is utilised only after a corpus of reliable material has been established by means of the first three criteria. It may then be possible to infer the authenticity of further sayings or actions that cohere well with material already established as likely to derive from Jesus. It is important to avoid applying this criterion negatively, i.e. to assume that a saying or action cannot be dominical owing to its inconsistency with supposedly authentic material. The criterion of rejection and execution focuses attention on the historical circumstances

90 “Wrong Tool,” 574. See also Boring, “Criteria of Authenticity,” 21.
91 “Wrong Tool,” 574.
92 Roots of the Problem, 174.
94 Meier, Roots of the Problem, 174.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid. 175.
97 Ibid. 176.
98 Ibid. 176–77.
behind Jesus’ death, recognising that he indubitably alienated some people and represented a threat to the authorities. Application of this criterion should prevent the reconstruction of a figure that is bland, non-threatening, and not at all similar to the historical Jesus.  

3.3. **Rhetoric in the Gospels:**

3.3.1. **Introduction:**

In its ancient sense, as employed by Aristotle, *rhetoric* refers to the artful use of language, as a practical means of persuasion. Having originated with the rise of numerous Greek philosophical schools in the fifth century B.C.E., rhetoric remained a significant cultural phenomenon through the early centuries of the Common Era. Although numerous *Arts* (i.e. τεχναί, or handbooks of rhetoric) were written from the fifth century onwards, Aristotle was the first to compose one on a scientific and systematic basis, and to include the topic of proofs. Aristotle’s *Art*, and that composed by Ps.-Cicero in ca. 88–82 B.C.E., are of particular importance for NT exegesis, since they provide valuable information concerning Graeco-Roman rhetoric. Many stylistic features and figures of speech recommended by Aristotle are evident in the Synoptic Gospels, showing that these remained current in the first century; they include metaphors, similes, apophthegms, riddles, paradoxes, jokes,
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99 Ibid. 177.
102 “Art” of Rhetoric, xiii–xxv.
103 Ibid. xxii.
105 Ibid. 73, 91 n. 40. Ad Herennium is the earliest extant work demonstrating the adaptation of Greek rhetorical style by a Roman author ([Cicero], Rhetorica ad Herennium, vii).
wordplay, proverbs, and hyperbole. However, the rhetorical forms of greatest
significance for present-day Jesus research are παραβολή and χρεία, and each of these
requires specific comment.

3.3.2. Parables:
Aristotle categorises proofs as either examples (παράδειγμα), or enthymemes, and
makes a distinction between examples that are historical and those that are fictitious.
Those in the fictitious category are further subdivided into comparison (παραβολή)
and fable (λόγος). According to Aristotle the term παραβολή means a comparison
that is realistic and readily imaginable, whereas a λόγος is a purely fictional
illustration. However, παράδειγμα is employed by Aristotle to mean both an
example in a general sense and also an historical example, and the difference
between παραβολή, λόγος, and historical example appears to be in their content rather
than their form.

The approximate Hebrew equivalent of παραβολή is בְּּפָר, which is frequently
translated into English as parable in the LXX and as proverb in the OT. However,
neither of these translations adequately expresses the multiple meanings of the
Hebrew term, which also include: a saying of any of various categories; a wisdom
saying; a mocking song; an engaging mind-teaser, or tease word; a riddle, or

105 “Art” of Rhetoric, xlvii–iii; metaphor: 3.2.6–15; 3.3.4; 3.10.7; 3.11.5; simile: 3.4.1; apophthegm:
2.12.6; 2.21.8; 3.11.6; riddle: 2.21.8; 3.2.12; paradox: 2.23.16; 3.11.6; joke: 3.11.6; 3.18.7; wordplay:
3.11.7; proverb: 1.6.20, 22; 1.11.25 etc. Note also that the same major rhetorical forms as are in the
Synoptics, occur in the roughly contemporary Satyricon of Petronius, viz.: allegorical interpretation,
107 Rhet. 2.20.1–2.
108 Ibid. 2.20.4–8; and see “Art” of Rhetoric, 274 note a.
109 Rhet. 1.2.9; 2.20.1.
110 M. H. McCall, Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
111 Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 145; Freyne, Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 57.
112 William L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (10th ed.;
oracle; a historical recital, a revelatory discourse, or a short story containing a complex allegory.¹¹⁴ The last of these meanings is significant in light of Jülicher’s view that each of Jesus’ parables has only a single point of comparison. Meier notes that allegorical traits are characteristic of the OT prophets and rabbinic literature, and therefore argues that the existence of such elements in synoptic parables need not necessarily be ascribed to the evangelists, or to the early church.¹¹⁵

From our examination of the backgrounds behind the term παραβολή and its approximate equivalent בֵּטַר, it is clear that caution must be exercised in appraising the synoptic “parables.” In view of the rich variety of meanings for בֵּטַר, παραβολή may properly be regarded as a Jewish pedagogical device, used in rabbinic literature as well as by Jesus.¹¹⁶ However, the distinctiveness of Jesus’ parables has been overemphasised by some scholars,¹¹⁷ and on the grounds of Graeco-Roman rhetorical practice it would perhaps be reasonable to claim that they are Hellenic rather than Hebraic.¹¹⁸ We must therefore consider whether the synoptic parables represent a combination of Hellenistic and Jewish traits. Such elements would have blended naturally; for instance, the inherent wittiness of the Hebrew בֵּטַר made it an ideal rhetorical device, since the employment of clever sayings and riddles was

---

¹¹³ Meier, Roots of the Problem, 6–7.
¹¹⁴ Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 146. See Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 75 n. 139 re Mark 7:15 as a בֵּטַר or riddle.
¹¹⁵ Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 146. See also Charlesworth, Judaism, 140, 158 nn. 18–20; Witherington, Jesus the Sage, 159–160, nn. 43–44; Kenneth E. Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1980), xxi.
¹¹⁷ E.g. Scott, who asserts that the parable as a form is limited to the Jesus and rabbinic traditions (“Jesus as Sage,” 401).
¹¹⁸ So Taylor, Groundwork, 81, 88.
recommended.\textsuperscript{119} Again, it was advised that in order to achieve vividness in public speaking, one should incorporate things that were familiar to the audience;\textsuperscript{120} this is surely applicable to Jesus' utilisation of themes and settings relevant to his hearers. Freyne's description of the way in which Jesus used parables is illuminating here:

\ldots a new and creative manner that combine[d] biblical images with thoroughly realistic everyday experiences drawn from the commercial, social and political life of Galilee. (Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 256)

From this representation, it is apparent that while Jesus typically engaged his audience by means of the παράβολη, a recognisably Hellenistic rhetorical tool, the context and content of his teaching were Jewish. Hence, it is necessary to take account of both the Hellenistic and the Hebraic elements that may underlie the parables recounted in the Synoptics.\textsuperscript{121}

Some final points concerning Jesus' parables are that they seem to have been transmitted in a relatively intact state,\textsuperscript{122} and that the presence of triadic form may be a factor in the determination of authenticity.\textsuperscript{123}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} Aristotle, \textit{Rhet.} 3.1.6. Note also Meier's view of Jesus as using powerful Jewish rhetorical traditions, esp. στράφω (“Reflections,” 92–93).
\item \textsuperscript{120} Aristotle, \textit{Rhet.} 3.10.2; 3.10.6.
\item \textsuperscript{121} A pertinent example of such an approach is provided by Farmer, who recognises the “distinctively Palestinian cast” of synoptic parables used to illustrate chreiai, as well as acknowledging the influence of Hellenistic rhetoric (“Material Peculiar to Luke,” 311–12).
\item \textsuperscript{122} Sanders and Davies, \textit{Synoptic Gospels}, 185.
\end{itemize}
3.3.3. *χρεία*.

3.3.3.1. Introduction:

In current Jesus research, several scholars are acting on the belief that *chreiai* were the basic units that the evangelists utilized for the composition of the synoptic passages known as pronouncement stories. The hypothesis is that at the heart of pronouncement stories are original *chreiai* which have been embellished in accordance with an established pattern, and which can be retrieved by removing the redactional material. Since several of the passages concerned are particularly significant in this study, it is necessary to explore the methodology involved, and expose any flaws. The topic is treated under the headings of (1) definition of the term *chreia*; (2) the Progymnasmata; (3) elaboration of the *chreia*; (4) *chreia* elaboration in the Synoptic Gospels; (5) Hellenistic vs. Hebraic traits; (6) caveats.

3.3.3.2. Definition of the term *chreia*:

At the outset, it must be stated that the meaning of *chreia* is vague, and that the term is difficult to define. According to Aune, the *chreia* in Graeco-Roman biography refers to an *anecdote*, and means essentially a saying and/or action

---

124 Hereafter, the conventional transliterated form of the Greek term is used for convenience.
126 See Mack, “Cynic-like Jesus,” 27–28 for a concise explanation of the theory, and a select list of core *chreiai* from the Synoptics; *idem*, *Myth of Innocence*, 379–84 for a table of the pronouncement stories in Mark.
within a brief narrative setting. He distinguishes the *chreia* from its expanded form, which is termed a *reminiscence* (ἀπομνημόνευμα), and from the *maxim* (γνώμη), which is a proverbial saying that lacks a narrative framework and an attribution to a person. The plural of the term is used to designate a collection of anecdotes, such as the works (titled Χρείαι) composed from the fourth century B.C.E. onwards by Aristippus, Demetrius of Phalerum, Hecaton, Metrocles of Maronea, Diogenes, and Zeno. The Cynic philosopher Metrocles is sometimes erroneously credited with having created the genre of Χρείαι, but the title had already been used by Aristippus. It is also noteworthy that although some biographies consisted primarily of chreiai, and the title Χρείαι was utilised extensively by Cynics and Stoics, the genre was not limited to *Lives* of philosophers.

One of the difficulties involved in defining the *chreia* accurately is that although it was in common usage by the fourth century B.C.E., it was not described by Aristotle. In rhetorical literature the oldest extant example of a *chreia* and its expansion is found in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and is thus to be dated from the early first century B.C.E. At a later time, the technique of *chreia* elaboration was used pedagogically in secondary schools, but the earliest textual evidence of this is

---

130 Ibid. 110.
131 Ibid. 110. Re maxims, see also Aristotle, Rhet. 2.21.
134 Ibid. Parts of Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* also reveal the ancestry of the Χρείαι genre (J. D. Denniston and K. J. Dover, “chreia,” *OCD* 325).
135 Ibid. 324–25.
137 G. W. Buchanan, *Jesus: The King and His Kingdom* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1984), 53. Buchanan (ibid.) notes Diogenes Laertius’ attribution of a *chreia* to Aristotle (Diogenes Laertius 5.18), and suggests that Aristotle “seems to have known the word,” although he did not comment on it as a literary form. However, the attribution, made many centuries after Aristotle’s death, is very unlikely to be authentic, and is irrelevant to the present discussion.
138 *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 370 note d; 4.43.56–44.57, (pp. 370–75).
139 Ibid. vii. The work is “from the second decade of the first century,” (ibid.).
from the *progymnasmata* of the second and third centuries. As Gow has stressed, not all *chreiai* were appropriate for use in the schoolroom. For instance, Machon’s anecdotes involve courtesans, parasites, and gluttons, and even those without risqué contents are unsuitable for pedagogical purposes; likewise, many of the *chreiai* cited by Diogenes Laertius would be inappropriate for use in education.

3.3.3.3. The *Progymnasmata:*

Considerable uncertainty exists over the background and dating of the early *Progymnasmata.* The earliest extant representative of these textbooks is generally believed to be that of Aelius Theon of Alexandria, although there is evidence of others having existed, probably in the first century B.C.E. It is assumed by Hock that these earlier manuals would have been much less complex than Theon’s. Of three textbooks published in the second century, the only surviving one is that of Hermogenes. Hock and O’Neill have posited that Theon’s textbook dates from between the mid-first century and the early second century C.E., although they acknowledge the lack of confirmation, and that a fourth or fifth century dating remains possible.

---

141 Note that risqué contents would not necessarily have been regarded as inappropriate in a Greek educational context in antiquity. Re the use of erotic expressions in a pedagogical setting see James R. Butts and Ronald F. Hock, “The Chreia Discussion of Aphonius of Antioch: Introduction, Translation and Comments,” in Hock and O’Neill, *Progymnasmata,* 231 n. 6.
144 Ibid. 10, 52 n. 57.
145 Ibid. 11. The textbook of Hermogenes of Tarsus is dated to the last third of the second century (ibid.).
147 Ibid. 64, 75–76 nn. 10–15. The fourth or fifth century dating for Theon is based on the evidence of papyrus fragments of his *Progymnasmata* (ibid. 64, 76 n. 12). The acceptance of an early date for Theon in the majority of recent studies is based on the conclusions of W. Stegemann, “Theon,” *PW S* A: 2037–39, although the arguments advanced for it are rarely compelling, as Stegemann admits (ibid. 2038; Hock and O’Neill, “Chreia Discussion of Theon,” 75–76 n. 11).
A further issue concerning the *Progymnasmata* is the substantial development that occurred during their long history. Theon did not, in fact, employ the conventional term *progymnasma*, but referred to an exercise as either a γύμνασμα or less frequently, a γυμνασία.  

Similarly, Hermogenes utilised only the term γυμνάσματα for his exercises, and *Progymnasmata* did not become the standard title for such textbooks until it was adopted by Aphthonius at the end of the fourth century. Moreover, the *function* of the textbooks altered over the centuries, becoming narrower in its scope. Whereas Theon viewed his exercises as beneficial for a broad range of writers, including historians, Aphthonius and the fifth century Nicolaus focused only on rhetoric. There is also evidence for modifications in *content* and *form*, as well as in nomenclature and function, from the exercises of Theon and Hermogenes through to those of Aphthonius. The differences are substantial, and include changes to the order and number of chapters on the various forms (*chreia*, fable, narrative, comparison, etc.).

A third factor to be considered is that the *Progymnasmata* were designed as written exercises to be undertaken in the schoolroom, and are not comparable with the rhetorical handbooks of the earlier centuries. Whereas the style manuals focused on grammar and provided written exercises in the use of various forms, the τέχναι set out the theory behind the art of persuasion, with an emphasis on oratory.

---

148 Hock, "Introduction," *Progymnasmata*, 12. The term προγυμνάσμα is used once by Theon, but it is not employed in a technical sense (ibid.).
149 Ibid. 12–13.
150 Ibid. Note that although the title *Progymnasmata* is acknowledged as incorrect for the textbooks of Theon and Hermogenes, Hock and O’Neill use it in order to avoid confusion (Hock, "Introduction," *Progymnasmata*, 15).
151 Ibid. 14, 54 nn. 92–93.
152 Ibid. 16.
153 See Mack and Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion*, 33, n. 1 for brief comments on the distinction between the τέχναι and the *Progymnasmata*.
The public speaker's tasks are delineated in *Ad Herennium* as conducting capable discussion, and securing the audience's agreement;\textsuperscript{156} and the means by which competency is acquired are listed as Theory, Imitation, and Practice.\textsuperscript{157} Admittedly, the theoretical element would have involved some written work, but Ps.-Cicero is believed to have had the speaker's practical needs in mind when he limited the complete argument to a mere five parts.\textsuperscript{158}

3.3.3.4. Elaboration of the *chreia*:

In contrast with the marked changes observed during the evolution of the *Progymnasmata* up to the late fourth century, there appears to have been little alteration to the *chreia* elaboration pattern established by the first century B.C.E. Yet the few modifications that occurred are significant. The earliest illustration of an expanded *chreia*, in *Ad Herennium*, includes: (1) the theme expressed simply; (2) the rationale, (3) a paraphrase of the theme, (4) the argument from the contrary, (5) the argument by comparison, (6) the argument from example, and (7) the conclusion.\textsuperscript{159}

Theon's discussion of *chreiai* is extremely complex,\textsuperscript{160} and largely irrelevant to the present topic. Nevertheless, an important difference from the technique described in *Ad Herennium* is Theon's inclusion of the citation of an ancient authority as an additional proof.\textsuperscript{161} This does not represent an *innovation* in rhetoric, however, as it was already a fundamental proof for Aristotle.\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid. 1.2.2.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid. 1.2.3.
\textsuperscript{158} *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 106 note b.
\textsuperscript{159} *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.43.56–44.57. The editor of the text includes the testament from antiquity (μαρτύρια τῶν παλαιών) as if it were combined with the section on the argument from Example (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 373 note e). Mack and O'Neill rightly point out that this is not the case ("Chreia Discussion of Hermogenes," 181).
\textsuperscript{160} See Hock and O'Neill, 83–112.
\textsuperscript{162} Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.15.3; 1.15.13–15.19, esp. 1.15.17; re the trustworthiness of ancient witnesses. See also [Aristotle], *Rhet. Alex.* 1.1422 a.27; Mack and Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion*, 41.
The techniques recommended by Hermogenes and Aphthonius, advising eight topics for the elaboration (ἐργασία) of a chreia, are both comparable with the system proposed in *Ad Herennium*, although like Theon’s, they include the testimony of an ancient authority. For Hermogenes, however, the addition of an ancient witness as a “proof” is merely an option, and Mack and O’Neill surmise that a “Statement by authority” was not regularly included in the ἐργασία in the second century of the Common Era. The reason given is that, as demonstrated by the lack of the testament from antiquity in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, the elaboration technique was still fluid in the first century B.C.E., and remained so into the second century C.E. Other differences from Ps.-Cicero’s chreia expansion are the addition of an encomium at the beginning, and that Hermogenes’ epilogue comprises an exhortation.

Hence, in assessing the place of the chreia in the rhetoric of the first century C.E., we need to remember that the provision of a proof was much less complex than in the second and later centuries. The form of rhetorical art was more fluid, and not influenced to the same extent by pedagogical concerns. From *Ad Herennium* it is

---


165 Ibid. 181 n. 14.

166 Ibid.


168 Mack seems incautious in his claim that: “it is now accepted that both the progymnasmata and the institution it [sic] assumes were current as early as the first century B.C.E.,” (“Decoding the Scripture,” 85, n. 13). He has apparently been misled by Kennedy, who assumes, merely on the grounds of the conservative nature of ancient education, that the progymnasmata were used at least as far back as “Hellenistic times” [The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1963), 270]. Kennedy also asserts (ibid.) that “the term progymnasmata is used of exercises in the Rhetorica ad Alexandrum (1436 a.25).” However, as Hock points out, the occurrence of προγύμνασμα in that instance is “ambiguous and perhaps questionable” (“Introduction,” *Progymnasmata*, 10, 52 n. 55). See also [Aristotle], *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, (trans. H. Rackham; LCL, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 374 n. 4.
clear that in the first century B.C.E., the accent was as much, or more, on imitation of others and on improving by practising the art, rather than on following rigid theoretical guidelines. Moreover, Fischel has argued convincingly that in Palestine, in the Hasmonean and Roman periods, rhetorical art in its popular form could readily have been learned by means of oral communication.\textsuperscript{169} His hypothesis is followed by Silberman, who suggests that with regard to Gospel texts:

\begin{quote}
rather than deal with the chriae . . . from an educational-institutional perspective, watching to make sure rules are heeded, it may be more illuminating to accept an informal, popular source of teaching and learning. One heard stories and one told stories in the way one heard them.\textsuperscript{170}
\end{quote}

We can surmise then, that prior to the \textit{Progymnasmata} it would have been possible, by emulating gifted orators, to learn and employ the art of persuasion without necessarily undertaking formal instruction. With this in mind, we turn now to considering whether the \textit{Progymnasmata} have a place in NT studies.

3.3.3.5. \textit{Chreia} elaboration in the Synoptic Gospels:

The main point at issue here is whether it is appropriate to use the \textit{Progymnasmata} for analysing synoptic passages. At a superficial level, they appear to provide a valuable source for understanding how \textit{chreiai} may have been employed in a pedagogical context in the early centuries of the Common Era. However, a number of factors count against the legitimacy of using them for analysing NT texts.

Dating:

Since the *chreia* expansion pattern in *Ad Herennium* was established a century before Jesus’ lifetime, it is theoretically possible for him to have known and utilised any of the rhetorical devices it contains. In contrast, the style manuals of Theon, Hermogenes, and Aphthonius are all significantly later than the historical Jesus.\(^{171}\) None of them can legitimately be applied to the early first century, and their use for analysis of synoptic passages is inevitably based on the presupposition that the majority of the material is redactional.\(^{172}\) Of course, assumptions made in such analyses may be correct; however, I would argue that the claims ought not to be made on the basis of *chreia* elaboration patterns in the *Progymnasmata*.

Furthermore, there are demonstrable differences between the *chreia* elaborations in each of these three *Progymnasmata*. It is therefore methodologically inept to regard them as interchangeable, on the pretext that they are equivalent to one another and to the earliest established pattern in *Ad Herennium*.\(^{173}\) Hence, Ps.-Cicero’s *chreia* elaboration pattern is the only version suitable for use in synoptic analysis.

Definition:

As seen above, the term *chreia* has a variety of meanings, and there is doubt about the appropriateness of later definitions, since there is no evidence that they were

---

\(^{171}\) Cameron’s article on Q 7:18–35 is a practical example of the unsuitability of Hermogenes’ elaboration pattern for NT exegesis. He finds it necessary to omit Part 1, the encomium, and to modify Part 8, the exhortation, because they are inappropriate for the task (“Characterizations,” 50–51, 60).

\(^{172}\) A prime example is Cameron’s analysis of Q 7:18–35 (ibid. 35–69). He asserts that the manner in which the passage was composed may be revealed by comparing it with Hermogenes’ *chreia* elaboration pattern (ibid. 46–47), and finds only vv. 19 and 23 to be authentic (ibid. 51–52). Although the parable in Luke 7:31–35 has a good claim to authenticity (Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 144–45, 209–10 nn. 136–38), Cameron is constrained by his methodology to attribute it to the Q community (“Characterizations,” 59–60).

\(^{173}\) See for instance Cameron, who seems to cite whichever definition or system is most expedient at a given point (“Characterizations,” 46, 60 (Aphthonius); 46–50 (Hermogenes); 53 (Theon)). Mack, who dates Hermogenes to the third century, acknowledges that there is “a slight problem in historical
applicable in Jesus’ lifetime. By the time of Theon the *chreia* not only has an essential connection with a specific person or type, but must also be concise, witty, and aptly attributed. It is not necessarily useful for living\textsuperscript{174} (Ἐξουσιαν ἔρωτεις or ἐν τῷ βιῶ ἥρωιμων).\textsuperscript{175} Hermogenes’ definition is similar: “A chreia is a reminiscence of some saying or action or a combination of both which has a concise resolution, generally for the purpose of something useful.”\textsuperscript{176} In differentiating the *chreia* from a reminiscence (ἀπομνημόνευμα) and a maxim, Hermogenes stipulates that the *chreia* must be concise, that it frequently occurs in question and answer form, that it has to do with actions, and has a character who has acted or spoken.\textsuperscript{177} Aphthonius defines the *chreia* simply as “a concise reminiscence aptly attributed to some character,” but adds that it is so called because “it is useful.”\textsuperscript{178} The variation between the definitions, particularly as to whether a *chreia* is essentially useful,\textsuperscript{179} gives us pause in the imposition of too strict a meaning on the term, especially for the early first century. With respect to this period, one should heed Aune’s warning against the distinctions made by the rhetoricians in the *Progymnasmata*, between the several types of Greek sayings.\textsuperscript{180} He suggests using the term “wisdom saying” for forms such as *chreiai* that lack a narrative framework, and “wisdom story” for those with a narrative framework and other structural elements.\textsuperscript{181}

\textsuperscript{174} Hock and O’Neill, “Chreia Discussion of Theon,” 83, 109 nn. 1–2.
\textsuperscript{175} Theon, Προφ. Χρησιμος, lines 15, 16, respectively.
\textsuperscript{176} Mack and O’Neill, “Chreia Discussion of Hermogenes,” 175.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{178} Butts and Hock, “Chreia Discussion of Aphthonius,” 225.
\textsuperscript{179} I am inclined to agree with Buchanan regarding the concept of the *chreia*’s usefulness; i.e. that the later rhetoricians simply deduced it from the etymology of the word (*Jesus: The King*, 45), and that it was not originally an essential element.
\textsuperscript{181} Ibid. 65.
The ascription of the term *chreia* for the “Theme” that is expanded in *Ad Herennium* (4.43.57) adds weight to Aune’s argument, since the saying appears more like a *maxim*, and is referred to as such by Mack and O’Neill.\(^{182}\) Here it is illuminating to consider Theon’s definition of a *chreia*, which stipulates that the attribution is to “some specified character or to something analogous to a character.” This may probably be understood as including an *archetypal* figure like “the wise man” (*sapiens*)\(^{183}\) in the saying cited by Ps.-Cicero.\(^{184}\) Hence, in the context of Jesus research, it is prudent to adopt a relatively loose description of the *chreia*, as Meier has done: “a short narrative framework or initial question introduces a pithy and memorable saying of a philosopher or some other great person.”\(^{185}\)

**Use of *chreiai*:**

Another reason for selecting Ps.-Cicero’s pattern for investigation of the Synoptic Gospels is that it functions as a “complete argument,”\(^{186}\) not merely as the elaboration of a *chreia*.\(^{187}\) This factor sets the matter in perspective, serving as a reminder that the characterisation of famous philosophers and others was not the only application of *chreiai*.\(^{188}\) They were also expanded for the sole purpose of furnishing rhetorical proofs to an audience.

\(^{183}\) Ibid. p. 370.
\(^{185}\) Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 428, 481 n. 127. Here Meier follows Bultmann in viewing the *chreia* as equivalent to an apophthegm.
\(^{186}\) See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 2.18.28.
\(^{187}\) See Mack, “Decoding the Scripture,” 94, re the distinction between “elaboration” and “the complete argument.”
\(^{188}\) See Cameron, “Characterizations,” 54.
3.3.3.6. Hellenistic vs. Hebraic traits:

Like the parables in the Gospels, the embellished *chreiai* in the Synoptics contain both Hellenistic and Jewish traits: the pattern used is fundamentally Greek, but one or more Hebraic elements may be incorporated in the elaboration. For instance, the story related in Mark 2:23–28 is a very slightly expanded *chreia* in which Jesus responds to the Pharisees' question with a scriptural example about David, before making a pronouncement on the proper use of the Sabbath.

A more significant phenomenon involves the adaptation of the Greek *chreia* into Hebrew culture. The most important aspect of this for the present topic is *humanisation*, which entails a shift of emphasis away from the sarcasm or wit of the hero that is evident in the Greek form of the *chreia*. In the Hebrew adaptation of the *chreia*, the protagonist shows empathy or kindness toward the victim, or the recipient of aid, thus exemplifying the Jewish ethic of concern for the poor, and compassion to strangers.

Recognition of the Hebrew elements in NT *chreiai* is particularly important in Jesus research, because it highlights the fact that the Synoptics portray certain qualities in Jesus' character, as well as his wisdom and wit. The use of *chreiai* in the Gospels is not the same as for the Cynic (or cynicising) *chreia*, which is employed to demonstrate Cynic values and ideals. Although the *chreiai* on which the Marcan controversy stories seem to be based certainly show Jesus as besting his opponents
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189 See above §3.3.2.
190 Re *chreia* elaboration in Mark, see below in §3.3.3.7.
191 Mack has shown how in Philo's commentary on Gen 4:2, the dual elements are revealed in that while a Hellenistic *chreia* elaboration pattern may have been employed, examples and witnesses are derived from Hebrew scriptures ("Decoding the Scripture," 114).
193 Ibid. 410.
194 Ibid. 392, 396.
195 Ibid. 373.
with witty pronouncements, he is also consistently depicted elsewhere as desiring healing and salvation for those he encounters.\textsuperscript{196}

3.3.3.7. Caveats:

As we have seen, there are several reasons to be cautious about using the \textit{Progymnasmata} for determining how certain synoptic passages may have been constructed from \textit{chreiai}. Silberman has succinctly summarised the inherent problems of the method, in his statement that “one is not at liberty to assume that what we have before us in the gospels are such exercises.”\textsuperscript{197}

Even when the elaboration pattern of Ps.-Cicero is chosen in preference to Hermogenes’, great caution is necessary in its use for synoptic analysis. Appropriate allowance should be made for Jesus’ use of rhetorical devices, especially parables, and care must be taken to ensure that the method is not stretched beyond its limits.\textsuperscript{198}

Another important factor is that the exegesis of Marcan and Q passages requires a different approach. In my opinion, a text such as Q 7:18–35 is better taken at face value, without attempting to identify one or more \textit{chreiai}, or the means of elaboration. In contrast, the key Marcan pericope concerning toll collectors and

\textsuperscript{196} For further comments on the \textit{chreia} elaboration pattern in Mark, see below, §3.3.3.7, and Chapter Six, §4.1.2.3.

\textsuperscript{197} “Schoolboys and Storytellers,” 111.

\textsuperscript{198} Examples of unrealistic expectations of the method, and unsound application are seen in Mack, “Cynic-like Jesus,” 33. He claims that the “problem with the Cynic hypothesis is not that the core sayings and \textit{chreiai} of the Jesus tradition do not fit the pattern of Cynic discourse,” but “with the way in which they have been elaborated.” His attitude begs the question as to whether the correct methodology is being applied to the received text. Cameron, likewise, often seems to be driven by his methodology, rather than to demonstrate its applicability. Glaring problems are his need: to overlook Q 16:16 because it does not fit into the elaboration pattern (“Characterizations,” 37); to \textit{guess} which of two \textit{chreiai} was authentic; and to surmise that this “original” saying was recast by the redactor (ibid. 52). He is also forced to use Q 7:33–34 as the argument from example (ibid. 60), although it does not comply well with the requirement to be from the arena of history (ibid. 49). His use of Jesus’ words (\textit{λέγω ὑμῖν}) from Q 7:28 as the second statement from authority (ibid. 58) is also decidedly unconvincing. Cameron’s observation that sometimes the “textual history and social history” of pericopae “overlap but do not mesh” strongly suggests that wrong assumptions have been made about the text and/or its sociological background, or that the exegetical tools need to be modified.
sinners (2:13–17) is one of several which exhibit a pattern. In such passages the logion and the most likely elements of the chreiai are readily determined, and the authentic sayings may be identified with a high degree of certitude, and without reliance on anachronistic elaboration techniques.

4. **Approach:**

4.1. *Procedure to be adopted:*

It will already be apparent that many of the methods currently used in Jesus research are considered inappropriate, and will not be adopted in the present study. For the exegesis of key texts, issues of authenticity will be discussed, and where necessary, attempts will be made to reconstruct Q passages in their most probable form, and to determine the most likely wording of logia. However, the emphasis will be upon investigating the background behind the synoptic Jesus and his table fellowship, and allowing it to illuminate the Gospel texts. The method used will draw particularly on hospitality, feasting, and literary traditions, and on historical, archaeological, and socio-anthropological evidence. Relevant synoptic material will then be critically evaluated in an attempt to extend our understanding of the historical Jesus.

Some of the methodological issues to be confronted are the paucity of evidence concerning Jesus' table fellowship; the inconsistencies between the various Gospel accounts; and the difficulty in determining the identity of the toll collectors and sinners. As a consequence, great reliance must be placed on the various traditions underlying the relevant texts, particularly on those that pertain to hospitality and feasting.

The major hypothesis is that the historical Jesus had a reputation as an uninvited guest, and this datum provides a new perspective on a range of NT

---

199 See Chapter Six, §4.1.2.3.
tradiions, particularly those concerning his table fellowship practice, and his ultimate exaltation. The concept of Jesus and his associates as ἄξιος is illuminating for the exegesis of several synoptic passages, and for explaining the mechanism by which Jesus issued invitations to the eschatological banquet. Owing to the inherent difficulties of the topic, it is not possible to be certain about our conclusions. However, it is hoped that the coherence of the proposed figure of Jesus with his milieu, and the logic of the arguments, will demonstrate the validity of the construct.

4.2. Outline of structure:

Part Two of the study comprises an exploration of the relevant traditions of hospitality and feasting in the ancient Mediterranean region, referring to the broad similarities between Graeco-Roman and Jewish customs, but acknowledging some differences. Chapter Three focuses most specifically on mores concerning hospitality to strangers, and the role of deities in punishing inhospitality. It also includes an outline of the related tradition termed the “Ambiguous Guest motif.” In Chapter Four, discussion centres on the Hebrew marzeah, the Greek symposion, the Roman cena, and Jewish meals, but refers also to the association of death and feasting that is evident in the literature of the period, and in ancient beliefs about the afterlife. In addition, mention is made of the uninvited guests of various kinds who were typically present at banquets, both in the literature and in reality.

Part Three employs the findings from Part Two to explore the early Christian tradition of Jesus’ table fellowship. It commences in Chapter Five with an investigation of the toll collectors and sinners who were allegedly involved as Jesus’ commensals. Chapter Six examines Jesus’ relationship with the Pharisees, since they feature significantly in the synoptic accounts of table fellowship, especially in Luke. The probability of actual disputes between the parties is affirmed, but in addition, it
is postulated that the controversies depicted in the Synoptics reflect tensions in the early church.

In Chapter Seven, the insights from the two previous chapters are applied towards an expanded reconstruction of the historical Jesus. The main purpose of the chapter is the examination of NT texts concerning the reception vs. the rejection of strangers, with a particular focus on Jesus and/or his disciples as uninvited guests. It also examines the rationale for viewing Jesus as an ἄριστος, and considers the issues of commensality vs. almsgiving; the importance of humility; and the means by which Jesus issues invitations to the eschatological banquet. The application of the hypothesis to three specific NT pericopae is illuminating, and demonstrates the value of exploring the texts from a new perspective.

Chapter Eight draws on previous findings to investigate issues concerning Jesus and meals. The initial emphasis is on the relationship between the quest for hospitality in this world, and in the kingdom, and then on the high value placed on hospitality in the early church. Much of the chapter is given over to consideration of the two meals in the Passion Narrative, especially the Last Supper. Jesus is seen as a guest at the Last Supper, and this view is crucial for understanding his actions and their significance. The implications of his conduct on that occasion are considered in relation to the ethics of hospitality and commensality in the early church, as well as to the Marcan accounts of the feeding miracles. Issues concerning the inclusion of Gentiles at the end time are then addressed by examining passages relevant to the eschatological banquet. The shift from John’s baptismal rite to Christian baptism is also noted, and a connection is proposed between the latter ritual and the traditional means by which outsiders gain entry to meals. Finally, the essential characteristics of the historical Jesus are delineated, and compared with the main features of the
synoptic Jesus. It is suggested that the fictional elements attributed to Jesus may
derive from the Ambiguous Guest motif, and that this would account for his
exaltation to the place of honour at the eschatological banquet. The Conclusion of the
thesis consists of a summary of findings, and reference to the implications of the
reconstruction that has been determined.

5. Summary:

The first of the three main topics in the chapter relates to *materials* employed in the
study. The Synoptic Gospels are the major primary sources, but occasional reference
is made to the *Gospel of Thomas*. Secondary sources are many and varied. They
include NT writings other than the Gospels, particularly the Pauline letters and Acts.
The use of rabbinic literature is kept to a minimum owing to problems over dating.
Although the Cynic epistles and Lucian are considered unsuitable for Jesus research,
the latter may be of value as a witness to second century dining customs. Plutarch is
used only with caution, since the uncertainty over the dating of his works means that
they may not be relevant to dining practices in the NT period. However, Homer is
found to be important for NT interpretation, especially with regard to hospitality
traditions. Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* is also of value as background material, since
it contains citations that can mostly be dated with accuracy.

§3 addresses the second major topic, *methods*. The two-source hypothesis is
accepted as the best approach to the Synoptic Problem. However, the stratification of
Q in terms of allegedly *early* or *late* layers is not considered legitimate, and
therefore, pericopae from Q will be treated in their entirety, with no attempt made to
identify authentic material by removing supposedly later strata. Where necessary, the
most probable primitive form of a Q passage will be reconstructed from the parallel
texts in Matthew and Luke.
The authenticity criteria are outlined on the basis of Meier’s discussion. The most important of these is the criterion of embarrassment, since it is applicable to several key texts. The criteria are used only to indicate degrees of probability as to the authenticity of logia.

The subject of rhetoric is important for Jesus research, since many of its devices occur in the NT. For analytical purposes, parables and chreiai are the most significant of such devices, and these are discussed in detail. Parables in the Gospels typically contain both Hellenistic and Hebraic elements, and appear to have been transmitted in a relatively intact form. It is noted that the presence of one or more triadic motifs in a parable may be an indicator of authenticity.

Chreiai, and techniques used for their elaboration, are discussed at some length. It is concluded that great caution must be exercised in analysing synoptic texts in the belief that they represent elaborated chreiai. The elaboration techniques outlined in the various Progynasmata are shown to be unsuitable for the analytical task, and only the pattern employed by Ps.-Cicero is appropriate as a reference point. The precise meaning of the term chreia in the early first century is unclear, and it is prudent to adopt a relatively loose description, such as: “a short narrative framework or initial question introduces a pithy and memorable saying of a philosopher or some other great person.” The presence of certain elements in elaborated chreiai may serve to differentiate them as Hebraic rather than Hellenistic, and/or as containing authentic Jesus material, rather than displaying a Cynic tendency. It is noteworthy that Marcan passages require a different analytical approach to those in Q, since a number of the former exhibit a pattern which allows the most likely elements of the chreia to be readily determined, and the authentic saying to be identified with a high degree of certainty.

The third major strand of the chapter contains two sections: firstly, a precis of the approach to be adopted; and secondly, an outline of Parts Two and Three of the thesis.
PART TWO

BACKGROUNDs
Chapter Three

ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN TRADITIONS OF HOSPITALITY

1. Introduction:

Hospitality was understood in the ancient Near East in the limited sense of showing friendship to strangers, rather than with the modern Western meaning of entertaining friends and/or relatives.\(^1\) Hence in Greek literature, and in the NT, the term translated as hospitality is φιλοξενία, i.e. literally love of strangers.\(^2\) Originally the Greek word ἕλεος meant foreigner, stranger, or enemy, but it came to denote either guest or host.\(^3\)

In this chapter, however, the emphasis is upon the primitive meaning of ἕλεος and its Hebrew equivalents, and on the customs associated with the practice of hospitality in the ancient world.

There are several Hebrew terms for aliens:

- יֵרֵע: of another family, or race; an alien, barbarian or enemy;\(^4\)
-ARI: mainly the resident alien, but also the Israelites when in Egypt, and Canaanites in Israel;\(^5\)
- גָּלֶה: an alien, sometimes equivalent to the יֵרֵע but sometimes distinguished as less assimilated;\(^6\) a resident lacking civil rights;\(^7\)
- קָרֵנִי or קֶרֶב: foreigner, sometimes equivalent to the יֵרֵע.\(^8\)

---

1 Bruce J. Malina, “hospitality,” HBD 440.
3 Ibid. In the NT, the meaning of ἕλεος and cognates is mostly in the realm of hospitality, but there are exceptions. See Gustav Stählin, “ἕλεος κτλ.,” TDNT 5:2.
4 Ibid. 8.
5 Ibid.
6 Holladay, יֵרֵע, Hebrew Lexicon, 388.
7 Stählin, “ἕλεος,” 8.
8 Holladay, קָרֵנִי, Hebrew Lexicon, 239.
The translations used mainly in the LXX are:

- ἀλλότριος for יְהוָה, and כּּוּ;  
- ἀλλογενής for יְהוָה and כּוּ;  
- πάροικος for בִּשְׂרָה and often for יונ;  
- προσήλυτος for יונ.  

Ξένος is used just five times for יונ and once for יונ, so it is clearly not an exact equivalent of any of the Hebrew terminology used to denote strangers. Moreover, perusing the occurrences of these Hebrew terms is mostly unhelpful for the investigation of hospitality in the OT, since nearly all the relevant examples describe particular circumstances and are not focused specifically on strangers. The examples are not numerous, but are sufficient to demonstrate that in ancient Israel it was customary to offer hospitality to unknown travellers. They are:

- the separate occasions in Genesis 18 and 19, both concerning hospitality provided for divine envoys;
- Judg 13:15, which depicts Manoah offering to detain the visiting angel and to prepare a kid for him;
- Judg 19:11–20, concerning the Levite and his concubine and their reception at Gibeah;
- 1 Sam 25:2–35, describing the action taken by Abigail to compensate for her husband’s failure to provide for David and his men in the manner that was obviously expected;

---

9 Stühlin, "Ξένος," 8.
10 Ibid.
• 2 Sam 12:1–15, especially v. 4, which indicates that it was standard procedure to
slaughter a lamb in order to provide for a wayfarer;
• Job 31:32b, relating how Job habitually welcomed travellers into his home.12

The account in Genesis 18 of Abraham and his generous provision to the
three heavenly messengers is a significant example of hospitality, not only on the
grounds of its importance in Judaism and Christianity, but because it indicates the
antiquity of the relevant customs. By comparing archaeological findings with cultural
descriptions given in Genesis, it has been possible to date the myth of Abraham’s
journey from Mesopotamia to Palestine as cast most probably in the Middle Bronze
Age, ca. 2000–1500 B.C.E.13

2. **Principles and rationale of hospitality:**

2.1. **Strategies toward strangers:**

The threat of foreigners could be dealt with either by excluding them completely, or
by incorporating them into the community;14 Israel adopted both of these strategies at
various times in her history.15 The exclusion policy was applied mainly to the רַע
and was achieved, for instance, through a policy of endogamy, particularly in the
postexilic period.16 The ונֵֽי, on the other hand, were encouraged to assimilate into
the community.17

---

12 Note that the original Hebrew text has רַעּ, which the NIV repoints as רַעּ, giving the reading “to
in 1; Regency Reference Library; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1987), 3:328].
fits most plausibly with the migrations depicted in Genesis (ibid.). See also André Parrot, “Abraham,”
in *Britannica*, 1:11.
15 Ibid. The approach taken by Israel toward aliens varied considerably over the centuries, partly as a
result of the development of religious ethics. See ibid. 8–14.
16 Ibid.
17 Stählin, “ךָוֹאָ,” 8–9, 9 n. 56. This is comprehensible in that a resident alien, though *originally* a
stranger, did not occasion the same degree of threat as an unknown sojourner. See §2.3 below.
What is of interest for our purposes, however, is the background to the reception of itinerant strangers, i.e. sojourners, rather than those seeking permanent residency. In these circumstances, the two alternatives for dealing with the threat posed by strangers were hospitality and war.  

2.2. Hostility vs. hospitality:

In primitive societies, as Mauss has demonstrated, the situation with regard to strangers was one of either mistrust or of complete trust; there was no middle ground, and hospitality was offered as an alternative to a hostile confrontation. The hostility/hospitality dichotomy is well illustrated in an Egyptian story that is titled "The Report of Wenamon," and dated to the early 11th century B.C.E. The tale is an actual account of the difficulties Wenamon encountered when travelling abroad from Thebes on a trade mission to purchase timber from Byblos in Phoenicia. He establishes relationships with Beder, the prince of Dor, and with Tjekerbaal, the Phoenician Prince of Byblos, but falls foul of some Tjeker seamen, who seek to

21 E. F. Wente, ed. and trans., "The Report of Wenamon," in The Literature of Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, and Poetry (ed. W. K. Simpson; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 142-55. See also Grottanelli, "Notes on Hospitality," 188-89, for a citation of part of the story. Wenamon's journey can be dated fairly precisely from the fact that it took place during the reign of Ramesses (Rameses) XI, and after Hori had become high priest of Amon—hence, between ca. 1094 and ca. 1083 (Wente, "Report of Wenamon," 143, n. 1; idem, "Egypt, History of, II. From the beginning of the 18th dynasty to c. 330 BC," Britannica, 6:477). According to Wenamon's account, the voyage commenced in the fifth year of this period, i.e. in ca. 1089; however, some doubt remains since the dates provided thereafter are irreconcilable (Wente, "Report of Wenamon," 143, n. 1).
22 Byblos (biblical Gebal, and modern Jebail, situated about 32 km north of Beirut), was crucially important to Egypt as a source of timber from the mountains east of the city (Denis Baly, "Gebal," HBD 364).
23 Dor was a natural seaport on the north coast of Palestine (Wente, "Report of Wenamon," 143 n. 4; James D. Parvis, "Dor," HBD 245).
24 Tjeker (or Tjekker) were Sea People settled on the Mediterranean coast between the territory of the Philistines, and that of the Phoenicians to the north (Peter J. Parr, "Syria and Palestine, c. 1550 BC–AD
imprison him. As long as Wenamon remains in the harbour at Byblos, Tjekerbaal has an obligation to protect him. The Prince of Byblos therefore elects to deport Wenamon, so as to allow the Tjeker crew a dispensation to pursue him. Evidently the ship with Wenamon on board then runs adrift on Alasiya.\textsuperscript{25} When the inhabitants of the town threaten to kill him, he arranges an audience with Hatiba, the region’s princess, and issues a counter-threat, warning that if he and the ship’s crew are harmed, the Prince of Byblos will seek revenge and kill ten of her crews. Hatiba then summons and punishes her subjects for their inhospitality, and offers Wenamon lodging overnight.\textsuperscript{26} It can be seen from the initial attitude toward Wenamon in Alasiya, and the subsequent change of heart, that hospitality was offered to him there both as a result of the threat he posed as a stranger, and the desire to avoid hostilities. The story also demonstrates that the attitudes expressed toward Wenamon at Dor and Byblos oscillated between extremes of hospitality and hostility. There is no intermediate position.\textsuperscript{27}

2.3. \textit{The role of deities:}

The essential characteristic of the stranger is that he is \textit{unknown}, and it is this fundamental aspect that evokes negativity or awe.\textsuperscript{28} The phenomenon is explicable in anthropological terms in that being unfamiliar, the stranger cannot be categorised;

\textsuperscript{25} I.e. Cyprus (ibid. 154 n. 33).
\textsuperscript{26} The remainder of the tale is lost (ibid. 155).
\textsuperscript{27} Upon his arrival at Dor, Wenamon is sent fifty loaves, a jug of wine, and an ox-haunch by the prince (ibid. 144–45). Subsequently, Wenamon makes a completely unreasonable request of the prince, but yet is invited to remain in the harbour, with every effort being made on his behalf (ibid.). At Byblos, on the other hand, Tjekerbaal repeatedly orders Wenamon out of the harbour until negotiations between the two enable a contract to be forged (ibid. 145–51). The underlying hostility remains visible however, until Tjekerbaal’s role as host is suddenly highlighted (ibid. 151–54), and he sends Wenamon two jugs of wine and a sheep, as well as an Egyptian woman to comfort him with her singing (ibid. 154). The following day he sends Wenamon out of the harbour (ibid.).
such entities, as Mary Douglas has shown, are profoundly threatening to most cultures. In the ancient Near East, an additional factor underlying the dread engendered by strangers was the ever-present possibility that they could be visitors from the divine realm. The accounts in Genesis 18 and 19:1–29 are clear illustrations of this belief and of its significance in people’s lives.

In the Greek world especially, there was overt acknowledgment of the likely arrival of gods in disguise, and the threat of divine vengeance in the event that hospitality was not offered to a stranger. The goddess Erinys (Fury), in particular, was believed to avenge offences committed against guests, and indeed, Zeus himself was known as god of beggars and strangers, and afforded special protection to them. A stranger could be any deity in disguise, however, and was not necessarily Zeus.

---


30 Cristiano Grottanelli, “L’ideologia del banchetto e l’ospite ambiguo,” *Dialoghi di Archeologia* NS 3 (1981): 128. As well as the risk of unknown visitors being superhuman, an equally fearsome possibility was that they could be subhuman [Grottanelli, “Notes on Hospitality,” 186–94, esp. 193].


33 Stählin, “ξένος,” 17, 17 n. 121; H. J. Rose and B. C. Dietrich, “Erinyes,” *OCD* 556. The curse uttered by Odysseus in *Od.* 17.475–476 is: “If for beggars there are gods and Furies, may the doom of death come upon Antinous before his marriage.” It is interesting to note that a Homeric “blessing” comprises the converse: e.g. he asks that the gods may grant the banqueters at Alcinous’ palace “happiness in life” and that each may “hand down to his children the wealth in his halls, and the dues of honour which the people have given him.” See *Od.* 7.148–150. Similarly, Odysseus prays to Zeus that for his offer of generous hospitality to the “stranger,” Telemachus may be “blest among men, and may have all that his heart desires,” *Od.* 17.354–355.

34 E.g. *Od.* 14.57–58, 283–284; 6.206–208. Note that an itinerant stranger is not to be equated with a beggar, although both types qualified for divine protection. On the different attitudes held toward beggars and strangers see Pitt Rivers, *Anthropology*, 102–103. Even though a traveller who arrived at the gates of a town and sat down awaiting hospitality was, in effect, “begging” (i.e. implicitly requesting sustenance and lodging), his status was completely different from that of a beggar who lived in the community, and who would thus be a familiar figure (ibid.).

35 Ibid. 100.
The belief that travellers were under divine protection can also be discerned in the OT. The idea of Yahweh as “minder” of individual travellers, as well as of Israel as a nation, is found in Psalm 121. In conjunction with a possessive pronoun, the root נַפְשָׁה (to guard or keep), occurs here as a leitmotif, and may be interpreted as applying to a Sitz im Leben of travelling. Moreover, in the LXX (Wis 19:13–16), God’s extraordinary care for strangers (ἀναμονήντας) is demonstrated by the punishment meted out specifically for inhospitality towards them. The concept of divine protection for wayfarers is possibly present also in the Kuntillet ‘Ajrūd Pithos A and B inscriptions, although there is doubt as to whether Yhwh šmrn should be understood as “Yahweh our minder” or “Yahweh of Samaria.”

Deut 10:18–19, which according to the NRSV refers specifically to God’s provision for strangers, cannot be used directly to demonstrate divine protection for them, since נַפְשָׁה is properly rendered here as resident aliens. Nevertheless the passage does support the idea that God cares particularly for those without a patron, and itinerant strangers certainly belong in this category, along with widows, orphans, and resident aliens. The ethic of compassionate care for the needy is presented as being linked strongly with Israel’s own experience as wanderers and as נַפְשָׁה in Egypt.

37 The passage relates to the situation of the Israelites in Egypt. Failure to receive strangers hospitably is here named as a sin worthy of punishment (19:14–15), though a far worse transgression was that of enslaving the Israelites after first receiving them “with festal celebrations” (19:16 NRSV), i.e. the “more bitter” practice of “hatred of strangers” (μηδέστερον) cited in 19:13.
38 The term occurs in a Kuntillet ‘Ajrūd Pithos A inscription. Andrew D. H. Mayes, [“Kuntillet ‘Ajrud and the History of Israelite Religion,” in Bartlett, Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation, 62] argues for the interpretation “Yahweh of Samaria,” and sees the alternative meaning as very unlikely in view of the reference to Yhwh of Tmūn found in a Kuntillet ‘Ajrūd Pithos B inscription. However Davies (“Yahweh as Minder,”) prefers the translation Yahweh our minder despite acknowledging that factor.
39 See §1 above.
40 See Ps 146:9; Deut 14:28–29.
2.4. *Protocols of hospitality and guest-friendship:*

According to the mores of hospitality as they evolved in the Near East, a stranger could only be received into table fellowship if certain protocols were followed to transform him from outsider to guest.\(^{42}\) In the first place, there was the requirement for a patron, since as a stranger he had neither status nor rights.\(^{43}\) The role inversion from stranger to guest involved a shift from being shunned and regarded with suspicion, to being given precedence and treated with honour.\(^{44}\) A poignant example is the story in Judges 19 about the Levite and his concubine. The account shows that under the ethic of hospitality, the host was expected to protect his guest to an extreme degree. In fact, the level of protection provided to male guests could sometimes be substantially greater than that exercised in accordance with the Hebrew obligation to family members and neighbours.\(^{45}\) This point is graphically illustrated by the bizarre offer of the Ephraimite in Judg 19:24 of his own daughter and the Levite’s concubine, in order to secure his guest’s protection. The similar offer made by Lot in Gen 19:8 indicates that the previous example is not merely an isolated instance. A patron’s obligation did have limits, however, and as illustrated by Tjekerbaal’s treatment of Wenamon, a guest was only guaranteed protection within the boundaries of the host’s jurisdiction.\(^{46}\)

Entry into a relationship of guest-friendship (\(\xi\nu\gamma\alpha\))\(^{47}\) entailed certain obligations upon the parties, including the offer and acceptance of gift and counter-

---


\(^{45}\) Stählin, “\(\xi\nu\nu\zeta\).” 4.


gift. Refusal of a guest gift or of hospitality was tantamount to declaring war.48

Following the initial act of hospitality, it was incumbent upon the guest to
reciprocate if/when circumstances permitted it, on an occasion in the future.49 The
parties would then compete by alternately giving over-generously, each attempting to
increase his status, and to establish an advantage over the other.50 If the stranger were
merely a sojourner, however, it was obvious that there would be very little chance of
the guest ever being in a position to reciprocate.51 Since the recipient was considered
to be a dependant of the donor until the gift was reciprocated,52 the approach had the
desired effect of disarming the stranger.

Typically the process of receiving a stranger included some form of challenge
(ἀγών) to ascertain his worth;53 indeed, Pitt Rivers regards the evaluation of the
stranger as a fundamental law of hospitality.54 As we have already seen, competitive
(i.e. “agonistic”) behaviour was a regular component in the establishment of guest-
friendships.55 This is true for the Homeric world as well, where one can discern both
the lavish provision of hospitality to strangers, and also justifiable fear of them.56

In his discussion of Judges 14, Burkert sheds some light on the agonistic
behaviour that, in the ancient world, was a normal part of the proceedings upon the
arrival of a newcomer.57 The relevant passage is the story about Samson and his

54 Ibid. 94–95. The ἀγών should not be confused with the “ordeal” described by Pitt Rivers in relation
to a stranger who intends to assimilate within the community (*Anthropology*, 106). The occurrence of
an ordeal implies permanency (ibid. 111).
55 Mauss used the term *agonistic* to describe the behaviour involved in this process (*The Gift*, 4–5;
56 Ibid. 4.
marriage to the Philistine woman at Timnah, and particularly the seven-day celebratory feast. Although Burkert accepts that many aspects of the story are mythological, he sees the type of feast characteristically held by the Philistines as historical, and as dating from about the twelfth century. He regards the gathering as an ἐγκόν, and calls it "a ritualized duel through riddles." The thirty young men from the girl's village act as a collective, and the exogamous marriage is thus a "deal" Samson must make with the group of males who challenge him. Although the riddle put to the group by Samson is the only one cited in the pericope, it is not unreasonable to assume, as Burkert does, that it was simply one of many posed during the weeklong feast. Hence, there is a clear analogy between this gathering and the Greek symposium as it was practised many centuries later, viz.: "a group of young men similar in age who find their identity in communal drinking, and the ritualized agon in the form of language play." What is of particular interest is the antiquity of the story, and the early date that can therefore be put upon behaviour that is normally regarded as "sympotic," and is often seen as deriving from the literary symposium genre. It is plausible to see it, instead, in terms of the competitive spirit that ordinarily exists among the young males of a community, and which undoubtedly arises spontaneously between a new arrival and members of the insider

---

58 Judg 14:10–18.
60 Ibid. 15.
61 Ibid. 15–16.
63 E.g. Braun, Feasting and Social Rhetoric, 106 n. 25; Corley, Private Women, 26 n. 6; Smith, "Literary Motif," 614–16.
64 For instance, the behaviour of the suitors at the palace of Odysseus: "making merry, throwing the discus and the javelin in a leveled place, as their custom was," (Od. 17.167–169).
group. In addition, the deterioration in relationships in the context of the story is clearly consistent with the idea of a hospitality/hostility dichotomy.

The protocols attached to the reception of an outsider as a guest included the washing of his feet. This gesture, which took place before food was offered, marked the transition in status from stranger to guest. In the same vein is the threefold ritual of purification and incorporation that occurs when Odysseus arrives at Phaeacia, and is found by Nausicaa. The three components of bathing, unction, and the gift of a new garment, are seen by Grottanelli as a means for removing the dangerous elements of the stranger, at least those that are external, before he is invited to a meal. Grottanelli’s observation that the triple ritual is analogous to Christian baptism is of significance for our hypothesis, and will be further explored in Part Three.

3. The Ambiguous Guest motif:

In order to show how widespread, both geographically and chronologically, was the ethic of hospitality to strangers, and to highlight a related phenomenon, we will compare three examples of the reception of travellers, and delineate some common features.

---

65 Cf. the contests in Book 8 of Odyssey, arranged in order that Odysseus might “tell his friends, when he returns home, how far [the Phaeacians] excel other men in boxing and wrestling and jumping and speed of foot.” (Od. 8.101–103). Odysseus is then challenged to try his skill against the Phaeacians, and accepts (Od. 8.143–184). Note that at this point, everything is in place for Odysseus’ departure (Od. 8.150–151). The contests are thus to be viewed as an ἀγών, not an ordeal.
67 Ibid.
68 Od. 6.210–250.
70 “Notes on Hospitality,” 191.
71 See Chapter Six, §4.1.5.3; and Chapter Eight, §4.4.
72 Much credit is due to Cristiano Grottanelli and his fine article “L’ideologia del banchetto e l’ospite ambiguo,” for the ideas on which the following section is based.
The first, the Tale of the Doomed Prince,\textsuperscript{73} originated in Egypt during the 19th Dynasty,\textsuperscript{74} hence no later than 1200 B.C.E. It relates the adventures of the young crown prince who travels north from the desert at the eastern edge of the Delta to Nahrin, i.e. North-West Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{75} The second example is from Odyssey, and is thus to be dated between 700 and 900 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{76} It concerns the arrival of Odysseus among the hostile Phaeacians,\textsuperscript{77} and specifically the hospitality provided by Alcinous.\textsuperscript{78} The third is the biblical account about Saul and the lost donkeys, in 1 Samuel 9–10, i.e. concerning the eleventh century,\textsuperscript{79} and written in about the sixth century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{80} Although the narratives originate in different eras and cultures, there is significant correspondence between them. I refer to the three in chronological order, as the prince, Odyssey, and Saul, with extra details provided as necessary.

- The traveller is in foreign territory:

  Nahrin;\textsuperscript{81} Phaeacia;\textsuperscript{82} Zuph.\textsuperscript{83}

- He is exceptionally attractive physically.\textsuperscript{84}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{73} Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 85–91; and cited partially, and in Italian, in Grottanelli, “L’ideologia,” 131–33.
\textsuperscript{74} I.e. 1320–1200 (Wente, “Egypt, History,” 475–76).
\textsuperscript{75} See Grottanelli, “L’ideologia,” 133 n. 25. Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 87 n. 3, describes the country as “the land of the Mitannian kingdom, located east of the bend of the Euphrates river,” and explains: “Since this kingdom fell toward the end of Dynasty 18, the action of the story takes place at a time in this dynasty when Syrian princes owed their allegiance to Mitanni.”
\textsuperscript{76} Oswyn Murray, Early Greece, 36.
\textsuperscript{77} About whom it was said: “... the people here have not much patience with strangers, nor do they give kindly welcome to him who comes from another land,” (Od. 7.30–33).
\textsuperscript{78} Od. 7.146–347.
\textsuperscript{79} James King West, “Saul,” Britannica, 16:281.
\textsuperscript{80} P. Kyle McCarter, “Samuel, the First and Second Books of,” HBD 902–903. Note that the story is recognised as deriving from a pre-existing folktale. See idem, “Saul,” HBD 976.
\textsuperscript{81} The prince has travelled here from Egypt. See Grottanelli, “L’ideologia,” 133 n. 25; Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 87 nn. 2–3.
\textsuperscript{82} Od. 7.24–26.
\textsuperscript{83} 1 Sam 9:4–5.
\textsuperscript{84} For the prince, see Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 87. For Odysseus, see respectively Od. 6.227–231 and 8.17–23, where Athena makes him appear taller and more handsome, so that he is “gleaming with beauty and grace,” and taller and sturdier so that he might be “welcomed ... and win awe and reverence.” For Saul, see 1 Sam 9:2. Incidentally, Odysseus and Saul are both unusually tall. Moreover, although nothing specific is stated with regard to the prince’s height, his physical maturity is mentioned (Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 86), and tallness may probably be assumed in view of his athletic ability.
• He arrives unexpectedly among officially-invited guests who are already present.⑧5

• He is self-effacing about his social status, sometimes hiding his true identity, at least temporarily:

  the prince maintains that he is the son of a chariot warrior;⑧6
  Odysseus sits at the fireplace, and delays disclosure of personal details;⑧7
  Saul says his family is the humblest of the least of the tribes of Israel.⑧8

• He is welcomed, and offered hospitality as an honoured guest:

  the prince is cared for, kissed and embraced by Syrian princes;⑧9
  Odysseus is invited to sit next to Alcinous, thus displacing his host’s favourite son;⑨0
  Saul is given the portion of honour, the thigh.⑨1

• He attains greater honour in the context of the narrative:⑨2

  the prince leaps higher than the Syrian princes;⑨3
  Odysseus hurls the discus far beyond the attempts of others;⑨4
  Saul is king-elect and is to save Israel.⑨5

• He is elevated to royal status:

  the prince attains sonship to the Prince of Nahrin;⑨6
  Odysseus is offered sonship by Alcinous;⑨7
  Saul is anointed king.⑨8

⑧5 Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 87; Od. 7.136–138; 1 Sam 9:22.
⑧8 1 Sam 9:21.
⑨0 Od. 7.167–171.
⑨1 1 Sam 9:24. This detail is clear, although the Hebrew text is uncertain here. See also Grottanelli, “L’ideologia,” 135.
⑨2 Winning it in a contest in two of the three stories.
⑨4 Od. 8.186–198.
⑨5 1 Sam 9:16–17, 20.
⑨6 Wente, “Doomed Prince,” 89.
⑨7 Od. 7.311–316. The word ἀρχής, translated king, was the normal title given to the Homeric hero, but should be understood as applying to leaders in communities (Murray, Early Greece, 38). Nevertheless, as stated in Od. 6.10–11, Alcinous is king of the Phaeacians.
⑨8 1 Sam 10:1.
Moreover, even though the deities involved are different in the three stories, there is in each case a strong concept of predestination. For travellers in foreign territory who fit the identified archetype, Grottanelli has coined an appropriate title, viz. "the ambiguous guest."99

4. Divine justice:

4.1. Retribution or blessing:

The previous three sections have considered the practice of hospitality in the ancient Near East from ca. 1500 B.C.E. or earlier,100 through the Archaic period,101 with reference to the important protective function of the various deities. As we have seen, the laws of hospitality placed particular obligations on both guest and host, and it was believed that failure to observe these mores would incur divine wrath, and warrant dire punishment.102 Conversely, it was expected that the provision of generous hospitality would be rewarded with great blessings.103

These ideas remained current into the first century of the Common Era. In Petronius' Satyricon the gods are reputed to walk about the streets so commonly that one might more easily meet them than human beings.104 The Greek myth Philemon and Baucis105 provides further literary evidence of ancient belief in visitation by immortals disguised as wayfarers, and in the divine vengeance which could be expected by those who failed to observe the ethic of hospitality. Ovid's inclusion of

99 I.e. a translation of l'ospite ambiguo (Grottanelli, "L'ideologia,"). The guest is said to be "ambiguous" because his status lies in between dependence and privilege (ibid. 151).
100 See §1 above re dating of Genesis 18.
101 The "Archaic period" proper usually refers to the era ca. 750–500 B.C.E., particularly in ancient Greece, and the "early Archaic period" to ca. 1200–750 B.C.E. (John Boardman, "Greek Civilization, Ancient I. The Early Archaic and Archaic periods," Britannica, 8:326).
102 Such behaviour, in fact, ranks as hybris (Marshall, Enmity in Corinth, 192).
103 See e.g. Od. 7.148–150; 17.354–355.
104 Sat. 17. The author of Satyricon is believed to have been Titus Petronius Niger (d. 66 C.E.) [Edward John Kenney, "Petronius Arbiter," Britannica, 14:189–90].
105 Ovid, Metam. 8.618–724.
the story in his *Metamorphoses*, composed 1–8 C.E.,\textsuperscript{106} confirms that such beliefs were still held at this time. Again, in the NT, the reactions to Paul and Barnabas in Lystra (Acts 14:8–18), and to Paul on the island of Malta (Acts 28:6), offer evidence of contemporary belief in divine visitation, as does Heb 13:2.

4.2. *The reversal motif:*

In §3 above, we considered some specific cases of hospitality exemplifying the Ambiguous Guest motif. The first of the three stories is dated to 1200 B.C.E. or earlier, and the underlying folktale is therefore of great antiquity. The element within the Ambiguous Guest stories that is of particular importance in the present section is what may be termed the *reversal motif*. This refers to a recurring theme in ancient literature, that divine intervention involves a reversal of fortunes, and results in the reward of the righteous, and/or the punishment of the wicked. For instance:

- Abraham will become the father of countless generations, though he and his wife Sarah are both well beyond the normal reproductive age;\textsuperscript{107}

- the wickedness of Haman is revealed, and he is hanged on the gallows intended for Mordecai, while the latter is promoted and set as head over Haman’s house;\textsuperscript{108}

- the humble abode of Baucus and Philemon is transformed into a temple, and the meek, poverty-stricken couple become priests, and thereafter are worshipped as gods; whereas their neighbours, from a thousand inhospitable households, perish by flood.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{108} Esth 3:1–6; 7:1–8:2.
The reversal motif often occurs in the form of the dichotomies: humbled/exalted, and first/last. In the three Ambiguous Guest stories, it clearly exists as the former, with the humble hero experiencing divine beneficence, and exaltation to royal status.

4.3. *The justice of the banquet:*

The idea that ultimately, divine justice will be done in accordance with the laws of hospitality, is exemplified in the closing stages of *Odyssey*, where all is set to rights. The suitors, having grossly abused their role as guests, die terrible deaths at the hand of Odysseus and his men. The righteous, including Odysseus, his family, and those servants of his household who remained faithful, are assisted by the gods to achieve this triumph, and also to negotiate a truce with the surviving enemies. Drawing on *Odyssey*, together with other examples, Grottanelli has explored the literary representation of the banquet as an instrument and theatre of honour and dishonour, and as the context in which certain guests are either promoted or demoted. He posits the concept of “the justice of the banquet,” in reference to situations where the mores of hospitality have been violated, and a just and appropriate outcome is achieved by divine intervention and design.

The punishment of inhospitality in *Odyssey* appears particularly harsh, but is, in fact, comparable with examples in the Synoptic Gospels. The most similar situation occurs in Matt 25:31–46, in which one of the criteria for distinguishing

---

110 E.g. in the OT and in the apocalyptic writings: Isa 2:9–17; Amos 6:1, 7; Ezek 17:22–24; 1 Sam 2:5; Ps 113:7–8; 1 En. 92–105. The reversal motif is conspicuous in the NT in the form of the two dichotomies, e.g. Luke 1:52, 14:11, 18:14; Matt 23:12; Jas 4:10; 1 Pet 5:6 (humbled/exalted); and Mark 9:35; Mark 10:31 and par. Matt 19:30; Matt 20:16 (first/last).


112 *Od*. 22. The sins of the suitors include wasting the produce of Odysseus’ household through daily, gluttonous feasting; raping the servants; and courting Penelope, wife of the absent host. For a summary, see e.g. *Od*. 22.35–40.


116 Ibid. 146, 149.
between the blessed and the accursed, is whether they have welcomed strangers. Those guilty of inhospitality are sent away to eternal punishment, while hospitable people will have eternal life (v. 46). Again, in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31), it is clear that the rich man’s punishment in hades occurs as a result of his inhospitality.\textsuperscript{117} The two examples demonstrate that although references to judgment in the NT do not necessarily occur in the context of feasting, those who breach the laws of hospitality will be barred from participating in the eschatological banquet. This point is supported by the fact that in the parable of the Banquet (Luke 14:15–24), the original guests insult the host by their casual responses to his invitation; consequently, they are no longer welcome at the occasion.\textsuperscript{118} The reversal motif is conspicuously present in this parable, as well as in Luke 16:19–31. Further, since the parable recounted in Luke 14:15–24 may be interpreted as analogous to the eschatological banquet, the notion of “the justice of the banquet” is applicable, and will be explored in that context in Chapter Eight.

5. Summary:

In the ancient Near East, the term hospitality referred to the reception of strangers. Throughout the Mediterranean region, hospitality was customarily extended to travellers and sojourners, as the preferred alternative to hostility. The essential quality of a stranger was his unfamiliarity, and this engendered profound fear, since he might possibly be a god in disguise. Moreover, strangers and beggars were

\textsuperscript{117} In some circles of Hebrew thought from the second century B.C.E., divine intervention was expected to occur in both the present and the future, perceived as separate periods, “the present time,” and “the time to come,” i.e. olam ha-zeh and olam ha-ba, respectively (Hartman, “eschatology,” 875). Hades, or gehenna, was regarded as the dwelling place of the wicked after death, while the righteous departed dwelt in paradise (ibid. 874). Participation in the eschatological banquet was seen as the reward for the blessed (ibid. 876). Feasting in the afterlife is discussed further in Chapter Four, §6.

\textsuperscript{118} Admittedly, since the original guests are apparently not strangers, the banquet parable is not about hospitality in its ancient sense, although those invited later are certainly unfamiliar to the host. Nevertheless, the conventional respect between guest and host would still apply, and to insult the host would invite hostility.
granted specific protection by Hebrew and Greek deities alike, and failure to
welcome them was expected to attract divine retribution.

A stranger had to undergo certain protocols in order to be acceptable as a
guest at table, and these normally included the washing of his feet, and sometimes a
more extensive purificatory ritual. Entry into guest-friendship entailed obligations on
the part of both guest and host, and failure to respect the traditional requirements was
a grave offence. However, a host’s obligation to protect his guest was applicable only
within the bounds of his jurisdiction. Agonistic behaviour was a regular feature in the
establishment of guest-friendships, and literary evidence suggests that it predated by
several centuries, the competitive spirit characteristically present at symposia in the
Archaic and classical eras. 119

An important motif deriving from literature of the ancient Mediterranean
region is that of the Ambiguous Guest. A significant element in it is the theme of
reversal, which is present as the sudden rise of the humble hero to an exalted
position, in accordance with divine providence. The reversal motif is often
discernible in combination with the theme of divine punishment or blessing. These
occasions are of particular significance for the present study when the retribution
results from failure to observe the laws of hospitality. The outcome of such situations
may be termed the justice of the banquet, a concept which will be considered further
in Part Three.

119 The term classical is used here to refer to the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. (Oswyn Murray,
Boardman, Jasper Griffin, and Oswyn Murray; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 204.
Chapter Four

ANCEINT MEDITERRANEAN TRADITIONS OF FEASTING

1. Introduction:

The feasting traditions in the ancient Mediterranean region, like those relating to hospitality, show a remarkable similarity over a broad time span and across cultural boundaries. Nevertheless, there are some dissimilarities in the customs relevant to different periods and geographical areas, so that for instance, it is not appropriate to discuss feasting traditions under the umbrella term *Graeco-Roman*.

The main aim of this chapter is to consider the underlying factors and traditions that eventually shaped the banqueting practices of the early first century C.E. in Palestine. The investigation commences by considering banquet themes from ancient Near Eastern texts and from Homer, and identifying motifs that have particular relevance for the thesis topic. The beliefs and rituals associated with animal sacrifice are also examined, with emphasis placed on differences and similarities between Greek and Jewish understanding and practice. The banqueting traditions of the Mediterranean region, from Ugarit in the mid-second millennium through Palestine in the Roman period, are then considered in the light of the previous findings. Although it is not possible to draw firm conclusions, the findings provide a realistic framework to postulate the milieu in which the table fellowship of the historical Jesus took place, and for interpreting synoptic depictions of meals. In addition, consideration is given to some phenomena linked with feasting in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, and brief comments are offered on beliefs concerning the afterlife.
The subtopics are as follows:

Elementary traditions:
  Banquet motifs
  Sacrificial rites
  The significance of grain:
    Semantics
    Religious significance
    Findings
  Selection and division of sacrificial animals:
    Hebrew traditions
    Greek traditions
  Division and distribution of sacrificial victims
  Implications of findings for thesis topic

The banquets:
  The marzeah
  The Greek συμπόσιον
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    Jewish feasting in the Roman period
    Summary of banqueting traditions in Palestine in the Augustan age

Feasting and ἐκλητοί
Feasting and death
Feasting in the afterlife
Summary.

2. **Elementary traditions:**

2.1. *Banquet motifs:*

A primitive dyadic literary pattern is discernible in both the Ugaritic legend of King Keret (III K:4–6), and Proverbs 9, with the two basic strands comprising the preparation of the banquet, and the summoning of the guests. The former text concerns Lady Hurriya’s banquet, while in the latter, it is personified Wisdom who summons the guests. In Ugaritic narrative, a typical banquet theme includes a third

---

2 Ibid. The sequence of preparation–summoning occurs also in the following texts: (1) the Ugaritic epic about the banquet held to celebrate the completion of Baal’s palace (IIAB, 6:4–6) [ibid. 21, n. 10; note that in the Proverbs text, the banquet is held following the completion of Wisdom’s dwelling (Prov 9:1)]; (2) the Akkadian myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal (vv. 1–6) [ibid. 22, n. 12]; (3) the Hittite legend of Illuyanka [ibid. 23, n. 14]; (4) Zeph 1:7b [ibid. 21, n. 10a].
event—the consumption of food and drink—as well as the dyadic sequence of food preparation and invitation to guests.³

For the purposes of this study, the element of greatest interest is the additional literary convention that occurs within the motif of preparation for the banquet, viz. the sequence of meat and then wine. The meat–wine formula is maintained in accounts of the serving and consumption of food and wine at the banquet, as well as for those pertaining to their preparation.⁴ This ancient motif is found not only in Ugaritic, Mesopotamian, and Hebrew literatures, but also in Homer.⁵ Furthermore, the parallel Ugaritic,⁶ Akkadian,⁷ and Hebrew texts referring to banquet preparation contain the meat–wine sequence in formulae that are structurally and semantically identical: \( \text{tabāhu} = \text{tbh} = \text{חֶבֶן} \);⁸ \( \text{ṣagāšu} = \text{ṣn} \);⁹ \( \text{alpu} = \text{alp} = \text{רֶגֶע} \);¹⁰ \( \text{immeru (=} \text{ṣēnu}) = \text{ṣin} = \text{גָּזָה} \).¹¹ The relevant Hebrew passage is Isaiah 22:13, which includes the formulaic phrase \text{גָּזָה} \( \text{דָוָה} \) \( \text{רֶגֶע} \) i.e. \text{slaying oxen and killing sheep}.¹² A further two OT texts containing the meat–wine sequence are also of particular significance. The first is Isa 25:6, in which the preparation of the banquet is by the Lord himself:¹³

---

⁸ I.e. \text{to slaughter} (ibid. 27 n. 41; “\text{qal}”, Holladay, \text{Hebrew Lexicon}, 365). Note that \( \text{qal} \), the verb used in Prov 9:2 for \text{slaughter}, is equivalent to \( \text{בָּשָׁם} \) . See “\text{qal}”, Holladay, \text{Hebrew Lexicon}, 121; and “\text{qal}”, ibid. 365).
⁹ I.e. \text{to kill} (Lichtenstein, “Banquet Motifs,” 27, n. 41; “\text{qal}”, Holladay, \text{Hebrew Lexicon}, 83).
¹⁰ I.e. \text{cows, cattle, bulls, bullocks} (Lichtenstein, “Banquet Motifs,” 27, n. 41; “\text{שָׁבַע}”, Holladay, \text{Hebrew Lexicon}, 46).
¹¹ I.e. \text{small cattle, sheep and goats} (Lichtenstein, “Banquet Motifs,” 27, n. 41; “\text{גָּזָה}”, Holladay, \text{Hebrew Lexicon}, 302).
¹³ Ibid. 28.
On this mountain the LORD of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear. (NRSV)

The passage is important in that the feast to which it refers is the eschatological banquet, and that the latter is thus shown to be in keeping with a literary motif of great antiquity.

The second text of special interest is Amos 6:4–6, which mentions the customs of anointing with oil\textsuperscript{14} and the playing of music\textsuperscript{15} at banquets; it also includes the motif of meat–wine.\textsuperscript{16}

2.2. Sacrificial rites:

Reference has been made in the previous section to the Ugaritic verb \textit{t\textit{bh}} and its equivalence to the Hebrew \textit{\textit{z\textit{bh}}} and \textit{\textit{n\textit{s}}} \textit{\textit{v}}, i.e. to slaughter.\textsuperscript{17} We will now give further consideration to this matter. It is clear that in Hebrew and Greek thought, the slaughter of an animal invariably had ritualistic overtones,\textsuperscript{18} so that \textit{t\textit{bh}} is in effect the equivalent of \textit{z\textit{bh}} = \textit{n\textit{s}}, \textit{to sacrifice}.\textsuperscript{19} Although the parts of the victim to be regarded

\textsuperscript{14} Paralleled in Gilgamesh II:15–18, 24 (Lichtenstein, "Banquet Motifs," 30).

\textsuperscript{15} The association of music and feasting occurs also in Ugaritic, Sumerian, and Homeric texts, and in Isa 5:11–12; 24:7–9. See Lichtenstein, "Banquet Motifs," 30, nn. 55–59.

\textsuperscript{16} See §§3.1, 3.4.1, and 5 below for further reference to this passage.

\textsuperscript{17} See nn. 8 and 12 above.


\textsuperscript{19} See "\textit{n\textit{s}}: qal," Holladay, \textit{Hebrew Lexicon}, 86. Lloyd notes that the terminology used in Deut 12:20–27 regarding consumption of meat in everyday life is the same as that used for specifically sacrificial offerings, and includes the use of the root \textit{n\textit{s}} (\textit{to sacrifice}) for the act of slaughter ("The Banquet Theme," 173).
as particularly sacred were different in the Greek and Hebrew rites, communion with the deity was implied in each case, since the carcass was shared between the human and divine participants. The situation in Ugarit was evidently the same, with no distinction being made between slaughter and sacrifice. This explains why in Ugaritic descriptions of banquet preparations, much more attention is focused on the slaughter of animals, than on opening jars of wine. In fact, priority appears to be given to the meat, as against the wine, throughout the Mediterranean, as is reflected in the sequence in which they appear in banquet narratives. The place where the slaughter occurs, (i.e. the altar), is also given emphasis, and has obvious religious significance in both Hebrew and Greek rituals. Nevertheless, religious rites were associated with wine also. In classical Greece these involved the consecration of some of the beverage in the form of a libation, prior to the mixing and distribution.

20 For the Greeks, the long bones, bone-marrow, and fat (Grottanelli, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 125–27; for the Hebrews, the blood and fat (ibid. 123–25; Lev 3:16b–17). In the Greek ritual, the victim’s blood is reserved for the deity; a special vessel [sphageion] is utilised to collect the blood, which is then poured on the altar (Durand, “Greek Animals,” 90–91). The blood is abandoned, rather than offered (ibid. 91). The actual haemorrhage of the victim is never pictured in Greek art, and appears to be deliberately concealed (ibid. 92; Detienne, “Culinary Practices,” 12). Note that Vernant writes of the moment of death as if the animal’s soul were located in the marrow, and its life in the blood (“At Man’s Table,” in Detienne and Vernant, Cuisine of Sacrifice, 25). According to the LCL translation of Od. 3.455, the bone-marrow (θυμός) contains the life. (See also Grottanelli, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 127). Moreover, the θυμός is understood by Plato as the “spirited” part of the soul. [Plato, Timaeus; Critias; Cleitophon; Menexenus; Epistles (trans. R. G. Bury; vol. 9 of Plato; 12 vols; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929), 192 n. 1, explaining the reference to “the various kinds of Soul” in Timaeus 73C]. These apparent contradictions are resolved by the fact that the concepts of life and soul were equivalent in archaic societies, and were associated particularly with the blood, heart, and liver (Christopher J. Rowe, “soul,” OCD 1428; “soul,” Britannica IX:363; and see, e.g., Od. 14.426; re the soul and liver in the human body, see Vernant, “At Man’s Table,” 54–56). In biblical terms, also, the life is in the blood (Grottanelli, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 124–25, referring esp. to Gen 8:18–22; 9:1–17; see also Lev 17:10–14; Deut 12:23).
22 Lloyd regards the equation of slaughter and sacrifice in Ugarit as merely “probable” (“The Banquet Theme,” 174), while Lucio Milano sees it as absolutely certain (“Codici alimentari, carne e commensalità nella Siria-Palestina di età pre-classica,” in Grottanelli and Parise, Sacrificio e società, 63).
In biblical tradition, specific instructions were given for the drink offering which, together with a grain offering, had to accompany any burnt offering or sacrifice.\textsuperscript{26}

2.3. \textit{The significance of grain:}

2.3.1. Semantics:

Cereal grains and bread were of major significance in the ancient Near East. In biblical Hebrew, the place of grain products as the staple diet is indicated by the fact that the root \( 
\text{סֶלֶשׁ} \) means \textit{to dine}, or \textit{to eat},\textsuperscript{27} while \( 
\text{סֶלֶשׁ} \) may refer to grain for making bread, to bread itself, or to food or nourishment in general.\textsuperscript{28} Precisely the same relationships are evident in Ugaritic poetry, with \( 
\text{לֶחֶם} \) meaning \textit{food} as well as \textit{eat.}\textsuperscript{29}

In view of the meat–wine sequence identified previously,\textsuperscript{30} it is clear then that semantically, \textit{bread} is the equivalent of \textit{meat}. The equation is readily apparent in the synonymous pairs in Ugaritic poetry: \( 
\text{לֶחֶם/לֶשֶׁת (to eat/to drink)} \) and \( 
\text{לֶחֶם/לֶשֶׁת} \), and also from the Hebrew text of Prov 9:2–5.\textsuperscript{31} The position is similar in Greek, where \( 
\text{ἀρτος} \) may have the meaning \textit{bread, loaf, food} (in general), \textit{support, livelihood, or reward} or \textit{proceeds} (of one’s labour).\textsuperscript{32} 

2.3.2. Religious significance:

For the Israelites, grain, wine, and oil represent the agricultural produce of the land,\textsuperscript{33} and comprise a formula that features conspicuously in the OT.\textsuperscript{34} The religious significance of the grain harvest is indicated by the requirement under Torah both to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} See Num 15:1–10 for prescriptions relevant to offerings of well being. The amount of wine offered depended on the type of animal being sacrificed. Re libations, see also Chapter Eight, §3.3.5.7.3.
\item \textsuperscript{27} See “\textit{סֶלֶשׁ}: qal,” Holladay, \textit{Hebrew Lexicon}, 175.
\item \textsuperscript{28} See “\textit{סֶלֶשׁ},” ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Lichtenstein, “Banquet Motifs,” 27.
\item \textsuperscript{30} §2.1 above.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Lichtenstein, “Banquet Motifs,” 27, 20.
\item \textsuperscript{32} See “\textit{ἀρτος}, ὕπατος,” BAGD 110–11.
\item \textsuperscript{33} For comments on the suitability of different areas of Palestine for production of these crops, see Hamel, \textit{Poverty and Charity}, 114–16.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
offer the first fruits,\textsuperscript{35} and to tithe the produce annually,\textsuperscript{36} in order to ensure continued divine blessing.\textsuperscript{37} The original concept was evidently that of a \textit{sacral} offering, although the regulations were probably not followed precisely in practice, and the details appear to have varied at different times and places.\textsuperscript{38} Furthermore, the offering of agricultural first fruits is accompanied by the sacrifice of firstlings from the flock,\textsuperscript{39} the latter representing the product of animal husbandry, just as cereal grains represent the fruits of agriculture. Thus, grain (i.e. bread) and meat can be viewed as counterparts, in that both are used as symbols of the land’s productivity. By offering the first fruits and firstlings, Israel acknowledged that a good yield of grain and livestock depended not only on human endeavour, but also on seasonable weather, and the mysterious, divine element that facilitated growth and fertility.\textsuperscript{40} God’s provision of these essential factors was contingent on Israel’s obedience to the commandments.\textsuperscript{41}

In the ancient Greek world, likewise, cereal grains were of great significance. For Homer, barley and wheat represent the \textit{marrow of men} (\textit{μυελὸς ὁνόματα}).\textsuperscript{42} This certainly indicates that grain was a staple food, and probably implies sacral value as

\begin{footnotes}
\item[34] Of 24 occurrences of the formula in the OT, eight are in the Pentateuch, and six of these are in Deuteronomy.
\item[35] Lev 23:9–14. The offering of the first fruits of the soil is termed the \textit{terumah} (Hamel, \textit{Poverty and Charity}, 148). Although the offering contains the three items (grain, wine, and oil), it is clear that the new grain and its products (flour and bread) have greater religious significance. See Lev 23:9–22.
\item[36] Num 18:21–32; Deut 14:22–23.
\item[37] Deut 7:13.
\item[39] In several different accounts: Lev 23:12 and Num 18:13–17 re the offering of the first fruits; Lev 23:18–20 re the Festival of Weeks; Deut 14:23 re regulations concerning tithes.
\item[40] The concept involved here of an invisible agent which stimulates growth or increase, is perhaps best understood in terms of the Hebrew verb הָנַּה (and in the LXX) its Greek equivalent ἀνεξάνθω, utilised in passages relevant to the “increase” or “multiplication” of the Israelites (e.g. in Gen 1:22, 28; 8:17 etc.). In the NT it is used in Mark 4:8 of the increase of the grain. The mystery attached to the process by which grain grows is captured precisely in Mark 4:27, in the phrase “he does not know how” (NRSV).
\item[41] See esp. Lev 26:9.
\item[42] \textit{Od.} 2.290; 20.108.
\end{footnotes}
well, in light of the belief that the bone-marrow contained an animal's soul.\textsuperscript{43} According to Greek mythology there was in antiquity a Golden Age, when humans and gods were commensals at daily feasts; at that time, cereal grains emerged from the soil without human effort, already "cooked" by sunlight, and ready to eat.\textsuperscript{44} However, the Golden Age ended when Zeus punished Prometheus for deceiving him about the more desirable portions of the animal sacrifice, and for his theft of fire.\textsuperscript{45} Thereafter, humankind needed to labour in order to produce the grain, and then cook it to make it edible.\textsuperscript{46} Vernant demonstrates how cultivated grain is analogous to sacrificial meat, in that what wheat is to wild plants, the domesticated animal is to wild animals.\textsuperscript{47}

2.3.3. Findings:

Examination of ancient Mediterranean traditions concerning cultivated grain shows a clear relationship with sacrificial meat. The link is conspicuous not only in the semantic field, but also in both Hebrew and Greek religious concepts, despite their very different backgrounds.\textsuperscript{48} In the next section we will consider another area, relevant to animal sacrifice, in which there are cross-cultural similarities but also differences.

\textsuperscript{43} Vernant interprets men's marrow in the Homeric passages as meaning "the very substance of their life force" ("At Man's Table," 37). See also n. 20 above.
\textsuperscript{44} Vernant, "At Man's Table," 34, 42.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid. 34, 43.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid. 36, 43.
\textsuperscript{47} See "At Man's Table," 35–38, in which Vernant compares Hesiod's Works and Days and Theogony, and finds that in the former, "the products of the cultivated soil . . . occupy a position analogous to that of the sacrificed ox" in the latter (ibid. 35). With respect to the "increase" of crops and animals, the use of the verb ἀνεξάρτητος shows that in this matter, Greek mythology is comparable with Hebrew thought. The cultivation of grain, and animal husbandry, both require the assistance of the gods as well as human labour to be successful. However, there is no requirement for the Greeks to obey divine commandments. (See n. 44 above, and Vernant, "At Man's Table," 56–57.)
\textsuperscript{48} For reference to the coexistence of a vocabulary of meat and a vocabulary of cereal in Ugaritic myth, see Milano, "Codici alimentari," 64.
2.4. Selection and division of sacrificial animals:

2.4.1. Hebrew traditions:

There were many different kinds of sacrifice in Hebrew tradition, but only two are relevant to this study: the offerings of wellbeing (i.e. peace offerings) and the Passover sacrifice. Offerings of wellbeing were used on occasions when meat was desired for normal consumption.\(^{49}\) For these, the biblical tradition includes strict instructions with respect to the selection of the animal victims: only cattle, sheep, and goats without blemish were suitable,\(^{50}\) while for the Passover, only sheep or goats were used.\(^{51}\) There were several variations in procedures from the patriarchal period through the Second Temple era, and the sacrificial system described in Deuteronomy differs noticeably from the provisions detailed in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.\(^{52}\)

According to the prescriptions of the Priestly writer regarding an offering of wellbeing, the animal was to be slaughtered at the entrance to the tent of meeting, and the priest was to dash the blood against the sides of the altar.\(^{53}\) The priest also burned on the altar all the fat, the kidneys, and the liver appendage,\(^{54}\) and received the right thigh in return for his services.\(^{55}\) The breast of the animal was shared between all the priests, and the person who brought the sacrifice received the remainder.\(^{56}\) While it was mandatory in this account for a priest to officiate,\(^{57}\) a modified version is given in Deuteronomy, permitting the Israelites to slaughter

---

\(^{49}\) Leviticus 3; Susan Rattray, “worship,” *HBD* 1223. Likewise, profane animal slaughter was permitted when meat was required for consumption (ibid. 1225). “Profane” is used with respect to the prescriptions of Deut 12:15–17, 20–24, and merely indicates that the slaughter did not occur at a formal sacrifice. However, the character of the slaughter remained sacral. See also n. 52.

\(^{50}\) Ibid.

\(^{51}\) A year-old unblemished male sheep or goat is specified (Exod 12:5).

\(^{52}\) Rattray, “worship,” 1225.

\(^{53}\) Lev 3:2, 8, 13.

\(^{54}\) Lev 3:3–5, 9–11, 14–16. In the case of a sheep, the tail had also to be removed and burned (Lev 3:9–11).

\(^{55}\) Lev 7:31–34.

\(^{56}\) Ibid. The meat was to be eaten within one to two days (Lev 7:15 cf. 19:6–8).
animals for meat within their own towns whenever they wished, providing the blood was poured out on the ground. The instructions for the Passover too, are different in the Priestly and Deuteronomic accounts. Whereas the account in Ex 12:1–13 has the Israelites celebrating the feast in their households, Deut 16:1–8 stipulates that they may not offer the Passover sacrifice in their towns, but must go to the centralised place of worship. There is no mention of the involvement of priests in either of these accounts, but later references indicate that they had an integral role at Passover, and received portions in return for the services they provided.

2.4.2. Greek traditions:

For the Greeks, as for the Hebrews, only domesticated animals could be used as sacrificial victims; in contrast, however, suitable species included pigs, as well as cattle, sheep, and goats. Rituals were designed with the objects of: obtaining the apparent consent of the animal to its slaughter; concealing the act of violence; and ascertaining the suitability of the chosen victim.

---

57 Lev 3:2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16. Re the distinction between the Aaronides and the Levites, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, “priests,” HBD 880.
58 Deut 12:15–16, 20–24. Other offerings and tithes still had to be taken to the prescribed place of worship (Deut 12:17–18, 26–27).
59 2 Chr 8:13–15; 30:13–27; 2 Kgs 23:21–23; 2 Chr 35:1–19; Ezra 6:19–22. For comments regarding the origins of the Passover and its transition from a household ceremony to a Temple festival, see Jeremiah Unterman, “Passover, the,” HBD 811. The version in 2 Chronicles 35 specifies that Mosaic laws are to be kept (v. 6) and reconciles the discrepancy between Exod 12:8–9 which requires the Passover lamb to be roasted, and Deut 16:7 which refers to boiling of the meat. 2 Chr 35:13 states that the pesach is roasted, while the other meat is boiled. (See ibid.)
60 Detienne, “Culinary Practices,” 8–9; Durand, “Greek Animals,” 94, 238 n. 23. As for the Hebrews, (cf. Exod 22:31; Lev 17:15–16; Ezek 4:14) the consumption of beasts which had died of old age or illness, or had been killed by wild animals, was prohibited (Detienne, “Culinary Practices,” 11).
61 Usually achieved by suddenly placing the animal’s head in contact with water and grain, causing it to shudder and then shake its head; the latter was taken as a sign of consent (ibid. 9). At Cos, the prospective victim was sacrificed only after it was induced to lower its head to signify its supposed agreement. The relevant verb, ὄποκτω, besides referring to the lowering of the head, means taking the posture of a supplicant, (under Zeus’ protection), and also bending beneath the yoke, (indicating submission) [ibid.].
62 Ibid. 10.
63 The appropriateness of the victim was determined by means of mantic scrutiny of the lobes of its liver (Durand, “Greek Animals,” 98; Vernant, “At Man’s Table,” 54, 232 n. 124). Sometimes, the shudder of the animal caused by the shock of the cold water was interpreted as an indication of the victim’s pureness and wholeness (Detienne, “Culinary Practices,” 9).
In the Greek ritual, the hide of the animal was kept intact for the priest (τερενος) or sacrificer. During the subsequent division of the meat, the priest was entitled to the meat privilege (γαρας), i.e. the choice pieces of the victim: the thigh, hindquarter, shoulder, one of the kidneys, and the tongue. As well as these portions, the cult ministers often received the unburnt edible portions (trapezomata) that had been offered to the gods. After the priest and any other privileged recipients had received their portions, the remainder would normally be distributed equally among other guests.

2.5. Division and distribution of sacrificial victims:

Some brief comments are required about the significance of assigning portions of the meat at a commensal meal. As Milano has observed with respect to the communal meal of the Israelites, it was the process of assigning and distributing portions that sealed the bonds between the commensals, as well as affirming the group as an entity. The validity of this point is demonstrable in that for both Hebrew and Greek sacrificial meals, the relevant deity, together with all the human participants, received an appropriate share, and it was the completion of the ritual that united those present. Pitt Rivers has rightly noted that “the ingestion together of a common substance creates a bond”; however, the link between such commensals is much more profound at a sacrificial meal. The reason for this may have been a belief that following the slaughter of the victim, its former integrity and life were symbolically

---

64 Durand, “Greek Animals,” 93, 104.
65 The thigh and hoof were included in the portion from which the long bone had been removed and offered to the gods (ibid. 105; Gill, “Trapezomata,” 123).
66 Durand, “Greek Animals,” 104–105. According to Detienne, a sovereign or other nobility present might also share the best portions (“Culinary Practices,” 13).
68 Detienne surmises (“Culinary Practices,” 13) that two different systems originally existed for carving and distributing the meat, and that they were combined, so that the remaining meat was apportioned in an egalitarian manner once the priest and the nobility had received their shares.
69 “Codici alimentari,” 60.
transferred to the group and thus became a unifying force among those who consumed its parts. In the Homeric tradition this phenomenon can be surmised in the apparent attempt to reconstitute representative parts of the animal during the sacrificial ritual, and in the procedures adopted in ancient hunting customs of the Greeks, aimed at restoring at least the outline of the slain beast. With respect to Hebrew tradition, Milano has made a convincing case for viewing the grim story of the Levite’s concubine (Judges 19–20) in a similar vein, although here a non-comestible sacrifice is involved. The story describes the division and distribution of the sacrificial victim among the twelve tribes, an act that may be interpreted as a means of uniting the Israelites for action against Gibeah. The idea that the integrity of the sacrificed animal somehow remained and had to be maintained, perhaps explains the frequent prescription to consume the whole carcass within a limited time and at the site of the slaughter. Nevertheless, in other cases, portions of the sacrifice were distributed to those who were not present at the time.

The task of assigning portions was evidently prestigious, and was undertaken in the name of a sovereign, or entrusted to persons of high rank, such as

70 Anthropology, 109–110.
71 See Grottanelli, “Uccidere, donare, mangiare: Problematiche attuale del sacrificio antico,” in Grottanelli and Parise, Sacrificio e società, 34; and also Dunnill, Covenant and Sacrifice, esp. 91–92.
72 Od. 3.455–458; 14.427–428; and re the original purpose of the practice see Walter Burkert, Greek Religion (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985), 57.
73 Ibid. 58. Burkert’s introduction to the topic indicates that such practices should perhaps be viewed as universal (ibid. 55).
75 Ibid. The argument is particularly persuasive in that the term for the knife used by the Levite to dismember the victim is μάρα, i.e. the same tool as that employed in Gen 22:6, 10 and intended for the sacrificial slaughter of Isaac. Moreover, the verb used for the dismemberment of the woman’s body is a technical term relevant to sacrifice: μαραστός. See ibid. 59; Judg 19:29.
76 The custom is found in both biblical and Greek traditions. Re the Hebrews, see e.g. Lev 7:15; 19:6–8; Exod 12:10; Deut 16:7; and re the Greeks, see Burkert, Greek Religion, 57, 369 n. 15.
77 Neh 8:10–12; (and equivalent in 1 Esd 9:51, 54).
78 The reason that assigning portions was considered a privilege probably stemmed from the belief that the portion received foreshadowed one’s destiny. (On this concept see esp. Grottanelli, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 132, 158 n. 29; see also Plutarch, Mor. 10.644 re the gods Portion and Lot.)
a priest.\textsuperscript{80} Such persons had the option of favouring certain guests or persons by giving special portions or larger servings. For instance:

- in Gen 43:34, Joseph provides portions of honour (רָבָא) from his own table, giving Benjamin five times as much as his other brothers;\textsuperscript{81}
- in Esth 2:9, Xerxes provides Esther with special food, and in 2:18 gives a great banquet in her honour, and liberally distributes gifts among the people;\textsuperscript{81}
- in 2 Sam 11:8, David sends a special portion of food (רָבָא) for Uriah;\textsuperscript{82}
- in \textit{Od.} 8.470–481, Odysseus, having been elevated to the position of chief guest, is evidently given the portion of honour.\textsuperscript{83}

However, even in circumstances where the person responsible for assigning portions was the father figure,\textsuperscript{84} it was possible to show favouritism, as did Elkanah, in 1 Sam 1:1–5.\textsuperscript{85}

In Neh 8:10–12, the food and drink comprise שִׁפְנוּת (i.e. \textit{delicious \textit{festive}} food prepared with much fat),\textsuperscript{86} and יִשְׁפָּנוֹת (i.e. \textit{sweet drinks}),\textsuperscript{87} suggesting extraordinarily choice fare, although the term נָשִׁי\textsuperscript{88} does not necessarily signify

\begin{flushright}
addition, it is clear that those authorised to assign portions could show partiality to some recipients if they wished. See Grottanelli, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 132–33; Milano, “Codici alimentari,” 69–70. \textsuperscript{79} E.g. in celebration of the return of the ark, David offered burnt offerings and offerings of wellbeing, and portions of food were distributed among all the Israelites (2 Sam 6:17–19; also 1 Chr 16:1–3). \textsuperscript{80} E.g. 1 Sam 9:23–24 describes how Samuel has instructed the cook to set aside a special portion for Saul. This passage serves well to make the distinction between the sacrificer (the butcher-cook) and the sacrificer (the priest, Samuel). The position is similar here to that of Greek tradition, where from the fifth century B.C.E. onwards the sacrifice was offered by the priest, but would be performed by a ritual specialist (a functionary titled the \textit{maizeiros}) [Detienne, “Culinary Practices,” 11]. \textsuperscript{81} Note that the Hebrew term translated \textit{gifts} in the NRSV is actually רָוָא, i.e. the same as that interpreted as \textit{portion of honour} in Gen 43:34. Although Holladay (“רָוָא,” \textit{Hebrew Lexicon}, 217) suggests the meaning here as Xerxes having granted gifts of wheat, the gifts could appropriately be seen as distributions of special portions of food from the banquet. \textsuperscript{82} Again, the term should be seen as implying a portion of honour. \textsuperscript{83} Odysseus, in turn, assigns part of this special portion to the minstrel, and instructs the herald to take it to him. See Grottanelli, “L’ideologica,” 131. \textsuperscript{84} E.g. for offerings of wellbeing, as in Lev 7:29–34. \textsuperscript{85} The meaning of the term יִשְׁפָּנוֹת יִשְׁפָּנוֹת in v. 5 is considered uncertain, but it is generally translated \textit{a double portion} (see NRSV, NIV).
\end{flushright}
special portions. The occasion described in this passage is the re-establishment of the Feast of Booths, a joyous festival held at the end of the year (on the fifteenth to the twenty-second days of the seventh month), to celebrate the ingathering of the autumnal produce from the threshing floor and the winepress. In addition, the festival commemorated God's protection over the Israelites during their time in the wilderness, and also looked forward to the ultimate ingathering of all the nations to worship at Jerusalem.

What is important for our purposes is a comparison of various references to the Feast of Booths, with the description of the eschatological banquet in Isa 25:6–8. Three points are worthy of note. Firstly, in the Isaiah passage, there is considerable emphasis on the extraordinary quality of the meat and wine, far more than in the comparable description of the rich food and drink in Neh 8:10–12. Secondly, the feasts described in those two passages represent banquets of basically different kinds. In one type, the participants provide the food; in the other, the host (usually a sovereign) bears the total cost of the meal. The Feast of Booths is obviously of the first type: all males are obliged to attend; no one is to arrive empty-handed; and each must give according to his ability. For the eschatological banquet, on the other

---

86 See עֶזְבֹּתָה, Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 220.
87 See עֶזְבֹּתָה, ibid. 200. The NRSV renders the term sweet wine.
88 Neh 8:10, 12.
90 Hence the requirement to dwell in booths during the week-long feast (Unterman, “Tabernacles, Festival of,” 1088).
91 Ibid.; Zech 14:16.
92 Shown clearly in the excerpt from v. 6: מְשַׁמֵּשׁ מַשָּׁהַ יְשׁוֹעֵי יוֹדֵעַ מַשָּׁהַ יְשׁוֹעֵי, i.e. “a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear,” (NRSV).
93 E.g. as for the sacrifices prescribed in the Pentateuch, or an ἁρπαγός, a “meal to which each brings his own portion.” See Od. 1.226.
94 E.g. Xerxes in 2:18; David in 2 Sam 6:17–19.
95 Exod 23:15b; Deut 16:16–17.
hand, God himself will provide all of the food and wine for the occasion.  
Thirdly, in Zech 14:16 the imagery of *ingathering*, primarily associated with the autumnal produce and celebrated at the Feast of Booths, is extended to apply to the future *ingathering of the nations*; it is stipulated that thereafter, a nation’s non-attendance of the Feast of Booths will incur dire punishment. In contrast, the vision of Isaiah has the *ingathering* occurring at the eschatological banquet—a completely inclusive event at which every nation is to be gathered in, with all sorrow and oppression having been overcome by God’s mercy and provision.

2.6. *Implications of findings for thesis topic:*

The combined findings from the investigation of ancient feasting traditions of the Mediterranean region are significant for interpreting a range of NT passages, especially accounts concerning Jesus and meals. One of the findings most obviously relevant to Jesus’ table fellowship practice is the confirmation of the bonding that typically occurred among commensals, and that this may probably be traced back to very primitive origins. The elements involved are thus far more profound than what is described as “the friend-making character of the table.” Moreover, when the equivalence of bread and meat is acknowledged, the idea that sharing the portions of a single sacrificial victim has a unifying influence on the participants, has obvious significance for interpreting the institution of the Lord’s Supper. This same factor

---

97 The appointed festivals of the ancient Israelites were derived mostly from festivities associated with nature, but in time assumed relevance to historical events as recalled by the community (Walter Harrelson, “Worship,” *Britannica* 19:1017).
98 Zech 14:16–19. Zechariah 9–14 probably dates from the fifth or fourth century (Paul D. Hanson, “Zechariah, the Book of,” *HBD* 1240).
100 See Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 89–90; and further discussion in Chapter Eight, §4.1.
101 Smith, “Table Fellowship,” 302, referring to Plutarch, *Mor.* 614A–B.
clearly allows a strong link to be made between the *bread* and wine in the Last Supper accounts, and the *meat* and wine in the Isa 25:6–8 reference to the eschatological banquet. The findings provide important background for Chapter Eight, in which we will undertake a detailed investigation of the Last Supper, and its links with the feeding stories, with expectations concerning the end time, and with early Christianity.

The review of elementary traditions revealed many similarities between the banqueting motifs and sacrificial practices of various cultures in the Mediterranean area. However, there was also considerable diversity, indicating a need to examine the dining traditions of the Hebrews and Greeks under separate categories. In an attempt to provide an accurate basis for visualising the historical Jesus at table, the findings regarding the *marzeah* and συμπόσιον will then be considered in relation to the Roman *cena*, and Jewish meals of the early first century C.E.

3. **The banquets:**

3.1. *The marzeah*

The type of feast termed *marzeah* is known from a vast number of occurrences dating from a little after the mid-second millennium B.C.E. to the sixth century C.E.\(^{103}\) Although there were undoubtedly cultural variations of *marzeah* and changes and/or development over these two millennia, an amazing degree of continuity is evident.\(^{104}\)

Innumerable studies have been conducted in the field, the 1973 dissertation of David Bryan probably being the most comprehensive to date.\(^{105}\) He has provided


\(^{105}\) See n. 103.
descriptions, translations and commentaries for a multitude of texts, including Ugaritic and Akkadian, Phoenician, Aramaic, and Palestinian. A Canaanite text, believed authentic, and thought to date from about the sixth century B.C.E., has since been discovered.

Care must be taken not to read back into the earlier examples of marzeah, features relevant to the praxis of a later time and culture, but the following points are generally agreed. The marzeah was a kind of club or association, a corporate body which could own property. It met occasionally or periodically for feasts involving an excessive intake of food, and particularly of wine. A member was known as a hbr; collectively they were “men of the marzeah” and they were

---

107 Viz.: biblical, targumic, and rabbinic references. The rabbinic, targumic, and other texts from the Common Era are of little significance here apart from proving that the marzeah survived into and beyond the NT period. However, rabbinic thought is important insofar as it lends support to a discernible theme, which is discussed below.
110 The word club has the advantage that it can be understood as either an organisation or the building in which a group meets. See Jared Judd Jackson, “Style in Isaiah 28 and a Drinking Bout of the Gods (RS 24.258),” in Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Mullenburg (ed. J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1974), 95 n. 82; and Mitchell Dahood, “Additional Notes on the marhe text,” in The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets (ed. L. R. Fisher; Rome: Pontificio Institutum Biblicum, 1971), 52. Marzeah in some contexts, e.g. in KTU 1.114, appears to denote a place. See e.g. McLaughlin, “The marzeah at Ugarit,” 273–74, 281, with reference to the meaning as place in the mythological texts. However, the term appears to refer in most occurrences to some sort of socio-religious organisation. See T. J. Lewis, Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit (HSM 39; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1989), esp. 82–83 and nn. 14, 16.
111 Usually religious, although L’Heureux sees it as a fraternal association as well. See C. E. L’Heureux, Rank among the Canaanite Gods El, Ba’al and the Rephaim (HSM 21; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1979), 219. However, at least with regard to the Ugaritic texts, his idea of marzeah as a guild is not well accepted; see e.g. Dennis Pardee, review of L’Heureux, Rank among the Canaanite Gods, AFO 28 (1981/1982): 266–67.
112 E.g. buildings, vineyards, etc. See McLaughlin, “The marzeah at Ugarit,” 266–74, 280–81; Lewis, Cults of the Dead, 83.
from the higher levels of society. The chief of proceedings was called *rb mrzah*, the approximate equivalent of *symposiarch*.

The two biblical occurrences of *marzeah* are in Jer 16:5 and Amos 6:7. The LXX translates *marzeah* in Jeremiah 16 as *θιαος*; in Amos 6 it has evidently been mistranslated, but it is clear from the content and eighth century dating of this passage that *marzeah* closely approximates the Greek *συμπόσιον* of the same period. The commencement of such symptic culture, for which the significant indicator is the custom of reclining, has usually been assigned to the late seventh century; however, it is better placed a century earlier and is thus contemporaneous with the feasting described in Amos 6.

---


119 Bryan, “Texts Relating,” 8; Lewis, *Cults of the Dead*, 91; Greenfield, “Social Institution,” 454; the role is sometimes that of high priest but it is clear that his primary function is not sacerdotal (ibid. 454, 454 n. 20).

120 This supports the theory that there is a religious connotation in some instances (King, “*marzeah*: Evidence,” 98). King here suggests that the name *θιαος* designates “a religious guild or confraternity with a divine patron,” a description consistent with the findings of Avigad and Greenfield re the cult of Shamash at Palmyra (“Bronze phiale,” 128). The only other occurrence of *θιαος* in the LXX apart from Jer 16:5, is in Wis 12:5.

121 Viz. as *ἵππων*, gen. pl. of *ἵππος*, which is nonsensical in this context.

122 See §3.2 below. *Marzeah* and *συμπόσιον* are also shown to be equivalent in the Palmyrene texts dating from the first three centuries of the Common Era. See King, “*marzeah*: Evidence,” 98; and for dating, Avigad and Greenfield, (“Bronze phiale,” 125). See also Bryan, “Texts Relating,” 2, 8; Grottanelli, “Wine and Death,” 85; Oswald Loretz, “The Ancient Syro-Palestinian Institution of the *marzhu* ‘Thiasos, Symposium’ According to the Ugaritic Text *KTU* 1.114,” in *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Palestine Antiquities III* (ed. Shawqi Shaath; Aleppo, 1988), 171.


There is continuing controversy as to whether or not some type of funerary or death cult was an essential characteristic, i.e. whether the marzeah was necessarily a funerary banquet. Whilst the context in Jer 16:5 suggests this as a possibility, it seems best to conclude that there is no essential link between marzeah and funerary cult.\textsuperscript{125} However, in the relevant literature, there is a recurring link between feasting and death, which is explored in §5 below.

3.2. The Greek σωμόθεουν:

The common elements in ancient Near Eastern and Homeric banqueting practices might collectively be termed institutionalised licentiousness—drinking as the primary activity, together with its normal accompaniment of eating to excess, and also music, song, and dance.\textsuperscript{126} For the Homeric banquet, especially, contests (i.e. games), bathing and anointing were also important components. In the Greek world of the eighth century, the addition to these elements of two new customs marks the transition to the σωμόθεουν. The first, the habit of reclining for the meal, has already been noted above, together with the correspondence between the Greek σωμόθεουν,

\textsuperscript{125} Such cults were indubitably associated with the marzeah in certain instances, e.g. in Nabataea (Lewis, Cults of the Dead, 90–91; Miller, “The mrzh text,” 46). Nevertheless, it should not be assumed that this was always so. Clearly, it is methodologically inept simply to import concepts across several centuries, either forwards from Ugarit, or backwards from Nabataea, into a different ancient Near Eastern region and culture. On the argument for the marzeah as a funerary banquet, see Marvin H. Pope, “The Cult of the Dead at Ugarit,” in Ugarit in Retrospect (ed. Gordon D. Young; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1981), 159–79; Miller, “The mrzh text,” 46–47, 47 n. 1; Baruch Margalit, “The Ugarteic Feast of the Drunken Gods: Another Look at R 24.258 (KTU 1.114),” Maariv 2/1 (1979–1980): 101–2, n. 104; and Jackson, “Style in Isaiah 28,” 95 n. 83; and on the argument against, see Bryan, “Texts Relating,” 226; Lewis, Cults of the Dead, 93–94; and McLaughlin, “The marzeah at Ugarit,” 281.

\textsuperscript{126} Milano, in considering the function of wine in the ancient banqueting traditions, refers to the existence of a climate of istituzionalizzata licenziosità (“Codici alimentari,” 74). See also Lewis, Cults of the Dead, 83, re the place of drinking in the marzeah at Ugarit. Of particular interest with respect to the cross-cultural similarity of banqueting practices, is an Egyptian text of the New Kingdom, (i.e. 1567–1085 B.C.E.) which describes the dissipated lifestyle of a young man who behaves “like a Syrian,” instead of focusing on studying to be a scribe. See Grottanelli, “Wine and Death,” 81–82, n. 4, and for dating, Wente, “Egypt, History,” 471–79.
and the *marzeah* described in Amos 6. The art and literature of that period confirm the subsequent adoption of the practice throughout Greece by the late seventh century. The second new custom is the division of the activities of eating and drinking, into the δείπνον and συμπόσιον.

Regardless of these major changes, however, there is evidence that the συμπόσιον evolved directly from the Homeric feasts associated with the warrior elite. This is seen most clearly in the emphasis on luxury, and on the pursuit of ἐφροσύνη, a term familiar from Homer, signifying the joy and elation that should accompany a feast. It was the task of the symposiarch to ensure that a proper balance was attained between sobriety and inebriation, so that ἐφροσύνη would prevail. Another important aspect carried over into the συμπόσιον from the Archaic
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127 See §3.1 above; Murray, “Nestor’s Cup,” 48–49. Murray demonstrates the probability of the Greeks having first encountered the custom of reclining on the island of Pithecusae (present-day Ischia). His hypothesis is that Phoenician influence, including the distinctive oriental habit of reclining at meals, was transferred to Greece no later than the second half of the eighth century, via Euboean traders who brought wine to the Italian peninsula in exchange for metal and luxury items required by the Greek aristocracy (ibid. 47, 53–54). Note that in the eighth century in Pithecusae, community members themselves were traders rather than aristocrats, but perhaps included some families of Phoenician-Greek extraction and culture (ibid. 54). The attestation that Phoenician wine was imported into Italy in the second half of the eighth century supports Murray’s argument (Annette Rathje, “The Adoption of the Homeric Banquet in Central Italy in the Orientalizing Period,” *Symptotica*, 282).


129 Ibid. 48.

130 Murray, “Nestor’s Cup,” 48; idem, *Early Greece*, 81, 177, 207. One of the reasons the συμπόσιον was restricted to the elite was that servants/slaves were needed to serve food and wine to banqueters who were reclining [J.-M. Dentzer, *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche Orient et le monde grec du VIIème au IVème siècle avant J.-C.* (Paris, 1982), 450].


period was that commensality was basically confined to males. Any females present would be courtesans, entertainers or slaves.

The combined effect of these several elements was that the συμπόσιον developed as a distinctive, ritualised occasion focused on drinking, luxury, and pleasure, and characterised by a strict format, rules of conduct, and various kinds of entertainment. Some of the amusement was provided by hired musicians, dancers, acrobats, and wrestlers, etc., but the guests themselves created much of the entertainment, particularly through contests involving recitation and poetic creativity.

The adoption of the recumbent position for dining had two significant effects. Firstly, it placed restrictions on the size of the group that could be accommodated, and on the layout of the dining area. The ἄνδρων of the classical period was roughly square, usually containing seven to eleven couches, which held one or two

---

134 See Murray, “Nestor’s Cup,” 49; Dentzer, Motif du banquet, 448. The hetaerae of ancient Greece were independent, professional courtesans, and were often highly educated; they were wealthy, respected women, taxed and protected by the state, and more socially emancipated than most; usually they were freedwomen, slaves, or foreigners (Madeleine M. Henry, “hetairai,” OCD 702; “hetaerae,” Britannica V: 19–20). The ἐπίτραπες was therefore to be distinguished from the τύφοι, who was a common prostitute (“ἐπίτραπες,” LSJ 700).
136 Pellizer, “Symptotic Entertainment,” 177–84; Burkhard Fehr, “Entertainers at the Symposion: The Akletoi in the Archaic Period,” in Murray, Symptotica, 185–95. The contests normally took the form of capping, in which each guest in turn attempted to better the previous singer’s performance of spontaneously composed verses in the same metre (Murray, Early Greece, 210; idem, “Nestor’s Cup,” 51). Murray notes that “the skolion and epigram are forms of composition especially adapted to the symposion,” (ibid.).
137 Too large a group would lack the intimacy that was essential to the συμπόσιον, and would be an impediment to communal activities (Murray, “Symptotic History,” 7).
138 The term ἄνδρων usually refers to the men’s quarters in the front part of a house, i.e. a dining room or banqueting hall. However, as a loanword (andron) in Latin it is used for the passage between the men’s and women’s quarters. See Carolyn Osiek and David L. Balch, Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches (The Family, Religion, and Culture; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 6, citing Vitruvius, De architettura 6.7.1–5; Smith, “Social Obligation,” 143 n. 26.
guests each, and were arranged end to end around the room.\footnote{Katherine M. D. Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more bibetetur: Greeks and Romans on the Dining Couch,” in Nielsen, Meals in a Social Context, 83. Dunbabin points out that with a very large number of guests, intimate dialogue between them would have been possible only if order were strictly maintained (ibid.).} The guest of honour had ostensibly the highest place to the right of the doorway as one entered the room, while the host took the lowest place immediately to the left of the entrance.\footnote{Ibid. 83, 99 n. 7, citing Plato, Symp. 175C and 177D re status of positions. For layout of couches see ibid. 82, Fig. 1; Dunbabin, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” in Slater, Dining in a Classical Context, Plates/Triclinium and Stibadium, Fig. 3.}

However, since couches were equidistant from the centre of the room, from which servants operated and where entertainment occurred, it is unlikely that there was any significant difference in the status attached to the various positions; hence an ethos of equality and unity can be surmised.\footnote{Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more bibetetur,” 83.} Although this type of dining area was still used in the Hellenistic period, two other types, the broad-room and the long-room, especially the former, were by then more common.\footnote{Ibid. 83–84.} The typical broad-room\footnote{I.e. oecus major (ibid. 84). The broad-room was not of Greek origin and probably derived from the East (Inge Nielsen, “Royal Banquets: The Development of Royal Banquets and Banqueting Halls from Alexander to the Tetrarchs,” in idem, Meals in a Social Context, 107).} was probably multi-functional, serving as living quarters in smaller dwellings, and as dining and reception areas in larger houses.\footnote{Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more bibetetur,” 84–86.} The way in which couches were arranged in the broad-room is unclear, but in the long-room, (symmetrical with the doorway placed centrally at one end), it is probable that the middle couch at the far end was the place of honour.\footnote{Ibid. 86–88. See also Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 107.} Such a layout, in a room perhaps 11 metres long, would preclude the type of intimacy possible in the square ἄνδρεῖον; however, this π- shaped arrangement was used also for formal dining in much smaller rooms, which
would have allowed the close interaction between commensals that was traditional for the συμπόσιον.\textsuperscript{146}

The second important effect of reclining for meals was a decline in sexual morality, with the consequence that pederasty became idealised as a formal mode of education, and for the initiation of young males into manhood. Moreover, slaves and/or entertainers of either sex were vulnerable to sexual exploitation by the all-male group, owing to the apprehension that "free love" existed within the συμπόσιον;\textsuperscript{147} flute girls especially, were the target of such advances.\textsuperscript{148}

Some changes were evident between the sixth and third centuries, especially in entertainment: the spoken word tended to replace song, and poetry to replace athletic contests.\textsuperscript{149} Nevertheless, near the end of the second century B.C.E. in Syria, the same fundamental elements of συμπόσια are evident in Posidonius' description of the urban lifestyle of the wealthy bourgeoisie, as well as in Palestinian epigrams of that era.\textsuperscript{150} Cameron asserts the constancy of the basic sympotic form over the centuries and across the Hellenistic world,\textsuperscript{151} whilst Oswyn Murray surmises that although the second and first centuries B.C.E. saw a decline of the συμπόσιον, there was occasional revival of it by the Augustan age.\textsuperscript{152} Thus it should not be surprising to find that behaviour and customs described in the NT era often reflect meal

\textsuperscript{146} Dunbabin, "Ut Graeco more bibereur," 88. Note that the term triklinos appears to refer to such a T-shaped layout in a dining area, rather than to a three-couch room, as one would expect (ibid. 88–89, 100 nn. 24–25).

\textsuperscript{147} Murray, "Sympotic History," 7; idem, "Nestor's Cup," 49.

\textsuperscript{148} Pellegrino, "Sympotic Entertainment," 118, n. 15. According to Aune, Greek art demonstrates the frequent presence of flute girls at symposia, and their identity as prostitutes ("Septem sapientium convivium," 72 n. 42).

\textsuperscript{149} Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 1:55, citing Athenaeus, Deipn. 12.527 eff (FGH 87 F 10) par. 5.210 eff. See Hengel, ibid. 2:41 n. 415. The epigrams of Meleager and Philodemus, and Let. Aris. 108–111 all confirm the perspective of Posidonius (Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 1:55).

\textsuperscript{150} Cameron, Callimachus, 72.

practices redolent of sympotic culture. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the term *sympotic* covers a wide range of influences. Private *συμπόσια* fell into two main categories: (1) those where the host himself provided for the needs of invited guests, e.g. a family occasion to mark a wedding or funeral, or a banquet held in a private home; and (2) those where the cost was shared between the participants, e.g. a regular meeting of an association or club. The latter type would usually be termed *θάξον* or *ἐρανον*. The term *symposium* was also applied to a literary genre: a loose structure that included dialogues, discourses, etc. purporting to have taken place in the context of a meal.

It is important to note here that although many scholars assume the symposium genre has been utilised as a literary device to depict table fellowship in Luke, there are good reasons for rejecting this notion, and for Gospel studies it is best to consider the symposium in broad terms. It is necessary then, to determine as far as possible those elements that are relevant to *actual* sympotic practices, rather than to the literary genre. The range of material for this purpose is vast, but to be valid for Jesus research, literary sources must be restricted to those dated no later

---

153 Aune, "Septem sapientum convivium," 72 n. 43.
154 Ibid. 72.
157 See the section "A critique of the symposium hypothesis," ibid. 136–44.
158 As Braun emphasises (ibid. 143).
than about the mid-first century C.E. This criterion means that commonly used
sources such as Plutarch and Lucian are ruled out.\textsuperscript{159} Nevertheless, a substantial body
of appropriate literature\textsuperscript{160} allows us to summarise the characteristic features of the
Greek \textit{συμπόσιον} as overindulgence in food and wine, intoxication, reclining, moral
decadence, competition, music, song, dance, bathing/washing, and anointing.\textsuperscript{161}

3.3. \textit{The Roman cena and convivium:}

The main Roman meal of the day was the \textit{cena}, or \textit{cenatio},\textsuperscript{162} while the term
\textit{convivium} implied a banquet.\textsuperscript{163} The lack of equivalents to the Greek names that
specifically imply a drinking party probably reflects the Roman preference for
drinking \textit{during} the meal, rather than only at the second stage of the gathering.\textsuperscript{164}

Nevertheless, the \textit{commissatio}, a revel that followed the meal, was typically the time
for more serious drinking, and for entertainment, though both could occur in the
earlier part of the gathering.\textsuperscript{165} For the most part, the terms \textit{cena} and \textit{convivium} seem

\textsuperscript{159} Hence, as discussed in Chapter Two, Lucian’s works and Plutarch’s \textit{Table Talk} are not legitimate
sources for ascertaining banqueting customs of Jesus’ era. However, Plutarch’s work may be used to
confirm that a practice remained current into the second century C.E.

\textsuperscript{160} Supplemented by findings of archaeological research such as those above on dining areas.

\textsuperscript{161} Becker and Göll, \textit{Charicles} remains an invaluable resource in this field, providing innumerable
references. See esp. 89–108 (Scene VI, “The Banquet”), and 310–32, 333–47 (Excourses I and II, on
“The Meals” and “The Symposia” respectively). Note that the number of differences in details given
by Plutarch, as against earlier writers, confirms the need to restrict the sources used for exploring
Greek symposia. E.g. (1) Plutarch describes δαίμονες as being an innovation in his city, whereas from
earlier literature this type of shared meal appears to have been the norm for public feasts [ibid. 314].
(2) More formality seems to have been attached to invitations in Plutarch’s era than in earlier times
[ibid. 315]. (3) Prior to the Roman conquest the Greeks evidently did not commence their meals with
the equivalent of a \textit{gustus}, whereas by the time of Plutarch and Athenaeus, appetisers (ψυχραὶ
τράπεζας) were normally served. [See ibid. 325–26; Plutarch, \textit{Mor.} 733F; Athenaeus, \textit{Deipn.} 58–64].
(4) Though an argument from silence is not compelling, it is perhaps significant that only Plutarch
mentions flute-playing during the libation ceremony [Becker and Göll, \textit{Charicles}, 330; Plutarch, \textit{Mor.}
713A].

\textsuperscript{162} Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 105. The word \textit{cenatio} was also used to designate a large dining hall
(ibid. 107).

\textsuperscript{163} The term \textit{epulum} could be used also, though this was mostly applied to public banquets (ibid. 105).

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid; John D’Arms, “The Roman \textit{convivium} and the Idea of Equality,” in Murray, \textit{Sympotica}, 311,
311 n. 23, citing Cicero, \textit{Fam.} 9.24.3. See also Keith Bradley, “The Roman Family at Dinner,” in
Nielsen, \textit{Meals in a Social Context}, 48; re the dessert course, i.e. \textit{mensae secundae} or \textit{second tables}.

\textsuperscript{165} Smith, “Social Obligation,” 30, n. 32.
to be used interchangeably, both in the ancient literature, and in current discussion on the topic; the latter term is often equated with symposium.

Although the practice of reclining for meals is believed to have spread to central Italy in the Archaic era, only the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods are of interest here. Much of the evidence concerning the cena is drawn from the δείπνον literature, which differs from the symposium genre in that it focuses on the food and drink that is served to guests, as well as, or instead of, the conversation that occurs during the meal. For the Roman period, the pertinent examples of the δείπνον occur as satires, notably those of Horace and Petronius, modelled on the prototype written by Lucilius. Although these works undoubtedly contain exaggerations, the portrayals they offer are fundamentally realistic, with each writer having provided a critique of the banqueting practices of his own era.

The clash of dining cultures that occurred between Greeks and Romans during the first century B.C.E. and the early Empire is an extraordinarily complex topic, and the difficulties involved are exacerbated by the paucity of reliable evidence from this period. One of the points at issue will serve to illustrate the topic's level of complexity: viz. whether women were indeed permitted to participate
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166 E.g. the Cena Nasidieni and Cena Trimalchionis both fall into the category of banquets rather than ordinary meals.
167 Re the impracticality of distinguishing between the terms relevant to ancient dinner-parties, see William J. Slater, “Introduction,” in idem, Dining in a Classical Context, 5.
169 See §3.1 and n. 127 above; Nevio Zorzetti, “The carmina convivalia,” in Murray, Sympotica, 290.
172 Ibid.; Shero, “The cena,” 127, 143. It is generally accepted that Lucilius' Book 20 contains a description of an actual banquet hosted by the nouveau riche Granius and attended by the tribune Crassus (ibid. 128; Martin, “Deipnonliteratur,” 664). See ibid. re other works of Lucilius which fall into the category of deipna.
in the Roman *convivium*, although they were excluded from the Greek *συμπόσιον*.

Although Oswyn Murray offers sound evidence for the presence of matrons at Roman banquets, Dunbabin remarks that this matter requires further analysis. It is therefore prudent to adopt a cautious approach, such as Bradley’s observation that the *cenā* was essentially an occasion for *male* friends to meet for pleasurable conversation while eating and drinking, although women were not entirely excluded.

Despite the inherent complications in such research, archaeological findings have provided some valuable insights on the question of dining areas. The style that ultimately became the norm for Roman dining halls appears to have been influenced by the Hellenistic royal palaces, as well as the Greek *ἀνδρῷ*.

The latter, comprising a small, square dining room with couches along four walls, and an asymmetrical door, was suited to the Greek *συμπόσιον* because the commensals sought intimacy and conversation. However, the banqueting halls in the new palaces of the Eastern kings (the Seleucids, Ptolemies, Hasmoneans, and Herod the Great), were of quite a different style—very large, opulent rooms, open on one side, often affording a spectacular view. The couches were placed around the other

---

174 Ibid. 81. See D’Arms, “The Roman *convivium,*” 312, for a typical comment on the subject.
176 “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 98 n. 2. Bradley comments that iconographic evidence provides many examples showing men, women and children eating together at a funeral meal, and suggests that this is “perhaps modelled on ordinary social practice,” (Bradley, “Roman Family at Dinner,” 38).
177 Dunbabin asserts that funerary art does not reflect *actual* convivial custom (“Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 101 n. 33).
178 Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 128.
179 Ibid. 116, 131 n. 30.
180 Ibid. 116.
181 Ibid. 116–24. The dining halls in the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces, and that of the governor in Ptolemais, were modelled on the Pavilion in the palace of Ptolemy II in Alexandria (ibid. 116, 132 n. 47).
three sides in a π-shape, with the place of honour in the middle section.\textsuperscript{182} These royal halls were placed on the central axis in the palaces, in contrast to Greek άνθρωπος, which tended to be tucked out-of-the-way.\textsuperscript{183} Moreover, the function of social occasions held in such halls was very different from the ethos of the συμπόσιον, with the focus of attention here being upon the sovereign, and on status, rather than on equality, conversation, and commensality.\textsuperscript{184}

Hence, when the Romans modelled their small, home dining areas upon the π-shape, or triclinium,\textsuperscript{185} the intimacy of the συμπόσιον could be obtained by limiting numbers to an optimum of nine; i.e. three diners on each of three couches.\textsuperscript{186} However, the Greek ideal of equality among commensals was replaced by concern over rank.\textsuperscript{187} The seat of honour was now the third place on the middle couch, while the host was adjacent, in the first place on the lowest couch, with the guest of honour to his left.\textsuperscript{188} Thus, the scenario is distinctly different from that of the Greek συμπόσιον.

A further consideration with respect to the merging of Greek and Roman cultures is the way in which architectural styles were affected. Characteristically, at least within Italy, Latin houses differed significantly from the Greek norm, in that close to the front entrance (ostium) was an atrium, a reception area reached by means

\textsuperscript{182} As for the broad-room and long-room. See §3.2 above; Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 125–26.
\textsuperscript{183} Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 107, 109.
\textsuperscript{184} Ibid. 125.
\textsuperscript{185} Triclinium, a Latinised version of the Greek τό τρίκλινον or τό τρίκλινον (= ὁ τρίκλινος), was first used to designate a room in Varro, Ling. 8 (Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 105, 130 n. 9). See also n. 146 above.
\textsuperscript{186} Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 128. Re Varro’s view of nine as the ideal number, see Bradley, “Roman Family at Dinner,” 37; Smith, “Social Obligation,” 27–28, n. 20.
\textsuperscript{188} Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more bireretur,”89; idem, Plates/Triclinium and Stibadium, Fig. 5. The three couches are designated lectus summus, lectus medius, and lectus imus (ibid.). Note that in Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica (trans. H. Rushton Fairclough; rev. and repr. ed.; LCL;
of a small hallway (fauces).\textsuperscript{189} During the Hellenistic period, the Greek peristyle was introduced, and was adopted in Roman houses shortly afterwards;\textsuperscript{190} by 79 C.E. the majority of houses in Pompeii and Herculaneum included a peristyle, usually situated behind the atrium.\textsuperscript{191} Another import, from the Hellenistic East, was the broad-room, or oecus.\textsuperscript{192} This type of room, which was elaborately decorated, usually opened toward the portico, and was often utilised for dining in fine weather.\textsuperscript{193}

A significant difference between the dwellings of Greeks and Romans resulted from their disparate attitudes to privacy. Whereas the Greek house was designed to exclude outsiders, the Roman concept was to make a display of the interior of the home and its occupants.\textsuperscript{194} Vitruvius indicated that anyone had the right to enter the vestibule, atrium and peristyle of a dwelling, and that only the bedrooms, dining areas, and baths were regarded as private.\textsuperscript{195} Hence, visitors and/or strangers were able to enter right into the living area of Roman dwellings, with or without an invitation.\textsuperscript{196} Sometimes a doorkeeper controlled access, though this was a luxury that not all householders could afford.\textsuperscript{197} In any case, the position was quite unlike that pertaining to a private home in today’s Western world; rather, the

\textsuperscript{189} Osiek and Balch, \textit{Families in the NT World}, 9.
\textsuperscript{190} I.e. in the second century B.C.E. (ibid.).
\textsuperscript{191} Ibid. 15, 227 n. 24.
\textsuperscript{192} John Ward-Perkins and Amanda Claridge, \textit{Pompeii AD 79} (2d ed.; Sydney: Australian Gallery Directors Council, 1980), 41. See also n. 143 above; Dunbabin, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 124, 137 n. 9, 138–39 n. 20; idem, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 84, 96–97; Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 116 Fig. 15, 117.
\textsuperscript{193} Ward-Perkins and Claridge, \textit{Pompeii}, 41.
\textsuperscript{194} See Osiek and Balch, \textit{Families in the NT World}, 24, 231 n. 69, citing Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, \textit{Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum} (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 45, 47. Note that Wallace-Hadrill’s views are disputed by some scholars, but are accepted in the present work, as they are by Osiek and Balch (\textit{Families in the NT World}, 16).
\textsuperscript{195} Ibid. 10, 17, 228 n. 33, citing Vitruvius, \textit{De architectura} 6.5.1. Note that in 91 B.C.E., plebeian tribune Livius Drusus regarded privacy as an undesirable feature for the design of his house, and wanted his activities to be visible to all (Osiek and Balch, \textit{Families in the NT World}, 24, 231 n. 70).
\textsuperscript{196} Ibid. 17, 228 n. 35.
\textsuperscript{197} Ibid. 25, 231 nn. 75–83.
situation resembled that of modern business premises, allowing people to come and
go with relative ease.\textsuperscript{198} Furthermore, the design of the houses meant that from the
front entrance, one had a line of sight right through the atrium and the office/living
room (\textit{tablinum}), to the peristyle.\textsuperscript{199} The idea was to entice people into the home by
means of the spectacular paintings, mosaics and sculptures, and so bring them under
the social influence of the householder.\textsuperscript{200}

It will be of value at this point to summarise our findings as to the major
differences in Greek and Roman culture, relevant to the \textit{συμπόσιον} and the
\textit{convivium}. Firstly, as a result of Roman dining preferences, eating and drinking
occur in the one context, in comparison with the traditional separation between
\textit{δείπνον} and \textit{συμπόσιον}. Secondly, the Greek egalitarian ethos is replaced by a
concern with rank and status at the Roman \textit{convivium}. Thirdly, the radical contrast
between Greek and Roman attitudes to privacy is manifested in architectural styles
that facilitate access into Roman homes.

Despite these differences between the banqueting customs of the Greeks and
Romans, all of the elements described previously as \textit{sympotic} are applicable to the
\textit{convivium}. While there is more emphasis in the satires of Horace and Petronius on
the sumptuousness of the food and wine than on overindulgence, the latter is
certainly an issue, as much as it is for the \textit{συμπόσιον}.\textsuperscript{201} Moreover, pederasty was

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid. 25, 231 n. 84.
\textsuperscript{199} Ibid. 25–26, 231–32 nn. 85–90.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid. 26, 232 n. 90. In the late Republic and early Empire, the paintings in Roman dwellings would
have been of the Second and Third Style (ibid. 26). The Second Style alludes to the grandeur of the
Hellenistic royal palace; the Third Style, which emerged about 30 B.C.E., reflects the political changes
brought about by Augustus (ibid. 26, 232 nn. 91–95). For a description of the Four Styles, see Ward-
Perkins and Claridge, \textit{Pompeii}, 59–67. The latest examples of the Third Style are dated to the mid-
first century C.E. (ibid. 62).
\textsuperscript{201} E.g. in Horace, \textit{Sat.} 2.8.10, the serving of wild boar for the \textit{gustatio}, [i.e. as an appetiser, which
traditionally comprised \textit{light} foods such as eggs and vegetables (Smith, "Social Obligation," 29)], and
calling for larger cups (Horace, \textit{Sat.} 2.8.35), a common theme in symposium literature (Shero, "The
normative at *convivia*, and boys, particularly wine waiters, were a focus of attention; they were expected to be young, sexually appealing, and long-haired, but clean-shaven. However, female slaves were also subject to sexual abuse, and it is recorded that naked girls were employed to serve at one of Tiberias’ meals. An important clue regarding behaviour at *convivia* is a Roman building (the so-called Auditorium of Maecenas) dated to ca. 30 B.C.E. A graffito on one of its outside walls asks pardon for unseemly behaviour induced by wine and love, suggesting that this elaborately decorated hall was utilised for *convivia* at which erotic poetry was performed.

The sympotic lifestyle was contrary to Roman ancestral custom, and Augustus attempted to discourage it, and to restore the values held in the Archaic period. According to ancient tradition, Roman *cenae* in former times had featured songs sung in praise of the noble deeds of illustrious men, accompanied by the *tibia* (i.e. *pipe* or *flute*). While Petronius’ *Cena* also contains references to music and singing, these are surely the antithesis of the cultured performances associated with
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202 E.g. note the innuendo in *Cena Trimalchionis*, e.g. 27.6, 31, 41, and overt homosexual activity in 64, 74–75.
203 John H. D’Arms, “Slaves at Roman *convivia*,” in Slater, *Dining in a Classical Context*, 173, 175–76, 182 n. 41 (citing Seneca, *Ep. 47.7*). In Petronius’ *Cena*, the servants (mostly designated simply as *puerii*), feature prominently; D’Arms notes that they make thirty-five entrances during the meal (ibid.).
204 Ibid. 173, 181 n. 14, citing Suetonius, *Tib.* 42.2.
205 Murray, “Symposium and Genre,” 43, n. 16.
206 By means of the *leges de sumptu, de adulteriis*, etc., and the exile of Ovid on account of his erotic poetry (ibid. 42).
209 E.g. in *Sat.* 78.
210 Ibid. 35, 52.
the lyric tradition of *mos majorum*. Likewise, throughout the meal in Petronius' satire, the scene is chaotic, and the dialogue banal, so that the gathering lacks the ambience and structured format of a *συμπόσιον*. The references to dancing and other entertainment, and to bathing and anointing, all conjure up an image of Trimalchio as a rich exhibitionist devoid of education, manners, and good taste. Further, although riddles, as well as recitation and/or parody of Homer and Publilius Syrus, feature as part of the entertainment at the meal, there is nothing to compare with the type of competition that traditionally took place during *symposia*.

Hence, it appears that the *cena*, as practised by some sectors of the community in the Imperial era, was significantly different from the *συμπόσιον*. While evidence exists that in refined and austere circles, a *convivium* comprised a much more sober gathering of friends who enjoyed appropriate entertainment and/or several hours of elevated dialogue during the evening, it is likely that immoderate banquets were more common. Thus, although the term *symptic* may legitimately be applied to characteristic elements of both Greek and Roman banquets, it is important to recognise not only the disparity between *συμπόσιον* and *cena*, but also the diversity of practices at *convivia* in the early Roman period. Pertinent here is

---

211 See Murray, "Symposium and Genre," 40–41. According to Zorzetti, the lyric tradition declined with the advent of Hellenistic professional poets (i.e. *tecnitai*) ("The carmina convivialis," esp. 294–95, 303–305).

212 *Sat.* 53 (acrobats); 55 (recitation, or parody, of Publilius); 59 (recitation of Homer); 58 (riddles).

213 Ibid. 28, 73.

214 Ibid. 28, 65, 70, 78.

215 A mime writer of the first century B.C.E. (John W. Duff and Elaine Fantham, "Publilius Syrus," *OCD* 1276; Pervo, "Petronius' Satyricon," 318 n. 53). The social realism depicted in the *Cena Trimalchionis* is confirmed by two of Seneca's references: (1) to a freedman who hosted extravagant banquets, and depended on his slaves to prompt him as he endeavoured to recite Homer and other Greek poets (Coffey, *Roman Satire*, 187–88 (citing Seneca, *Ep.* 27.5–6)); (2) to the debauched and vulgar Pacuvius, who, like Trimalchio (Petronius, *Sat.* 78), forced his household and guests to participate in a mock funeral (Coffey, *Roman Satire*, 187).

216 E.g. the practice of capping (Cameron, *Callimachus*, 80). For examples of the erudition and ingenuity manifested at classical and post-classical *symposia*, see ibid. 71–103.

Dumbabin's statement regarding the "extraordinary complexities" associated with the meeting of different cultures.\textsuperscript{219} Furthermore, with regard to discussion in the next section concerning Jewish feasting customs of the early Empire, it is salutary to note that the situation is so much more complicated "where other ingredients and other cultural traditions entered into the Greek/Roman mix."\textsuperscript{220}

3.4. **Jewish banquets:**

3.4.1. Hebrew traditions:

The centrality of drinking wine in Jewish feasting is clear from the fact that נַשֵׁב, the main Hebrew term for a banquet or feast, is derived from the verb נָשָׁה (to drink), and means simply *drinking*.\textsuperscript{221} As mentioned above in §2.2, wine was an integral part of festive occasions in OT tradition,\textsuperscript{222} and one of its proper uses was for making merry in accordance with divine commandment.\textsuperscript{223} The availability of wine in abundance is regarded in the OT and LXX as a blessing, both for its ability to bring joy, and as a stimulant for the weak.\textsuperscript{224} An inevitable consequence of the liberal consumption of alcohol during feasts is drunkenness,\textsuperscript{225} and it is interesting that in Gen 9:18–28, the inebriation of Noah does not attract divine censure.\textsuperscript{226} Nevertheless, there is abundant evidence in the OT of negativity toward excessive drinking, and of prophetic

\textsuperscript{218} This may reasonably be assumed from Augustus’ actions. See also Smith, “Social Obligation,” 32.
\textsuperscript{219} "Ut Graeco more bibetur," 98.
\textsuperscript{220} ibid.
\textsuperscript{222} See §§2.1 and 2.5 for reference to wine as an integral component of feasts.
\textsuperscript{223} See Jackson, “Style in Isaiah 28,” 93–94, 94 n. 72; and Lev 23:13, 37; Deut 14:26; 1 Sam 1:9, 24; 10:3 re the cultic use of wine.
\textsuperscript{226} Milano, “Codici alimentari,” 77. See ibid. 75–77 for illuminating comments on the foundation myth concerning the cultural function of wine.
denunciation of drunkards.\textsuperscript{227} From the story concerning Hannah in 1 Samuel 1, it appears to have been particularly shameful for a woman to become inebriated.\textsuperscript{228} On the other hand, several scriptural accounts highlight the folly of drunkenness by demonstrating how men, through excessive drinking, have become vulnerable to the power of women.\textsuperscript{229} In fact, examination of wisdom traditions concerning women, especially in relation to meals, and the issuing of invitations, shows that according to a patriarchal perspective, they were responsible for the downfall and ultimate death of men.\textsuperscript{230}

In addition to the admonitions against drunkenness, another relevant theme in Hebrew scripture involves God’s wrath against prodigals who attend lavish feasts, and who show neither concern for the poor and needy, nor any regard for God’s purpose and deeds. It is applicable to Amos 3:12–15;\textsuperscript{231} 4:1–2; 5:21–24; 6:4–7; Isa 5:11–12; and Wis 2:1–10.\textsuperscript{232} A further significant issue with respect to Jewish banquets is that feasting is not appropriate at all times. In his discussion of the rabbinical literature, Bryan identifies a theme comprising an opposition between


\textsuperscript{228} See v. 14.

\textsuperscript{229} E.g. Gen 19:32–38; Esth 7:2; Jdt 12:20; 13:2. See Jackson, “Style in Isaiah 28,” 94 n. 73.

\textsuperscript{230} See Judith E. McKinlay, Gendering Wisdom the Host: Biblical Invitations to Eat and Drink (JSOTSup 216; Gender, Culture, Theory 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), esp. 115–32, 166–78, commenting on the depiction of women in Proverbs and Sirach. See e.g. Prov 22:14; 23:27–28; 23:20; Sir 9:8; 25:13–26; 26:5–12, 22–27; 42:13–14a. A classic depiction of shame being brought upon a man by a woman is found in the ancestor hymn of Sirach 47, referring to David’s downfall as a result of his affair with Bathsheba. See esp. v. 19, and McKinlay, Gendering Wisdom the Host, 176.

\textsuperscript{231} This passage provides a powerful example of the type of feasting that earns God’s wrath. Samaria’s upper crust believe they can continue to lead a dissolute life, trusting in the protective influence of theleonine imagery on their resplendent couches. But, on the contrary, the “lion” (Yahweh) will turn against them with ruinous power, so that the only remainder will be pitiful pieces, as of a herd animal rescued from the rapacious beast’s mouth. See Siegfried Mittmann, “Amos 3,12–15 und das Bett der Samarier,” ZDPV 92 (1976): 166.

\textsuperscript{232} In the passage from Wisdom of Solomon, the impious views of the unrighteous, expressed in vv. 1b–10 (note esp. v. 10), earn God’s judgment in vv. 23–24. See Grottanelli, “Wine and Death,” 86–87.
lamentation and marzeah.\textsuperscript{233} The texts under discussion, which interpret marzeah as meaning feast or luxurious feast,\textsuperscript{234} all mention in the first half of the saying a lamentable tragedy, while the second part adds “... and this wretch holds (literally ‘makes’) marzeah.”\textsuperscript{235} This motif may readily be applied to Isa 22:12–13, and to Jeremiah 16,\textsuperscript{236} and it is clear that in Hebrew tradition, feasting is regarded as inappropriate at a time of national tragedy.\textsuperscript{237}

3.4.2. Jewish feasting in the Roman period:

Owing to the scantiness of evidence regarding Jewish dining customs in the early Imperial period, the conclusions of scholars often depend to some extent on rabbinical literature. While the lateness of rabbinic texts casts doubt on their reliability for studying practices of the early first century, most findings are supported by evidence from alternative sources, and can therefore be rated as probable, though not certain.

The purpose of discussion here is to provide as accurate a portrait as possible of the type of banquet at which Jesus earned a reputation for eating with toll collectors and sinners. The oft-cited meals of the Therapeutae\textsuperscript{238} and Essenes\textsuperscript{239} are

\textsuperscript{234} Ibid. 121.
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid. The four texts cited are Esth. Rab. 1.10 and 3.3, Qoh. Rab. 7.4 and Midrash Samuel (ibid. 121–22). They relate to two biblical scenarios, two to Esther 1 re the sumptuous feast held by Ahasuerus while Israel was suffering greatly; and two to 1 Samuel 25 and 28, re Nabal holding a banquet regardless of the tragedy of the death of Samuel. Bryan states that the passages “seem to reflect a popular saying involving the marzeah,” (ibid. 121). For precise details of references see ibid. 251–52 nn. 212–15.
\textsuperscript{236} In Jeremiah 16, the dead, because of their apostasy, are not to be lamented, and will suffer the terrible fate of being left unburied, to be eaten by wild creatures. See esp. vv. 4, 10–13, 18.
\textsuperscript{237} A non-biblical example of extremely inappropriate feasting is that of Alexander Jannaeus, as reported in Josephus, J.W. 1.97; Ant. 13.380. He had about eight hundred captives crucified, and while they were still alive, had their wives and children butchered in front of them. Meanwhile Jannaeus reclined and feasted, with his concubines beside him. See Sanders, Practice and Belief, 381.
\textsuperscript{238} E.g. Corley, Private Women, 70–71; Lee Edward Klosinski, “The Meals in Mark,” (Ph.D. diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1988), 107–11. Re the Therapeutae see also Koester, History, Culture, and Religion, 267; Lohse, NT Environment, 88–89; Slater, “Sympotic Ethics,” 215, n. 27. The meals of the Therapeutae are described in detail in Philo, Contempl. Life 65–82, but the comparison with the vulgar συμπόσια of others (Contempl. Life 40–56) should be understood in light
not relevant, since they belong in the category of θεος, as distinct from privately-hosted banquets. In any case, since the *Therapeutae* abstained from alcoholic beverages, their meals should not be considered in the same category as typical Jewish banquets, which, as noted, always included wine. The *haberim* and their fellowship meals will be discussed in Chapter Six.

The restrictions imposed by Jewish food laws (kashrus) meant that table fellowship in the home of a non-Jew was problematical, and would have been avoided except by very liberal Jews. The Romans and Greeks regarded the prohibition of pork as particularly eccentric, and such Jewish customs, especially Sabbath observance, were likely to be regarded as antisocial merely on grounds of deviation from the norm.

In general, the procedure for Jewish formal meals was presumably similar to that at a συμπόσιον, as Smith has conjectured; this would include the removal of a guest’s sandals, and the washing of feet, upon arrival. Diners would sit for the

---


240 See Aune, “Septem sapientum convivium,” 72.


242 Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 135. Abstaining from pork could have been interpreted as meaning that the Jews worshipped the pig (Whittaker, *Jews and Christians*, 82 n. 1).

243 Ibid. 64–70. Misconceptions included the notion that the term *Sabbath* derived from the Egyptian malady *sabattosis*, which involved groin pain (ibid. 66; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.20–21); and the belief that the Sabbath was associated with fasting (Whittaker, *Jews and Christians*, 68–72).

244 See ibid. 73.

245 “Meal Customs,” 650–51. Smith’s conclusions are mostly affirmed by Noy, although there are some discrepancies.
aperitif, before reclining for the meal, and normally would wash at least the right hand, since it would be in direct contact with the food; after the meal the hands might be washed again. The blessing and breaking of bread would mark the beginning of a meal, with the wine being given a separate blessing. At some stage a hymn was sung, most likely at the end of the meal as in Mark 14:26.

Jewish feasts probably resembled συμπόσια in other respects, as well as in their broad outline. For instance, given the conservative, patriarchal nature of Jewish society, it is highly unlikely that women would have been present at such “public” banquets with their husbands, although they would have attended family occasions such as weddings, birthdays and funerals. It is also plausible to surmise that the

---

246 Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 137, 143 n. 34; Smith, “Meal Customs,” 651–52, citing Athenaeus, Deipn. 2.58b–60b, and m. Pesaḥ. 10:3.
247 Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 137. Smith has it that the hands were washed before the meal (“Meal Customs,” 651), and again at the end of the δείπνον after the tables had been removed, and the floor swept (ibid. 652, citing Athenaeus, Deipn. 11.462c–d). The issue of handwashing is contentious, largely owing to the statement in Mark 7:3 claiming it as a custom of “all the Jews” and the Pharisees. See Chapter Six, §4.1 for discussion on this matter and on Mark 7:1–23.
248 Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 136. But see Chapter Eight, §3.3.3, esp. n. 66, for further discussion on this issue.
250 Noy mentions the saying of grace after the meal, rather than singing a hymn (“Mealtime for Scholars,” 138). Smith places the singing of a hymn at the beginning of the συμπόσιον (“Meal Customs,” 652).
251 Reference here is to the distinction made by Corley between the private and public sphere (Private Women, 15–17). In the ancient world, only men were expected to frequent places deemed public, e.g. the marketplace, courts of law, theatres, and banquets (ibid. 16). Any women in public spaces would usually be courtesans, prostitutes, or slaves; virtuous women would be expected to restrict their activities to the domestic, or private sphere (ibid. 16–17). A banquet would thus be deemed public if attended by males from outside the immediate family, even though held in a private home.
252 See Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 138, 143 n. 33. The notion that Jewish banquets were typically for males only is thoroughly in keeping with the findings of McKinlay regarding the attitudes to women in Proverbs and Sirach. See esp. Gendering Wisdom the Host, 122–27, re what constitutes a good woman/wife, and note the warning in Sir 9:9 against dining with another man’s wife. Corley (Private Women, 66–70) argues that some Jewish women were relatively emancipated in the early Imperial period, and that they may well have attended public meals with men. She cites the requirement for women to recline at the Passover Seder, and that this custom could date from the first century C.E. However, in the date at which reclining at the Passover became mandatory for women cannot be confirmed; moreover, the Passover was not a typical Jewish banquet. Further, her claim (ibid. 70) that Sir 9:9 demonstrates that “Jewish men did encounter married women at a public banquet during the Hellenistic period, possibly even in Palestine,” is unconvincing. A single reference of this nature in a work dating from ca. 180 B.C.E. cannot legitimately be used as a firm indicator of dining customs two centuries later. The idea that women dined in an area separate from men is supported by the findings from the archaeological site at the citadel of Machaerus, where the smaller of two areas may well have been reserved for women. See Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “John the
type of conversation during a typical Jewish formal meal was similar to the
philosophical dialogue of an idealised συμπόσιον; i.e. that discussion of the Torah
might have taken place, as commended in Sir 9:15–16. Furthermore, the sympotic
elements of music, song, and dance were all customary features of Jewish festivities
over the centuries and into the NT period, and were associated particularly with
joyous thanksgiving for blessings received. All were constituents of Hebrew
“merrymaking” which normally accompanied feasting, and especially drinking,
although Jewish celebratory use of music and dance should perhaps be differentiated
from the unrestrained festivities associated with συμπόσια. In addition, bathing
and anointing were both connected in the OT tradition with feasting and
celebration.

However, some important differences can be discerned between Greek and
Jewish banquets, and the term συμπόσιον, where it occurs in the LXX, should be

---

indicates that the women and men are in separate areas.
253 Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 138. See also Philo, Contempl. Life 75–78.
254 E.g. Ex 15:20–21; Ps 149:1–3; 150:3–5. Note that music was not considered appropriate in times
of mourning. See Sir 22:6; Eccl 3:4; and §3.4.1 above re the inappropriateness of feasting during
tragic circumstances.
255 E.g. 1 Sam 18:6–7; 2 Sam 6:5; Jer 31:4.
256 Burkert, “Oriental Symposia,” 15. See also Wright, “feasts, festivals, and fasts,” 305; Sir 32:5–6;
257 See S. Stein, “The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah,”
JJS 8 (1957): 21, re Philo’s comparison of behaviour at pagan feasts with the restrained conduct of the
Therapeutes. Stein notes the low reputation of dancers and musicians in the LXX and the NT (ibid. 21
n. 31). However, note the comment on Philo in n. 238 above.
258 According to Noy (“Mealtime for Scholars,” 138), the custom was to bathe after the meal. Cf.
Smith, (“Meal Customs,” 651) who refers to bathing before the meal as part of normal preparations in
the Graeco-Roman world. Note, however, the Roman custom of bathing before and/or after feasting,
e.g. after: in Persius, Sat. 3.288–106, cited in Grottanelli, “Wine and Death,” 69; and in Cena
Trimalchionis: before (28) and after (73). David bathed before breaking his fast (2 Sam 12:20) but
since this was associated with a purificatory rite, it should not necessarily be regarded as standard
procedure.
259 Guests at banquets were honoured by the anointing of their heads and/or feet, e.g. Deut 33:24; Ps
23:5 [“Ointments, Perfumes,” J. Rousseau and Rami Arav, Jesus and his World: An Archaeological
and Cultural Dictionary (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 217]. Ointments were also used to moisten dry
skin, or after bathing, e.g. 2 Sam 12:20 (ibid.).
260 Since anointing signified rejoicing, it was not used at times of sorrow (ibid.).
261 The only relevant occurrences are Sir 31:31; 32:5; 49:1; the remainder refer to royal banquets.
understood simply as a feast, rather than in its classical sense. The strict separation of courses, which was definitive for the development of the συμπόσιον, was not a feature in Jewish practice; wine, as we have seen, was an essential component of the feast, and was drunk throughout the evening—with the appetisers, with the main course, and following the meal. Moreover, the sexual activities for which συμπόσια were notorious would have been avoided by Jews on moral grounds.

Some aspects of Jewish formal meals in the early Imperial era resemble the cena rather than the συμπόσιον. As noted in the discussion of Roman architecture, the custom of placing the dining hall axially in buildings was derived from the East, the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces having been influential both in this regard, and in the matter of the π-shaped triclinium with the room open at one end. Yet stylistic influences travelled in the opposite direction as well. Wall-paintings in the Pompeii Second Style have been found at the Temple Mount of the Old City in Jerusalem; and the Herodian buildings there, commenced in 20 B.C.E. and completed about 20 C.E., were apparently modelled on Roman architectural principles. In the same

---

262 An interesting feature of Sir 32:1 is that although the content brings to mind the role of symposiarch, the Greek term used is ἤγοιμανος. (See "ἡγισταμαι," 1, BAGD 343, and cf. Acts 14:12, where this word refers to the chief speaker.) The choice of a non-sympotic term perhaps indicates that the banquet described in this Jewish context differs from the traditional Greek συμπόσιον.

263 Baruch M. Bokser, The Origins of the Seder: The Passover Rite and Early Judaism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 63, 130–31 n. 51. See also Noy ("Mealtime for Scholars," 141, 144 n. 70) re the talmudic prescriptions for drinking of wine “before, during, and after the meal” at funerals.

264 Smith, “Meal Customs,” 652. The realism of this point is supported by Whittaker’s observation that the moral code of Jews made them distinctive among their pagan contemporaries; e.g. they were known for their close-knit families, and for never exposing unwanted neonates (Jews and Christians, 15).

265 See §3.3 above; Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 116–122.

266 Hengel, “Hellenization” of Judaea, 12, 68 n. 48. The artwork in Jerusalem differs in that it lacks the human and animal images that usually featured in the Second Style (ibid.).

period, it is clear that Roman constructive techniques were used in Palestine, as Herod’s palace at Jericho demonstrates.\textsuperscript{268}

As a result of these findings, and those of Dunbabin regarding the disappearance of the \( \alpha ν\delta ρ\omega ν \) and the Hellenistic broad-room,\textsuperscript{269} we are able to see that the dining areas in Palestinian homes in the early first century were most likely to resemble Roman rather than Greek styles, i.e. \textit{triclinia}, with a \( \pi \)-shaped layout of couches, open at one end, and placed centrally on the axis of the building.\textsuperscript{270} Affluent homes such as the “Herodian mansion” in the Old City of Jerusalem, were designed with dining rooms situated around a central courtyard or peristyle,\textsuperscript{271} and like Roman dwellings would probably have been fairly readily accessible to outsiders.\textsuperscript{272}

Unfortunately, other firm evidence about dining areas in the first century is lacking, though the fact that the \textit{triclinium} with a T + U layout\textsuperscript{273} was still in use in Antioch in the early second century C.E.,\textsuperscript{274} and still later in Sephoris,\textsuperscript{275} suggests that the earlier architectural styles simply continued to prevail.\textsuperscript{276} This notion is supported by the fact

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{268} Ibid. 109.
  \item \textsuperscript{269} See Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 94; and §3.3 above.
  \item \textsuperscript{270} This conclusion is consistent with the layout of dining areas in Herod the Great’s northern palace at Masada (Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 106 Fig. 4; 118 Fig. 17; 107–18); the Herodian palace at Caesarea, Palestine (ibid. 115 Fig. 14); the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces at Jericho (Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 96, 97 Fig. 12); and the Herodian palace at Macheerus, with its two \textit{triclinia} (Murphy-O’Connor, “John the Baptist and Jesus,” 370, n. 48).
  \item \textsuperscript{271} Osiek and Balch, \textit{Families in the NT World}, 12–13.
  \item \textsuperscript{272} Ibid. 10, 17, 24–25; and §3.3 above.
  \item \textsuperscript{273} The U shape of the design is marked by the layout of the couches, while the horizontal bar above the central mosaic panel (i.e. of the T-shape), provides additional space for entertainment (Dunbabin, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 126).
  \item \textsuperscript{274} Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 94, 93 Fig. 8. The Atrium House is believed to be one of the earliest in Antioch, possibly predating the earthquake of 115 C.E. (idem, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 126, 141 n. 38).
  \item \textsuperscript{275} See Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 94, 101 n. 36; Osiek and Balch, \textit{Families in the NT World}, 227 n. 15; and for a detailed description of the villa and \textit{triclinium}, see Eric M. Meyers, “Roman Sephoris in Light of New Archeological Evidence and Recent Research,” in \textit{The Galilee in Late Antiquity} (ed. Lee I. Levine; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 331–33. The Dionysus mosaic of Sephoris is dated by Horsley as second to fourth century (\textit{Society in Galilee}, 63–64).
  \item \textsuperscript{276} Examples of \textit{triclinia} at Petra provide further evidence of the style’s prevalence in the Eastern Mediterranean region. They are of uncertain date, but may be from the first century B.C.E. or C.E.,
\end{itemize}
that in the Mishnah, guidelines concerning dining arrangements indicate that a
triclinium typically has access to a courtyard, and that courtyards of separate
dwellings are frequently accessible from one another, either directly, or via an
alley.\textsuperscript{277} Although the text dates from ca. 200 C.E., the information it provides is
significant in that it coheres so well with archaeological evidence from the early
Imperial era, and thus affirms the comparability of Roman and Palestinian dwellings
in the time of the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{278}

A further consideration regarding Jewish banquets is the position of honour.
In Hebrew and NT tradition, the right hand is frequently identified with strength,
power and protection,\textsuperscript{279} as well as being the place of honour.\textsuperscript{280} Thus although the
majority of references pertain to enthronement on a seat of judgment, rather than to
reclining for a meal, there is no doubt that the place of honour at a banquet would be
to the host’s right, as Noy states.\textsuperscript{281} However, the situation is somewhat clouded
owing to the request of James and John to sit on either side of Jesus, in his glory,\textsuperscript{282}
and it may perhaps be assumed that the next highest place is to the host’s left.\textsuperscript{283}
Jewish practice was for the host to recline in the centre of the middle couch of the
triclinium, with the chief guest on his right.\textsuperscript{284} Hence, the position differed from Roman custom, in which the host took the highest place on the lowest couch, with the guest of honour on his left.\textsuperscript{285}

3.4.3. Summary of banqueting traditions in Palestine in the Augustan age:

The investigation of Jewish practices at formal meals in the early Imperial period has shown that some aspects are similar to those of συμπόσια, some are more comparable with cenae, while others are distinctively Jewish. Most of the sympotic elements previously identified were present, viz.: an emphasis on eating, and especially on the drinking of wine; intoxication; reclining; music, song, and dance; bathing/washing, and anointing. However, the strict moral code of the Jews had a significant impact on their conduct in public, and at least among observant Jews, the overt sexual activity and revelry associated particularly with the συμπόσιον would have been lacking; the music and dancing were probably more restrained; and drunkenness was perhaps less rife. On the other hand, conversation during the meal quite likely referred to issues concerning the Torah, and entertainment possibly included recitation, riddles, and performing artists, as at convivia. It is very doubtful that these activities would have involved the structured type of competition familiar from the συμπόσιον, although concerns over rank and honour in this period were such that rhetorical skills and erudition would certainly have been exhibited with pride. Jewish feasts would probably have been noticeably different from συμπόσια and cenae, owing to the observance of dietary restrictions, the blessing of food and wine, the absence of women, and the topics discussed during the meal.

\textsuperscript{284} Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 138.
\textsuperscript{285} Ibid.
It was observed that even in the late Hellenistic period, Greek ἀνδρῶνες had been superseded in the East by Roman architectural styles, with the result that by the first century of the Common Era, dining areas typically comprised triclinia opening on to courtyards or peristyles. The design of homes was such that it would have been relatively easy for outsiders to gain access to reception areas or banqueting halls. This last issue brings us to the topic of the next section, the presence of uninvited guests at banquets.

4. **Feasting and ἀκλήτοι:**

A phenomenon relevant to feasting in the ancient world was the proliferation of parasites.²⁸⁶ Literally the epithet “parasite” means simply **one who eats at the table of another,**²⁸⁷ although it has long had pejorative overtones. Typically the parasite came to meals uninvited (i.e. was ἀκλήτος); did not contribute materially (i.e. was ἄσυμβολος); had an insatiable appetite²⁸⁸ for food and drink (and was always expected to be drunk),²⁸⁹ and was bold and shameless.²⁹⁰

An early example is Arnaeus (known as Irus), the πτωχός in Odyssey who ingratiated himself by running errands for people.²⁹¹ Others obtained free meals by providing entertainment such as dancing and wrestling.²⁹² In popular belief, the anticipated intoxication of ἀκλήτοι was paired with an expectation of unseemly behaviour; in particular, it was thought that owing to their uninhibited state, they

²⁸⁶ The term is derived from the corresponding Greek verb. See “παρασιτέω,” LSJ 1323.
²⁸⁷ See “parasite,” Macquarie Dictionary, 1561.
²⁸⁸ See Athenaeus, Deipn. 10.421d for the use of the term παράσιτος as a euphemism for πολυφάγος, i.e. a glutonous person.
²⁹⁰ Ernst Wüst, “Parasitos,” section 2, “Der Schmarotzer an den Tischen der Reichen,” PW 18.4: 1382, 1388. Re being ἄσυμβολος as characteristic of the parasite, see Athenaeus, Deipn. 1.8c, 4.162f, 4.164f.
²⁹¹ See Od. 18.1–7.
²⁹² See e.g. Fehr, “Entertainers,” 185–95.
were likely to start dancing spontaneously,\textsuperscript{293} possibly with lewd gestures, and often with homosexual innuendo.\textsuperscript{294} They were depicted with pot bellies, probably as an allusion to their appetites, or perhaps to suggest the food intake necessary for the physical demands of boxing.\textsuperscript{295}

There is also evidence of the rise of a subgroup of parasites, reputed to be intellectually stimulating and witty;\textsuperscript{296} courtesans were notably included in this category.\textsuperscript{297} Parasitism flourished in the Greek world especially in the fourth century, as a result of the prevailing political and economic circumstances,\textsuperscript{298} and consequently the parasite remained a stock character in Middle and New Comedy. Naturally the personalities of the characters were highly exaggerated,\textsuperscript{299} but they were nevertheless based on reality.\textsuperscript{300} By the era of New Comedy, the two main types of parasite, παράσιτος and κόλαξ, were firmly established;\textsuperscript{301} their masks illustrated their characteristics, with some in common.\textsuperscript{302} Although the two subclasses were distinguishable both on the stage and in reality, their \textit{modus operandi} was the same, i.e. toadyng.\textsuperscript{303} Apart from their masks, standard indicators of parasites in New Comedy were the στλεγγίς, i.e. a tool for scraping oil and dirt from the skin in the bath, or following exercise;\textsuperscript{304} and the λίθυθός, i.e. an oil bottle, or casket for

\textsuperscript{293} Ibid. 186, 189, n. 38; and see \textit{Od.} 14.462–466.
\textsuperscript{294} Fehr, "Entertainers," 190.
\textsuperscript{295} Ibid. 189.
\textsuperscript{296} Wüst, "Parasitos," 1388.
\textsuperscript{298} Fehr, "Entertainers," 188; Wüst, "Parasitos," 1384.
\textsuperscript{299} Ibid. 1395.
\textsuperscript{300} Ibid. 1388.
\textsuperscript{301} Ibid. 1395. Re the sycophant type see J. O. Lofberg, "The Sycophant-Parasite," \textit{CP} 15 (1920): 68–71; and for a discussion on flatterers, see Marshall, \textit{Enmity in Corinth}, 70–90.
\textsuperscript{302} Wüst, "Parasitos," 1395; Marshall, \textit{Enmity in Corinth}, 77. However, the accuracy of details about the masks is dubious, since the source (Pollux, \textit{Onomasticon}), was written several centuries after classical theatre (Howard Bay, "Staging and Stage Design," \textit{Britannica} 17:530; Peter B. R. Forbes, Robert Browning, and Nigel G. Wilson, "Pollux, Iulius," \textit{OCD} 1209).
\textsuperscript{303} Athenaeus, \textit{Deipn.} 6.237c.
\textsuperscript{304} LSJ 1646. The στλεγγίς is the equivalent of a strigil. For its use by a parasite see Plautus, \textit{The Persian} 124.
The χωθος was utilised for the anointing of men before and/or after sexual intercourse, a task performed by courtesans, or in more refined circles by wives.

Later, from 200 B.C.E. onwards, there is evidence of an increase in the number of poet-parasites. Plautus portrayed the parasite Gelasimus as a “seller of funny stories,” and referred to the use of books of anecdotes and apophthegms to provide humorous entertainment. First century B.C.E. evidence of the poet-parasite type includes Cicero’s reference to the triumphal tour of Archias through several countries.

Parasitism was sharply criticised by philosophers; Plato, particularly, spoke in opposition to flatterers and their occupation, and Xenophon followed suit. However, the works of Aristotle and his pupil Theophrastus are of greater interest for our study. Aristotle endeavoured to differentiate between the χρεοκος (who tries to please), the κόλαξ, and the true friend, while Theophrastus, in his work On Flattery, distinguished between the κόλαξ and the χρεοκος, and also made a distinction between these two types in Characters. Cynics saw themselves in contradistinction to flatterers by insisting on frank speech (παρηγβω) as against the κολακεϊα of the latter, though their candour was not always appreciated. Cicero, in

---

305 See "ανθεγγίας," LSJ 1647; "λίθωθος," ibid. 1044.
306 Corley, Private Women, 104; Athenaeus, Deipn. 12.553.
309 See ibid. 36, 36 nn. 8, 11; and Plautus, Stich. 171, Capt. 470, 477; Pers. 392–395.
310 See Cameron, Callimachus, 48–49, n. 165; and Cicero, Arch. 4–5.
311 Wüst, "Parasitos," 1386.
312 Ibid.
313 The term means pleasing, but it is used mostly in a bad sense, i.e. obsequious, cringing ("χρεοκος," LSJ 238).
314 Wüst, "Parasitos," 1391.
315 Ibid.
similar vein, observed that one was more likely to receive an accurate character appraisal from enemies than from insincere friends.\textsuperscript{317} Uninvited arrivals were not necessarily undesirable. The presence of distinguished or engaging guests brought honour to the host, so unexpected extras could well be advantageous.\textsuperscript{318} They often would have included an invited guest's relatives or friends, since it was deemed appropriate to take an associate along without notice;\textsuperscript{319} such a person was known as an \textit{umbra} or \textit{sκιά}, i.e. \textit{shadow}.\textsuperscript{320} Reference by Plutarch indicates that the practice remained current in the first and second centuries of the Common Era,\textsuperscript{321} and parasites would certainly have abused this long-standing tradition.\textsuperscript{322} Alternatively, uninvited guests could be wayfarers or strangers, as we saw in Chapter Three.

Thus from Homer through the NT era, uninvited guests of various types turned up at banquets, and it was considered prudent and praiseworthy for householders always to have some food in store, in case of any unexpected arrivals.\textsuperscript{323} A convenient generic term for them, which includes strangers and wayfarers as well as parasites, is \textit{ἐκλητοί}.

Brief mention must be made of a relevant phenomenon occurring from as early as the mid-second millennium,\textsuperscript{324} i.e. that canine imagery, both literal and

\textsuperscript{318} Pitt Rivers, \textit{Anthropology}, 107.
\textsuperscript{319} According to Graeco-Roman etiquette it was accepted practice for an invited guest to bring one or more others with him. See Suetonius, \textit{Claud.} 35.1; Horace, \textit{Sat.} 2.4.17–19; 2.8.22; Plato, \textit{Symp.} \textit{174A–B}; Plutarch, \textit{Mor.} 708B.
\textsuperscript{320} Braun, \textit{Feasting and Social Rhetoric}, 55; D'Arms, "The Roman \textit{con vivium}," 318.
\textsuperscript{322} Becker and Göll, \textit{Charicles}, 315–16.
\textsuperscript{323} See e.g. Athenaeus, \textit{Deipn.} 1.13a; Horace, \textit{Sat.} 2.2.89–93. The practice is also mentioned in Plutarch, \textit{Quaest. Conv.} 678E.
\textsuperscript{324} E.g. RS 24.258, dated ca. 1400 according to Pardee and Bordreuil, "Ugarit," 6:706.
metaphorical, is often associated with feasting and ἀκλητοῖοι. The underlying themes are usually low or despised social status, dependency and humility, and these may be interpreted in either a negative or a positive sense. The motif will be encountered in Part Three, where a distinction is made between ἀκλητοῖοι who behave like dogs, and those who are treated like dogs. In the literature, the latter type represents the stereotypical victim who becomes a hero.

5. Feasting and death:

The literature of the ancient world frequently implies a connection between death and the συμπόσιον, and/or between death and wine. At a superficial level, an obvious link exists between death and drinking to excess; the terms dead drunk and drunk as a dead man capture it neatly. It is also possible that inebriation was seen

---

326 The canine analogies occur in a number of different forms. Adulatio, the Latin for flattery, literally means fawning or cringing like a dog [Marshall, Enmity in Corinth, 74, n. 21]. Such behaviour is more applicable to some of the following examples than to others. However, all involve low status or dependency, and most refer to being fed, and/or to fawning, in the manner of a dog. (1) Yarih, in KTU 1.114 (i.e. RS 24.258), acts like a dog under the table, is fed by one god, and hit by another, and consequently is called a dog by the porter [McLaughlin, “The marzeaḥ at Ugarit,” 279; Margalit, “Ugaritic Feast of the Drunken Gods,” 71–72]. (2) The favourite of the Parthian king sits on the ground, and eats, dog-like, what the king tosses to him; he is often dragged away on a slight pretext and flogged until, covered in blood, he falls down and does obeisance to the king [Athenaeus, Deipn. 4.152f–153a]. (3) Some Cynics are categorised as dogs who should have bread thrown to them in order to allow people peace [Alessandra Lukinovich, “The Play of Reflections between Literary Form and the Symptic Theme in the Deipnosophistae of Athenaeus,” in Murray, Sympoticia, 269, citing Athenaeus, Deipn. 3.113f–114a]. (4) In Xenophon, Memorabilia 2.9, Crito is persuaded by Socrates to employ Archedemus as a “watch-dog” to protect his master from sycophants; Archedemus is not identified as a sycophant, but clearly belongs to their ilk [Lofberg, “Sycophant-Parasite,” 71]. (5) In the Amarna letters, the appellative dog refers to the status of a servant: “inferior, subordinate, dependant” in relation to a high-ranking person whom he must obey [José M. Galán, “What Is He, the Dog?” UF 25 (1993): 175]. (6) The parasite Gelasimus implies that as an ἀκλητος at a meal he will require only as much space as a small puppy to recline [Plautus, Stich. 615–620].

327 For literary examples and discussion of the two types see Grottanelli “L’ideologia,” 122–54, esp. the section “L’ospite è un cane,” 137–50.
330 McLaughlin, “The marzeaḥ at Ugarit,” 280 n. 115. The assumed connection between sleep and death is clear in the apparent equation of couch and bier in Amos 3:12, as also in Isa 26:19, Jer 51:39, 57; Ps 76:5–6; Job 14:12; Dan 12:1–2 [Mittmann, “Amos 3,12–15,” 165]. Lion symbols on couches
as a means to communicate with the dead. Moreover, there are several elements which are common to banqueting and funerals, viz.: wine, anointing, and music, and with the advent of the reclining banquet, the couch. All four elements are found in Amos 6:4–7. Again, in three of the Gospel accounts of the anointing at Bethany there is clear reference to a funerary theme in the context of a meal.

In addition to frequent connections being made between banquets of the living and funerary rites for the dead, the literature of the period often draws a comparison between banqueting and life. This perspective implies that one should "leave life like a guest withdrawing sated from a symposium," and involves two recurring themes connecting wine-drinking and/or the symposium, with death. The first is termed carpe diem, and comprises the familiar eat, drink, and be merry attitude. The second is memento mori, translated roughly remember that you must die. In the OT, there are several instances of texts containing one or both of the themes. For instance in Isa 22:13–14, the carpe diem theme is transformed into a memento mori theme with a dire warning of the coming destruction of Jerusalem.

Jeremiah 16 contains the memento mori theme first, in vv. 3–4, followed in vv. 5 and

---

(as featured in Amos 3:12), sarcophagi and graves were evidently believed to grant apotropaic protection for a sleeper or for the dead [Mittmann, “Amos 3,12–15,” 165].

331 Lewis notes the connection between wine and death in the Anthesteria, the feast of Dionysus held during the month of Anthesterion, the time when it was thought that “the ghosts of the dead return,” (Cults of the Dead, 97).

332 Grottanelli cites garlands as a further element common to symposia and funerals (“Wine and Death,” 69).

333 See Matt 26:6–13; Mark 14:3–9; John 12:1–8; and Grottanelli, “Wine and Death,” 77. The accounts of the death of John the Baptist are a further example of a link between banquet and death. See Matt 14:6–12, Mark 6:21–29.


335 Ibid. 192, 194, 209, 224; Grottanelli, “Wine and Death,” 62–89.


8 by a prohibition, for the prophet, of feasting, i.e. a negative version of *carpe diem.*
Amos 6:1–7; Isa 5:11–13, and 28:1–2 contain strong versions of the second theme. A
prime NT example containing both themes is the parable of the Rich Fool (Luke
12:16–21).

Between 100 B.C.E. and 100 C.E., both of the themes were particularly
widespread in ancient Mediterranean culture and were mostly expressed by
variations on the relationship between death and the symposium. The themes, though
treated by writers as *oriental,* are thoroughly integrated into the Graeco-Roman
cultural milieu. The ubiquity of the motif in the literature of the period indicates
that a preoccupation with death was common, at least among the banqueting elite.
We will therefore look now at contemporary beliefs about what might transpire
beyond death.

6. **Feasting in the afterlife:**

As our investigation has shown in this chapter and the last, there was a great deal of
similarity in the ancient hospitality and feasting traditions of the Hebrews and
Greeks. However, there were substantial differences in their theological views, and
the disparity in their understanding about the afterlife is significant. The Greeks in
the classical era saw death as the termination of physical life, while from the
second century B.C.E. some circles of Jewish thought espoused concepts of the
resurrection of the dead, and of individual reward, or punishment, of the departed.

---

340 Ibid.
341 For the Greek perspective on death as putting an end to the joys of banqueting, see Murray, “Death and the Symposion,” esp. 240–41, 254–55.
342 The earlier Hebrew understanding of death was probably similar to that of the Greeks. Sheol was the abode of all departed spirits, both good and bad. See Michael Fishbane, “Sheol,” in *HBD* 1011; Hartman, “Eschatology,” 875.
343 Ibid. 874–75.
According to these concepts, divine intervention was expected to occur in both the present and the future, perceived as separate periods.\textsuperscript{344} Gehenna and paradise, respectively, were regarded as the dwelling places of the wicked and the righteous departed,\textsuperscript{345} and the eschatological banquet was the anticipated reward for the blessed.\textsuperscript{346} When compared with the Greek view of death as putting an end to feasting pleasures, such a concept of the afterlife would have obvious appeal. Moreover, drawing on the above-mentioned analogy of worldly life as a banquet, we see that for the wicked, death puts an end to the banquet, while for the righteous, the afterlife consists of an ongoing banquet. From this viewpoint, it is clear that the opposition existing between death and life may also be expressed as a dichotomy between death and banqueting.

The apocalyptic writings are inconsistent as to whether reward and retribution occur immediately after death, or at the resurrection.\textsuperscript{347} Predictions about the nature and timing of the resurrection vary,\textsuperscript{348} and this lack of uniformity is evident in the NT as well. E.g. Pauline depictions of the end time in 1 Cor 15:20–57 and 1 Thess 4:13–17 differ markedly from Matt 25:31–46. Luke 16:19–31 is different again, with judgment—reward or punishment—occurring immediately after a person’s death. Although the notion manifested in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus cannot be accepted as representing the prevailing view of life after death in the first century C.E., this parable has particular relevance in the present study. Its importance will become evident in Chapter Seven, where Lazarus is revealed as an archetypal ἄκλητος who becomes a hero.

\textsuperscript{344} Ibid. 874. See also Chapter Three, n. 117.
\textsuperscript{345} Hartman, “Eschatology,” 874.
\textsuperscript{346} Ibid. 876.
\textsuperscript{347} Ibid. 875–76.
\textsuperscript{348} Ibid. See also Chapter One, §3.2.2.2.
7. **Summary:**

Examination of the ancient banqueting themes from the Mediterranean region showed that a frequently occurring motif within the texts is the sequence of meat–wine. This finding is particularly important, in that meat and wine are shown to be essential components in the sacrificial rites of both Hebrews and Greeks, and in view of the metaphorical equivalence of meat and bread (or grain).

Investigation of sacrificial practices revealed many similarities, but some fundamental differences, between Hebrew and Greek rites. In both, the slaughter of an animal was always a sacrifice, implying the deity’s participation in the meal, and the apportionment of the sacrificial victim was a crucial part of the procedure, serving to create a bond between all the commensals. Some of the major differences in the Hebrew rites were the prohibition of pork, and the belief that obedience to divine commandments was an essential requirement in return for guaranteed prosperity in agriculture and animal husbandry.

The eschatological banquet was found to be an important concept in the Hebrew sacrificial spectrum, in that it exemplifies the dyadic banquet theme of preparation–invitation, as well as the meat–wine sequence. The Isaianic vision (25:6–8) espousing the ultimate ingathering of the nations was also seen as highly significant, since it foreshadows a time beyond earthly sorrows, when God will host a rich banquet for all humankind.

The findings are particularly relevant for the thesis topic since they provide profound insight with respect to the bonding that occurs through table fellowship. They also reveal deeper meanings behind the “multiplication” of bread in the feeding miracles, and the sharing of bread (understood metaphorically as portions of the sacrificial victim), at the Last Supper. Further, the use of *bread* and wine at the
institution of the Last Supper is shown to correspond with the *meat* and wine that will be served at the eschatological banquet.

Owing to the considerable diversity of banqueting customs in the ancient Mediterranean world, it was necessary to examine them under separate categories, in order to reach an understanding of practices in Palestine during Jesus’ lifetime. Although Jewish meals appeared to be superficially similar to συμπόσια, there were several distinctive features that derived from ancient Hebrew beliefs, notably: rigorous dietary restrictions; and a moral code that disallowed illicit sexual activity, ensured the absence of women from banquets, and encouraged discussion of serious topics, especially Torah, at table. It was also noted that Hebrew ethics condemned feasting that was unduly lavish, untimely, or that neglected the needs of the poor.

The separation of courses that marked the evolution of the συμπόσιαν was no longer an issue in the early Imperial era. Moreover, the style of competition that was typical of συμπόσια did not seem to be characteristic in the Roman period, although entertainment still included riddles and recitation, and organised amusements such as acrobatics, performed by slaves or hired artists. Yet it appears certain that the agonistic spirit universally displayed during festive gatherings would have been an element at Jewish banquets, as at Roman *cenae* of the period. In addition, excessive eating, and especially drinking, were such a feature in OT accounts of feasting that they probably would have been the norm at Jewish banquets, though extreme drunkenness and wild revelry would most likely have been less common than at Greek and Roman dinner-parties. Thus, bearing in mind these considerations, we can say that most of the delineated *symotic* elements were present at Jewish feasts: excessive food and wine, music, song, dance, bathing/washing, and anointing.
By the first century C.E., the disappearance of the Greek ethic of equality meant that positions for reclining at meals were dictated by rank. Couches were now arranged in a π-shape, with the place of honour on the middle couch. It seems likely that at Jewish meals, the host reclined in the centre of the middle couch, with the guest of honour on his right.

On the basis of architectural styles, it was concluded that at this time, outsiders could fairly easily have gained access to a reception area or dining hall. This factor is relevant to some NT pericopae, and to the various kinds of ἀκλήτοι who were prominently associated with banqueting throughout the ancient world. It was demonstrated that not all ἀκλήτοι were undesirable as guests at table, and that although they are often linked with canine imagery, the contexts are not necessarily negative.

Literary motifs connecting feasting with death were found to occur both in the Hebrew Bible, and as ubiquitous themes from ca. 100 B.C.E. through the NT period. They indicate that during this period in the Graeco-Roman world, the wealthy were often preoccupied with banqueting pleasures, in the belief that they would cease upon a person’s death. In that light, the understanding of the afterlife held by some Hebrews would obviously be an attractive alternative: the righteous would participate in the heavenly banquet, and experience εὐφροσύνη. Accordingly, the contrast between death and life may be construed as a dichotomy between death and banqueting. The first century literary themes relevant to death and feasting, and ideas about the afterlife, constitute significant background material for interpreting NT passages involving table fellowship.
PART THREE

JESUS' TABLE FELLOWSHIP
Chapter Five

*JESUS, TOLL COLLECTORS, AND SINNERS*

1. **Introduction:**

The main purpose of this chapter is to characterise as precisely as possible the *tax collectors* and *sinners* who, according to synoptic tradition, engaged in table fellowship with the historical Jesus. §2 contains a restatement of the conclusions reached about the historical Jesus in Chapter One. In §§3 and 4, respectively, examinations are made of the terms τελωνει and ἀμαρτωλοί, drawing once again on findings from the introductory chapter, but with provision of much more background information. Comments are included on the NT passages referring to both groups, and on the issues of repentance, and invitations to participate in the eschatological banquet. The chapter concludes with a summary.

2. **Reconstruction of the historical Jesus:**

One striking aspect to emerge from Chapter One was that although the Synoptics portray Jesus mainly as an observant and pious Jew, Mark depicts him in 7:1–23 as implying that the dietary restrictions imposed by kashrus were invalid. This finding has obvious relevance to the table fellowship theme of the present research. Another significant and perhaps related conclusion was that Jesus’ outlook and values may well have been influenced by Cynic-Stoic elements.

Other points included in the reconstruction are that Jesus was an itinerant teacher who called disciples, and utilised parables and aphorisms in his teaching. He was both eschatological prophet and sage, and he announced the imminence of the kingdom of God. Since further data will emerge from the investigation of toll collectors and sinners in this chapter, and of Pharisees in Chapter Six, an expanded outline of the historical Jesus will be given at the conclusion of that process.
3. **Τελῶναι:**

3.1. **Etymology:**

There appears to be scholarly consensus nowadays that the term τελῶναι in the Synoptic Gospels refers to toll collectors rather than to tax gatherers.\(^1\) It derives from τέλος (toll) and ὄνειμα (to buy), and denotes either those who purchased from state authorities the right to collect indirect taxes such as custom duties, or their employees at a toll booth or revenue office (τελῶνιον).\(^2\) The τελῶνης is the approximate equivalent of סנס (pl. סכנים) in the rabbinical literature, and in that context is mostly to be distinguished from the מנה (or מנהיג), who was responsible for collection of direct taxes.\(^3\) These Hebrew terms concerning tax collection are not biblical, although סנס, which refers to a religious tax or toll, and is a cognate of סנס, occurs in Num 31:28, 37–41.\(^4\) The distinction between tax and toll collectors is important, one of the significant differences between them being that the latter operated at a stationary base, and would not normally have had occasion to enter dwellings.\(^5\)

Although there are several terms for taxes and tolls in the Greek NT, they occur infrequently, and are difficult to differentiate.\(^6\) In the story concerning the

---


\(^2\) Michel, “τελῶνης,” 89; Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 54.

\(^3\) Ibid. 49; “מנה, מנהיג.” Jastrow 206. Re the Palmyrene tariff inscription see Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 49 n. 40; and Michel, “τελῶνης,” 99 n. 115. On סנס and its meaning see also Chapter Six §4.2.2; and “סנס,” Jastrow 741–42.

\(^4\) Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 49. Walker suggested that references to τελῶναι in the Synoptics may have resulted from an erroneous transliteration of the Aramaic כֶּלֶה, surmising that the term could be translated as playboys, who might well have been associated with sinners and prostitutes [*Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 237]. However, the proposal does not appear to have gained support.

\(^5\) Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 50. But see Chapter Six, §4.2.2.
lawfulness or otherwise of paying taxes to Caesar, Matthew follows Mark and uses
the word κῆρυςος (tax)⁷ [Matt 22:17, 19; Mark 12:14], while Luke (20:22) opts for
φόρος (tax or tribute).⁸ The legend about payment of the temple tax, peculiar to
Matthew, contains διδραχμαυ in reference to the temple tax (17:24),⁹ as well as both
τέλη (toll) and κῆρυςος (tax) in the following verse. A further term, ἀπογραφή, is
utilised in Luke 2:2 and Acts 5:37 to refer to registration or census.¹⁰
3.2. Problems:
Donahue enumerates three problem areas encountered in an investigation of the
synoptic references to τελώναι, and Jesus’ table fellowship with them.¹¹ Firstly, it is
necessary to identify them and their status—a difficult task, especially as the tax
collection systems in Judaea and Galilee differed during the time of Jesus, and
references involve both provinces.¹² Secondly, one must attempt a moral evaluation
of τελώναι, and this is complex owing to generally negative attitudes toward them in
all strands of the contemporary literature, and the fact that they are frequently linked
with various kinds of unsavoury characters.¹³ Thirdly, there is a need to ascertain the
significance of Jesus’ alleged “friendship” with τελώναι and sinners.¹⁴

Although the tradition of Jesus’ commensality with toll collectors and sinners
is generally considered authentic,¹⁵ the limited evidence for it poses a further

---
⁷ Ibid. The term is a Latin loanword meaning census, and applicable to tax and poll-tax (“κηρυςος, ou, 
δο,” BAGD 430).
⁸ See “φόρος, ou, δο,” BAGD 865.
⁹ Snell, “Taxes and Taxation,” 339. The διδραχμαυ was about the equivalent of a half-shekel, the
temple tax to be paid annually by each Jew (“διδραχμαυ, ou, το,” BAGD 192).
¹¹ “Tax Collector,” 337.
¹² Ibid.
¹³ Ibid.
¹⁴ Ibid. 338.
¹⁵ Ibid.
difficulty. Another inherent problem with respect to the tradition is the ambiguity over the name of the toll collector in Mark 2:13–17 and parr.; as one of the Twelve he is listed as a toll collector only in Matthew, and is named Levi, rather than Matthew, in the Marcan and Lucan accounts of his call. Ambiguity also exists as to whether Levi/Matthew is a guest or the host at the banquet linked to the call story.

3.3. Historical situation:

Many efforts have been made at estimating the tax burden in Palestine during the NT era. Augustus provided some relief by commencing a reorganisation of imperial finances, including a reduction in the power of tax farming corporations, and by remitting the tribute formerly paid to Rome by Idumaea and Samaria. Nevertheless, Judeans complained over excessive taxes imposed by Herod and subsequently by Archelaus, and they even requested annexation to Syria in the hope of alleviating hardship. Moreover, in 17 C.E. during the reign of Tiberius, direct taxes remained sufficiently burdensome in Syria and Judaea for a reduction to be requested. However, Rousseau and Arav suggest that the tax burden in Palestine during Jesus’ era has been overemphasised. Even though it was apparently the threat of an

---

16 See Walker, (“Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” 224) re the absence of the tradition from the fourth Gospel, and the fact that only two passages in the Synoptics (i.e. Mark 2:13–17 and parr., and Luke 19:1–10) refer to Jesus as actually at table with toll collectors (ibid. 231–34).

17 Ibid. 234–37. Levi and Matthew are generally accepted as synonymous (e.g. Aland, Synopsis of the Four Gospels, 42), although Jeremias concludes that the names of both, as toll collectors, are from pre-literary tradition (New Testament Theology, 115–16, 116 n. 1; Walker, “Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” 235, n. 70). On this issue, see also Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 1036 n. 317; idem, “Matthew, Gospel of,” ABD 4:627.


19 Ibid. 94.

20 Ibid. 97, n. 88. Michel, following W. Otto (“Herodes,” PWSup 2:55), provides the date 30 B.C.E. for the removal of this tax (Michel, “τελωνη,” 97 n. 89). If that is correct the remission was, in fact, granted by Octavian before he adopted the title “Augustus.”

21 “Tax and Tax Collectors,” Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary, 278, citing Josephus, Ant. 17.304–314, and J.W. 2.84–92; Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 44, n. 22, referring to the request for remission of taxes in Josephus, Ant. 17.204–205. The sales taxes that were the subject of the complaint in the latter passage were partially removed by Vitellius (Freyne, Galilee from Alexander the Great, 191, citing Josephus, Ant. 18.90).
additional tax in Syria and Judaea that provoked the disturbances led by Judas the
Galilean in 6 C.E., they point out that the reasons for the revolt were not only
economic, but also nationalistic and religious. Their perspective is sound in view of
the fact that from 6 C.E. until the end of Jesus’ life there was no further insurrection
directly associated with oppressive taxation in Palestine.

Taxation systems varied markedly throughout the Empire, and there is not a
great deal of evidence as to the situation obtaining in Palestine during the NT era. However, the scholarly consensus seems to be that revenue collection during the
imperial period was modeled on the system that existed in Ptolemaic Egypt, under
which τελώναι purchased by auction the right to collect one or more taxes within a
particular region during a specified period. A new contract would apparently have
been required at the beginning of each year, even if the same tax farmer were to be
once again the successful bidder for a certain area at the subsequent sale. The
τελώνης was entitled to any yield over and above the contract price of the sale, and in
addition was paid a reward when the contract was completed successfully. On the
other hand, the tax farmer had to bear the loss if he collected less than the contracted
amount. Several elements of the system indicate that the government exercised

---

23 “Tax and Tax Collectors,” 278, citing Josephus, Ant. 18.1–10; Stern, CRINT 1.331. See also Freyne, Galilee from Alexander the Great, 190–91 for a balanced perspective on the tax burden and the treatment of the Jews under Herod.
24 “Tax and Tax Collectors,” 278. Though it is of interest for comparative purposes, the Gallic rebellion in 21 C.E. cannot reasonably be cited as indicating excessive taxation in Palestine at that time. See Stern, CRINT 1:332 for reference to that event.
26 Ibid. 60, 74–76.
27 Ibid. 49.
28 Ibid. 50.
29 Ibid. 51–52.
30 Ibid. 52.
certain controls in an attempt to protect taxpayers from unscrupulous dealings.\textsuperscript{31}

These included a prohibition on the employment of slaves and royal officials in revenue collection, and restrictions on the coercive power of the tax farmer—he could not act unilaterally against any recalcitrant taxpayers, and was confined to lodging an official charge against them with the government authorities.\textsuperscript{32}

In Judaea, financial administration during the Roman period became comparable with that of Ptolemaic Egypt after Caesar restored the Hellenistic tax system in 44 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{33} Only indirect taxes were sold to tax farmers in Palestine from the time of Augustus, while direct taxes were collected by government agencies.\textsuperscript{34}

Some well-attested customs offices at which τελῶναι would have been stationed were those at the large Judaean ports Caesarea and Joppa, and the inland cities of Jerusalem and Jericho.\textsuperscript{35}

Youtie holds that Palestinian toll collectors in this era should not be placed in the same category as either the τελῶναι of Hellenistic city-states, or the publicani employed in the western provinces prior to the principate.\textsuperscript{36} He bases his argument on the similarity between tax farming in Palestine in this period, and in Graeco-Roman Egypt, citing similarities as being that the majority of tax farmers were indigenous; that individuals, rather than large corporations were involved; and that tax-collection was regulated by the state authorities.\textsuperscript{37} However, this opinion does not take account of the significant differences between tax collection in Judaea and Galilee in the time

---

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid. 53–55.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid. 74. Publicani were used only briefly in Judaea, from 56–44 B.C.E. (ibid.).
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid. 74, n. 102.
\textsuperscript{35} Michel, "τελῶνας," 98; Stern, CRINT 1:333.
\textsuperscript{36} "Publicans and Sinners," ZPE 1 (1967): 6–17. See also Llewelyn, "Tax Collection and the τελῶναι," 74, n. 104, but note that the page numbers cited there do not correspond with those of the ZPE article.
\textsuperscript{37} Youtie, "Publicans and Sinners," 12–16; Llewelyn, "Tax Collection and the τελῶναι," 74.
of Jesus. The τελώναι in Judaea were employed directly by Roman procurators, may well have been foreigners rather than indigenous, and could have been regarded as collaborating with Rome.\textsuperscript{38} It is therefore probable that they were more despised here than were their counterparts in Galilee, who were not so closely associated with Roman officials, and who were more likely to be Jewish.\textsuperscript{39}

The disparity between revenue collection in Judaea and Galilee during Jesus’ lifetime resulted from differences in governance. Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea were ruled from 6–41 C.E. by Roman prefects; in contrast, Galilee and Peraea were controlled from 4–39 C.E. by the quasi-independent government of Herod Antipas.\textsuperscript{40} Hence, in Galilee during the time of Jesus’ ministry, the τελώναι were employed under the nominal supervision of the Jewish client king Antipas, rather than by the Romans.\textsuperscript{41} It is highly unlikely therefore, that the τελώναι with whom Jesus allegedly associated in Galilee would have been regarded as quislings, although their counterparts in Judaea may have been.\textsuperscript{42}

Capernaum, where Levi was situated as a toll collector,\textsuperscript{43} would have been an important centre for customs duty on goods being brought in from the Decapolis and elsewhere,\textsuperscript{44} and possibly for the collection of other indirect taxes as well.\textsuperscript{45} Freyne has argued persuasively, in light of Mark’s depiction of Galilean culture, for an

\textsuperscript{38} Freyne, \textit{Galilee from Alexander the Great}, 192.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.; Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 45; idem, “Tax Collector,” 338.
\textsuperscript{40} Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 45.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.; idem, “Tax Collector,” 338.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.; idem, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 45, 59. Note that although Sanders was initially convinced by the notion that tax collectors would have been seen as collaborating with the Romans (“Jesus and the Sinners,” \textit{JSNT} 19 (1983): 9), he subsequently changed his stance (\textit{Historical Figure of Jesus}, 229).
\textsuperscript{43} Mark 2:1, 14 and par.
\textsuperscript{44} Michel, “τελώνης,” 98; Stern, CRINT 1:333.
\textsuperscript{45} E.g. frontier tolls, and dues for fishing rights (Michel, “τελώνης,” 98 n. 113).
economy of “adequate sufficiency” during the lifetime of Jesus, thus providing the rationale for the presence of multiple toll collectors as featured in the Synoptics.46

Donahue’s analysis of Luke 3:7–17, a composite section concerning the proclamation of John the Baptist, supports the belief that τελώναι were guilty of dishonest practices.47 The answers to the question “What should we do?”48 in Luke 3:10–14 reflect the moral issue most relevant to the particular questioner,49 and the response to the τελώναι indicates that their most conspicuous failing was collecting more than the prescribed amount.50 Although John’s ministry was evidently confined to the region around the Jordan,51 it is reasonable to conclude that the saying attributed to him in Luke 3:13 is applicable to the toll collectors in Galilee, as well as to those in Judaea, and that they were generally perceived as dishonest.52

As indicated above, a τελώνης did not have the power to distress goods, and his only recourse if confronted with smugglers or delinquent taxpayers was to report them to the Roman authorities.53 The formal process by which the toll collectors informed against taxpayers inevitably encouraged συκοφαντεῖα, i.e. cheating, extortion and/or oppression.54 This type of abuse is mentioned in Luke 19:8, where

---

46 Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 41.
48 The question forms a conversion pattern and occurs also in Luke 16:4; 18:18; Acts 2:37; 16:30; and 22:10 (ibid. 58 n. 72).
49 These verses may be traditional or could be a Lucan construction (ibid. 58 n. 72).
50 Ibid. 58.
51 See e.g. Mark 1:4. John’s performance of baptisms in the Jordan shows that the “wilderness” where he appeared was not a waterless desert, but rather a desolate area with some water available, such as in the Jordan Valley (Denis Baly and Paul J. Achtemeier, “wilderness,” HBD 1213).
52 Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 58–59. Donahue also surmises from Luke 3:12–13 that the τελώναι here are subordinates in the toll collection system (ibid. 58), although this finding is not necessarily applicable to the Galilean situation, since the term may in other contexts refer to the purchaser of the right to collect (ibid. 54). Donahue’s perspective is preferable to that of Herrenbrück, who views all the τελώναι of the Gospels as “Hellenistic small tax-farmers”, although he regards them as wealthy, and upper-middle or upper class citizens (Llewelyn, “Tax Collection and the τελώναι,” 76, n. 108).
54 Ibid. 54; Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, “συκοφαντέω,” TDNT 7:759.
Zacchaeus implies he has defrauded clients. The verb συκοφαντέω occurs also in Luke 3:14, where John admonishes soldiers not to extort money by threats or false accusations.

In light of our findings so far, we can surmise that toll collectors were despised on the grounds of their presumed dishonesty, and also that they were especially unpopular in Judaea, where they would have been regarded as employees of Gentiles, and where many may actually have been Romans. As the following subsection will affirm, the synoptic tradition indicates a negative perspective toward τελωναί overall, especially in Matthew. This aversion to them is also very evident throughout the rabbinical literature, where tax and toll collectors alike are equated with robbers. Some indirect taxes, in particular, were thought to be unjust, and it apparently became acceptable to swear falsely to τελωναί in order to avoid customs dues; e.g. *m. Ned.* 3:4 provides that one may untruthfully swear to a toll collector that something cannot be given because it is a due to the priests, or belongs to the king. However, this tract and others in the Babylonian Talmud demonstrate some inconsistencies in rabbinic attitudes toward customs evasion, with many believing

---

55 While Llewelyn infers that Zacchaeus “denounced taxpayers to officials” (“Tax Collection and the τελωναί,” 74). Youie interprets the verb here as meaning he had “brought false charges” (“Publicans and Sinners,” n. 103). The latter is probably more correct, as Hunzinger states that the verb no longer has its original meaning to denounce in the NT (“συκοφαντέω,” 759). Nevertheless both interpretations have the effect that even an ἀρρητολογός could not act alone against taxpayers.

56 Hunzinger, “συκοφαντέω,” 759. Jeremias, following Jotun, believed these “soldiers” to be police who accompanied tax collectors in order to protect them (New Testament Theology, 48 n. 3, 110). However, the idea is not convincing, and in any case does not seem applicable to toll collectors.

57 Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great*, 192.


59 Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; 4 vols; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–87), 1:376; Donahue, “Tax Collector,” 337–38. The parable about the tax collector Bar Ma’jan, possibly dating from the first century C.E., is an informative example. It depicts the subject as being given a good funeral on grounds that despite his impious life, he once invited the poor to attend a banquet in lieu of the city’s counsellors, who had refused to come (ibid. 338, citing *Sanh*. 6.23).

60 Michel, “τελωνης,” 102, n. 139.
that cheating in such matters was justifiable only if the τελώνης concerned were an infamous rogue.62

It could be argued that the evidence from the Talmuds and even from the Mishnah is too late to be relevant to Jesus research. Yet Paul’s exhortation in Rom 13:1–7 suggests that in the mid-first century, significant tensions existed both for Jews and Christians as they sought to be faithful to God’s commandment while under foreign rule.63 Moreover, the attitudes of Jesus and his contemporaries toward taxes and tolls are pertinent to our research topic, as we will see from our investigations below.

3.4. Relevant NT references:

3.4.1. Introduction:

It is striking that NT references to τελώναι are found only in the Synoptic Gospels, and that toll collectors nearly always appear in combination with other characters.64 For the most part, they are paired with sinners: τελώναι and ἀμαρτωλοί occur together in Mark 2:15 (and par. Matt 9:10),65 Matt 11:19 (and par. Luke 7:34), and Luke 15:1. Hence these references derive from three separate sources: Mark, Q, and L.66 Luke is the only evangelist to mention the τελώναι as a designated group without attaching them to one or more other groups, viz. with respect to those who come to seek baptism from John (3:12; 7:29).67 In addition, Luke features two τελώναι as individuals: firstly in the parable contrasting a Pharisee with a toll collector

61 Ibid. 102, n. 141; Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 1:376. See also Michel, “τελώνης,” 102 n. 140 re avoidance of slave tax by means of a false oath.
62 Ibid. 102 n. 141.
63 Ibid.
64 Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 55.
65 Re the pairing of toll collectors with “others” in Luke 5:29, see the review of Corley’s work in Chapter One, §3.4.1.
67 Ibid.
(18:10–14); and secondly in the story involving the ἀρχιτελώνις Zacchaeus (19:1–10). 68 Apart from ἁμαρτωλοί, terms used in conjunction with τελώναι are ἑθνικοί (Matt 5:46–47; 18:17), πόρναι (Matt 21:31–32), and ἁρπαγεῖς, ἡδίκοι, and μοιχοί (Luke 18:11). 69 Of the combinations, the group termed τελώναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί is of the utmost importance, and must be examined in detail, since the toll collectors and sinners comprise part of the main focus in our research. However, as the ἁμαρτωλοί may be found to subsume one or more of the other groups, including τελώναι, it will be necessary to investigate the identity of the sinners alone, before considering them in combination. Discussion on the τελώναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί will therefore be deferred to the major section below, on sinners. The remainder of the present section is devoted to examination of the other synoptic references to τελώναι, and of Jesus’ response to the question concerning payment of taxes (Mark 12:13–17 and par.).

3.4.2. Τελώναι and ἑθνικοί:

In addition to the negative attitude shown toward toll collectors in Matthew, 70 it is noteworthy that three out of five NT occurrences of ἑθνικός appear in the first Gospel, 71 and that none of them is complimentary. The term occurs in conjunction with τελώναι in Matt 5:46–47 and 18:17, while in 6:7, criticism is expressed of the alleged manner in which Gentiles pray. The relevant texts are as follows:

68 Ibid.
69 Ibid. 54–55. See n. 65 above re toll collectors and “others”.
70 See §3.3 above, and n. 56.
Matt 5:46–47:

46 έαν γάρ ἀγαπήσῃς τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας Ἰμάς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελώναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; 47 καὶ έαν ἀσπάσῃς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἰμάς μόνον, τί περισσόν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ έθνικοι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

46 For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the toll collectors do the same? 47 And if you greet only your brothers and sisters, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same?72

Matt 18:15–17:

15 Εὰν δὲ ἄμαρτῃς [εἰς αὐ] ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ὑπαγε ἔλεγξον αὐτὸν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μάνου, εὰν σοι ἀκούσῃ, ἐκερήθηκας τὸν ἀδελφὸν σου. 16 εὰν δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃ, παράλοβε μετὰ σοῦ ἕτι ἕνα ἢ δύο, ἕνα ἐπὶ στάσιμας δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν σταθή πάν ῥήμα. 17 εὰν δὲ παρακολούθῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· εὰν δὲ καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρακολούθῃ, ἔστω σοι ὁπωσερ ὁ έθνικός καὶ οἱ τελώνης.

15 If another member of the church sins against you, go and point out the fault when the two of you are alone. If the member listens to you, you have regained that one. 16 But if you are not listened to, take one or two others along with you, so that every word may be confirmed by the evidence of two or three witnesses. 17 If the member refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church; and if the offender refuses to listen even to the church, let such a one be to you as a Gentile and a toll collector.

Matt 6:7:

Προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βαπταλογήσητε οἴσαντι ὁ ἐθνικός, δοκοῦσιν γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ ποιολογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται.

When you are praying, do not heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do; for they think that they will be heard because of their many words.

---

72 Following the lead of Donahue ("Tax Collectors and Sinners," 55 n. 58) the translations I use here and in other excerpts are from the NRSV, but with toll collector substituted for tax collector.
The passage Matt 5:46–47 is of particular interest, since it has the terms τελονει and ἔθνικοι rather than ἀμαρτωλοῖ, which is utilised in each case in the parallel version of Luke 6:32–33. This suggests that the word ἀμαρτωλοῖ might perhaps have been considered a substitute for τελονει on the grounds of the presupposed dishonesty of toll collectors, and that the terms ἔθνικοι and ἀμαρτωλοῖ could have been deemed interchangeable. Both of these possibilities will be examined further in §4, and discussion here will be confined to some preliminary comments.

Although the dating and setting of the tradition found in Matt 18:15–17 are uncertain, the fact that v. 15 is comparable with Luke 17:3 indicates that the pericope may be at least partially authentic. However, the lack of a Lucan parallel to vv. 16–17, the inclusion of the term ἐκκλησία in v. 17, and the implication that an organised institution is involved, suggest that the latter two verses, and perhaps all, are a creation of the Matthaean community.

Stendahl has observed the resemblance between Matt 18:15–17 and the procedure documented in Rule of the Community for reprimanding a fellow-member. It involves three steps: a private meeting with the offender, and then the calling of witnesses, before the matter is brought before the whole community. In the Matthaean church, as well as at Qumran, the procedure is evidently intended as a

73 Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, “ἀμαρτωλοῖ,” TDNT 1:328.
75 Ibid.
76 “Matthew,” PCB §688f, 789, referring to 1QS V, 25–VI, 1. A similar process is cited in CD IX, 3 (Stendahl, “Matthew,” §688f, 789). The occurrence of the same procedure in 1QS and CD affirms the fundamentally Jewish character of Matthew. It is possible that the disciplinary process could have developed independently in the separate communities, since instruction is given in the Pentateuch regarding reproof of a neighbour, and the need for witnesses if a charge is to be sustained. See Lev 19:17–18 and Deut 19:15 respectively; Meier, “Matthew,” 633; Stendahl, “Matthew,” §688f, 789.
77 Ibid. For the two documented examples of the procedure see Martínez, Dead Sea Scrolls, 9, 40, respectively.
disciplinary measure, rather than as a pedagogic device. However, the relevant practices of the communities are not identical: should the offender not be won over in the process, the action to be taken against a member in Matt 18:15–17 is final, involving excommunication, as distinct from the possibility of only temporary expulsion at Qumran. The stipulation to treat an ousted member as ὃ ἐθνικὸς καὶ ὃ τελώνης is therefore extremely harsh, and is also inconsistent with other Matthaean passages, in which Gentiles and toll collectors are upheld as examples of faith, in contrast to Jews.

The most plausible conclusion to be drawn is that only v. 15 has any claim to authenticity, and that even if it were dominical, the unit as a whole was created by the church. If this were the case, the juxtaposition of ἐθνικὸς and τελώνης in v. 17 is not necessarily of relevance to the historical Jesus and his table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. Moreover, the attitudes reflected in the text could then be attributed to the Matthaean community and its milieu, and need not match those of Jesus.

Donahue has attempted to determine the historical setting of Matt 18:15–17 in light of the negative view shown toward Gentiles and toll collectors, and his belief that the unit derives from a Jewish Christian community in Palestine. His reading of

---

78 Stendahl, “Matthew,” §688f, 789. Note, however, that the Gospel of Matthew as a whole is perceived by Stendahl as an instruction manual pertaining to administration and teaching in the church, with a form comparable with the Rule of the Community (ibid. §673c, 769).
79 Ibid.
80 Ibid., citing Matt 8:1–11; 9:9–13; 15:21–28. Stendahl rationalises the incongruous and negative manner in which the terms ἐθνικὸς and τελώνης are used, by surmising that had they not put their faith in Jesus, such persons would still epitomise those excluded from the kingdom (“Matthew,” §688f, 789). This explanation raises some important issues concerning the redaction of Matthew, to be discussed below.
82 “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 58, accepting the statement of Michel, “Τελώνης,” 104, n. 147 that Matthew is “certainly of Palestinian origin.” However, a more likely provenance is Syrian Antioch (Meier, “Matthew,” 624; M. Eugene Boring, “The Gospel of Matthew: Introduction, Commentary and
the passage seems to rest on an interpretation of the Gentile and the toll collector in v. 17 as a single entity, and on considering when and where such a person would have been perceived as collaborating with the Roman oppressor. The method Donahue adopts is to draw on his findings as to the different revenue collection systems operating in Judaea and Galilee in the early NT period. He concludes that the exclusion envisaged for dissident church members in Matt 18:17 is not relevant to Galilee during the time of Jesus’ ministry, or indeed until 44 C.E., but would fit either with the situation in Judaea prior to 44 C.E., or anywhere in Palestine after that date.

A problem with Donahue’s reasoning is that the location of the Matthaean community, in which Matt 18:15–17 most likely developed, is debated, and many scholars situate it in Syrian Antioch rather than in Palestine. A further difficulty is that because he apparently accepts that ἕθνες and τελωνείς are used in reference to the one person in Matt 18:15–17, Donahue bases his analysis of the passage on the historical situation of the τελωνείς in Palestine during the NT period. Although he mentions the texts in which τελωνείς are paired with other groups, his main focus is their association with ἀμαρτωλοί, so that insufficient attention is devoted to the connection between toll collectors and Gentiles, and none is given to the NT texts in

Reflections,” *NIB* 8:105; Jack Dean Kingsbury, “Matthew, the Gospel According to,” *HBD* 661; and see below re Stendahl’s opinion). Donahue is somewhat misleading in his assertion (“Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 58) that Stendahl, “Matthew,” 789 argues for “an early setting” for Matt 18:15–17. Stendahl is, in fact, non-committal as to the setting and historicity of the passage during his discussion. Yet in observing the stepwise process described in the pericope he is evidently viewing it as a unit created by the church to meet its needs. Elsewhere he posits Antioch in Syria as the most likely provenance for Matthew, in view of its distinctly Jewish flavour (ibid. §673f, 769), and acknowledges that most scholars assign a post-70 C.E. dating to the Gospel (ibid. §673k, 770). He seems to do so himself in his discussion on Matt 22:1–14 (ibid. §690l, 791). However, Stendahl does state that the Matthaean understanding of Jesus often has “a more original ring” than the interpretations of Mark, Luke, and Paul, and denies that the formal and ecclesiastical nature of Matthew’s Gospel necessitates a long developmental period (ibid. §673k, 770).

83 I.e. a Jewish toll collector who has made himself “as a Gentile” (Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 57).
84 Ibid. 58.
85 Ibid.
86 See n. 82 above.
which ἔθνικοι feature without τελόνατι. The result is that two significant references to ἔθνικοι are overlooked.

The first of these, Matt 6:7, quoted above, provides an important clue for understanding a possible link between toll collectors and Gentiles. The term ἔθνικός may be translated *Gentile, national or foreign*, but the latter two meanings are applicable only in later Greek, so that it is properly rendered as *Gentile* for NT occurrences.88 As Schmid demonstrates on the basis of Matt 5:47, references to Gentiles in the NT are to be understood in a religious, rather than national context: i.e. ἔθνικοι are persons who do not observe the Law, and are therefore to be viewed in contradistinction to Jews.89 Hence, in Matt 6:7, where Jesus is depicted as criticising Gentile prayer customs, the real issue is the dichotomy between appropriate and inappropriate religious behaviour. The saying forms part of the homily exhorting listeners to greater righteousness in preparation for the kingdom.90

In the segment 6:1–18, true piety is discussed with respect to the traditional Jewish practices of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, with an emphasis on the ethics and values of Judaism, especially the avoidance of pretentiousness in one’s service to God and neighbour.91 The term ὑποκριτής basically refers to a play-actor, and this sense can be readily applied in Matt 6:2, 5, and 16.92 Elsewhere in Matthew, the more pejorative nuance implied by the translation *hypocrite* is justified,93 while in the LXX,

88 Schmidt, “ἔθνικός,” 372. The term is not utilised in the LXX (ibid.).
89 Ibid.
90 Stendahl, “Matthew,” § 680a, 778. The call for a higher standard of righteousness is implied throughout the Sermon on the Mount, but is found esp. in Matt 5:20. Stendahl notes the “but” (δὲ) that is often included in reliable MSS at the beginning of Matthew 6, indicating a warning about the pitfalls involved in aiming at a higher degree of piety (ibid.).
91 Ibid.
92 See “ὑποκριτής, οὖν, δὲ,” BAGD 845. Other meanings are *hypocrite, pretender, dissembler* (ibid.).
impious, or godless,\textsuperscript{94} and in Psalms of Solomon (4:6, 20) it is used polemically against a rival faction.\textsuperscript{95} As Stendahl has stressed, the Gentiles mentioned in Matt 6:7 should not be equated with the hypocrites who feature prominently elsewhere in vv. 1–18.\textsuperscript{96} The Lord’s Prayer (vv. 9–13) exemplifies a style of supplication that is proper for the Jew (or Christian), in contrast to the practice of the non-Jew.\textsuperscript{97}

The other NT text of relevance, Gal 2:14, confirms that the significant issue in the distinction between Jew and non-Jew involves religious observance:

\begin{quote}
άλλ’ οτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ ἐιςαγωγοῦντος, εἶπον τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐμπροσθεν πάντων, Ἐβ οὐ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἔθνικός καὶ οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκός ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζετο Ἰουδαΐζειν;
\end{quote}

But when I saw that they were not acting consistently with the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all, “If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”

Paul here shows the absolute polarity between Jew and Gentile—there is no middle way between living ἔθνικός\textsuperscript{98} and Ἰουδαϊκός.\textsuperscript{99}

It will be beneficial at this stage to review our conclusions so far. It has been found that in NT usage the term ἔθνικοι refers to Gentiles, i.e. those who, in

\textsuperscript{94} Stendahl, “Matthew,” §680b, 778. See e.g. Job 34:30; 36:13.
\textsuperscript{95} Stendahl, “Matthew,” §680b, 778. See also Dunn, “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 278, 288 nn. 64–65.
\textsuperscript{96} “Matthew,” §680c, 778.
\textsuperscript{97} Stendahl demonstrates the similarity between the Lord’s Prayer and 1st century Jewish prayer, but notes the eschatological tone of the former, esp. in Matthew (ibid. §680d, 778).
\textsuperscript{98} Adverbial form of ἔθνικός (Schmidt, “ἔθνικός,” 372).
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid. The other important observation to be drawn from this text is that Paul’s condemnation of Cephas is not directed towards the fact that he had been living ἔθνικός, through joining with Gentiles for table fellowship. The hypocrisy involved was the cessation of that behaviour when Jews from the circumcision faction were present (Gal 2:11–13). For Paul, the truth of the gospel (ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εἰςαγαγοῦσαν) consists in the freedom given to Jew and Gentile alike to live by faith in Jesus, rather than by observing the Law. (See Gal 2:5, 14, 15–16). On the question of table fellowship of Jews and Gentiles, see discussion below in this section, and also in Chapter Six, §4.1.5, Chapter Seven, §3.1.3.4, and Chapter Eight, §§3.3.3.9–11, and §4.
contradistinction to Jews, do not observe the Torah. In light of this, ἀμαρτωλοὶ could conceivably be used as a synonym for ἔθνικοι. Since toll collectors were presumed to be dishonest, they too could have been labelled ἀμαρτωλοὶ, and this would provide a possible explanation for the conjunction of τελῶναι and ἔθνικοι in Matt 5.46–47 and 18:17, and for the evidently despised status of both groups.

On the other hand, it could be argued, especially in the case of Matt 18:17, that Christian ἔθνικοι should be placed together with Jews, rather than non-Jews. This is plausible for understanding the term ἔθνικός, in that the meaning of its cognate ἔθνος is by no means uniform in the NT. Sometimes τὰ ἔθνη includes Gentile Christians, as in Rom 11:13 and Eph 3:1, while at other times it excludes them, as in 1 Thess 4:5. Hence, while it is accepted that the NT usage of ἔθνικός always makes a distinction between Jew and Gentile, it is possible that in Matt 18:17 Gentile converts are included alongside Jews among the saved. However, the negative connotations of the term τελῶναι in Matthew cannot be circumvented in such a manner, and we must seek another explanation for the evangelist’s inconsistencies concerning toll collectors and Gentiles.

Meier mentions two factors that have bearing on Matthew’s lack of uniformity in this respect. These are: firstly, the observation that the three sources Mark, Q, and M, utilised in the final redaction of Matthew, are less than

---

100 This is not to say that the terms are always synonymous. See e.g. Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 74 n. 135.
101 I take this to be Stendahl’s understanding of the situation, viz. that faith in Jesus is the crucial factor that enables Christian Gentiles and toll collectors to receive salvation; they would otherwise remain sinners. See n. 80 above.
104 See Schmidt, “ἔθνος,” 371, re salvation history as the crux of the distinction.
harmonious;\textsuperscript{105} and secondly, the debate as to whether the evangelist was a Jewish, or Gentile, Christian.\textsuperscript{106} Both points deserve investigation.

Looking first at the nature of M, it seems from the shift in attitudes from anti-Gentile\textsuperscript{107} to strongly pro-Gentile\textsuperscript{108} and anti-Jewish,\textsuperscript{109} that the source itself is probably composite, and contains both attitudes. That situation could be explained by positing two separate redactors, the first a conservative Jewish Christian, the second a Gentile.\textsuperscript{110}

Secondly, we will consider the faith position of the author(s). In the examination of NT texts containing the term ἔθνος (and ἔθνοι), Gal 2:14 was found to be influential, and it is also of significance with respect to the authorship of Matthew. It is important to note that Antioch was very likely the location of the Matthaean community, and that the dispute over the matter of Peter’s table fellowship with Gentiles occurred there. We may surmise that prior to the settlement of the argument at the Council of Jerusalem in ca. 49 C.E.,\textsuperscript{111} and possibly for some time after that date, there was rigorous insistence from a strong Jewish leadership in the community that the traditional mores of Judaism be maintained.\textsuperscript{112} Such an attitude coheres well with the negativity toward Gentiles that is evident in some portions of special Matthew, but requires that M be viewed as a compound source,

\textsuperscript{105} "Matthew," 625. Meier emphasises that M should be seen as an evolving oral tradition rather than a document (ibid. 623).

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid. 625–27.

\textsuperscript{107} E.g. Matt 18:17; 10:5; 15:24.

\textsuperscript{108} E.g. 28:18–19.

\textsuperscript{109} E.g. 23:1–36.

\textsuperscript{110} So E. Abel, "Who Wrote Matthew?" NTS 17 (1971): 138–52. This hypothesis provides a more convincing explanation than the notion of a zealous Jew who became a zealous Christian (Meier, "Matthew," 626), although not every aspect of it is persuasive. What seems certain is that M contains strands reflecting contradictory attitudes which were held at different periods of the community’s development.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid. 624. See also Gal 2:1–15; Acts 15:1–35.

\textsuperscript{112} I.e. the resistance to abandoning Jewish traditions was a factor within the Matthaean community, and not only among members of the so-called "circumcision faction" from Jerusalem.
containing inconsistencies in itself. The proposal would allow for three or four decades after the apostolic decree, for the development of the community and its theology before the final redaction in ca. 80–90 C.E.\textsuperscript{113} Doubtless the destruction of Jerusalem in the meantime would have influenced the evolutionary process to some extent,\textsuperscript{114} and a 30–40 year period would have been sufficient for the compromise solution on table fellowship to be effected. Clearly, the idea that the disparate content of M reflects an attitudinal shift within the community provides a plausible reason for Gentiles to be regarded sometimes as faith heroes, and at other times as despicable sinners. Admittedly, this notion does not directly account for such inconsistencies with respect to toll collectors. However, it is probable that the Matthaean community knew the tradition associating τέλωναί with sinners\textsuperscript{115} at an early date, via Mark and Q.\textsuperscript{116} Thus, the status of both toll collectors and Gentiles as heroes of the faith is explicable in light of the combined sources available to the community.

The tradition of Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners has apparently been incorporated from Mark and Q into Matthew without major alterations.\textsuperscript{117} However, if the notion of two separate redactors is entertained, a trace of the earlier pro-Jewish attitude is perhaps discernible in Matthew’s version of the controversy story recounted in Mark 7:1–23. Mark’s assertion in v. 19c that Jesus “declared all foods clean” is omitted from Matthew’s account of the episode (15:1–20). Thus the effect of the saying is played down, and the emphasis is shifted from the ingestion of “unclean” foods to the comparatively innocuous topic of eating

\textsuperscript{113} Re dating see Meier, “Matthew,” 624; Boring, “Matthew,” 106.
\textsuperscript{114} Meier, “Matthew,” 624–25.
\textsuperscript{115} As we have seen, the epithet ὀμαρτωλοί certainly encompassed Gentiles in some instances.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid. 623.
with unclean hands.\textsuperscript{118} In contrast, Paul’s account of the events surrounding the Council of Jerusalem, especially his knowledge of Peter’s table fellowship with Gentiles, is consistent with the declaration in Mark connoting that the Jewish food laws were not binding for Christians. Moreover, although Luke includes only a fraction of the handwashing controversy in his Gospel,\textsuperscript{119} he does provide in Acts 10:9–16, an etiological account of Peter’s liberation from Jewish dietary restrictions.\textsuperscript{120} When all these factors are considered, the different stance in Matthew is appreciable, and could comprise further evidence of an anti-Gentile element in his community.

The investigation of Matthaean authorship has been helpful for understanding the range of attitudes toward τελωναί and ἔθνοι, and some important issues concerning table fellowship have been raised. This background material will be of ongoing benefit in the next subsection, as we turn to the pairing of toll collectors and prostitutes, another combination that is unique to Matthew.

3.4.3. Τελωναί and πόρναι:

Although Matthew 21:31b–32 is the only instance in which prostitutes and toll collectors are directly associated in the Gospels, there are sound reasons for accepting the authenticity of the tradition that one or more prostitutes were included among Jesus’ followers. In the first place, application of the criterion of embarrassment makes it extremely unlikely that the offensive logion in Matt 21:31b–32 could be an invention of the evangelist.\textsuperscript{121} Further, the prostitute Rahab is

\textsuperscript{120} On this issue see Loader, \textit{Attitude towards the Law}, 368–79, 385–86. Luke, like Matthew, does not take as radical a stance as Mark (ibid. 386, 388).
\textsuperscript{121} See Chapter Two, §3.2, esp. nn. 83–84.
among the women of dubious moral character featured in Matthew’s genealogy,\textsuperscript{122} and it is perhaps significant that she is also numbered among the Israelite faith heroes in Hebrews 11,\textsuperscript{123} and is in fact the only woman mentioned there. In addition, it seems highly probable that the term πόρναι occurred in Q 7:29, but that Luke removed it and substituted the phrase: πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελώναι (“all the people who heard this, including the toll collectors”).\textsuperscript{124} The likelihood of this is affirmed by his placement of the anointing story in the following segment of the chapter (Luke 7:36–50), and by his description γυνὴ ἤτες ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀμαρτωλός, which strongly suggests the woman is a prostitute.\textsuperscript{125}

Since the saying concerning τελώναι and πόρναι comprises the conclusion to the parable of the Two Sons, it is necessary to cite the complete passage:

Matt 21:28–31:

28 ἢ δὲ ἤμιν δοκεῖ ἀνθρώπως εἶχεν τέκνα δύο. καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῷ εἶπεν,

Τέκνον, ὑπαγε σήμερον ἔργαζον ἐν τῷ ἀμπελώνι. 29 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, ὦ θέλω,

ὦστερον δὲ μετεμελήθης ἀπῆλθεν.

30 προσελθὼν δὲ τῷ ἑτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσεὶς. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Ἐγώ, κύριε, καὶ

οὐκ ἀπῆλθαν. 31 τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησαν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός; λέγουσιν, ἢ πρώτος.

λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰσαώσ. Ἀμήν λέγω ἢμῖν ὅτι οἱ τελώναι καὶ οἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν

ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 32 ἠδὲ γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὄνομὶ ἰδικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ τελώναι καὶ οἱ πόρναι ἐπίστευσαν

αὐτῷ· ἢμεῖς δὲ Ἰδοὺς oὐδὲ μετεμελήθητε ὦστερον τοῦ πιστεύσαι αὐτῷ.

\textsuperscript{122} As Corley has observed. See Chapter One, §3.4, for the review of Corley’s work, and esp. 3.4.1, and nn. 258–59, re the tradition concerning πόρναι in Matthew.

\textsuperscript{123} V. 31.

\textsuperscript{124} Corley, Private Women, 156; Boring, “Matthew,” 411. Note also that Luke 7:29–30 is shown as a parallel to Matt 21:31–32 in Aland, Synopsis of the Four Gospels, 242. Another indication that the saying may have occurred in Q in some form is the use of the expression “kingdom of God” in Matt 21:31, rather than “kingdom of heaven” (Corley, Private Women, 157, n. 42). The former is rare in Matthew, occurring only five times, as against 31 incidences of the latter.

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid. 156, n. 37.
28 "What do you think? A man had two sons; he went to the first and said, 'Son, go and work in the vineyard today.' 29 He answered, 'I will not'; but later he changed his mind and went. 30 The father went to the second and said the same; and he answered, 'I go, sir'; but he did not go. 31 Which of the two did the will of his father?" They said, "The first." Jesus said to them, "Truly I tell you, the toll collectors and the prostitutes are going into the kingdom of God ahead of you. 32 For John came to you in the way of righteousness and you did not believe him, but the toll collectors and the prostitutes believed him; and even after you saw it, you did not change your minds and believe him."

The parable itself is generally believed to be redactional, although a connection with Luke 15:11–32 has been considered a possibility. Any such link, however, is probably limited to the fact that both of the parables feature a father (representing God), an obedient/penitent son, and a stubborn son. There are several variant readings. Whereas most texts show the first son, who changes his mind and goes, as the "obedient" one, some have the religious leaders asserting that the other son, who agreed to go but did not, was the one who did the father's will. In the second case, then, the Jews are depicted as stubborn, believing that the crucial factor for their salvation is their nation's original agreement to the covenant at Sinai. In some of the latter texts, a further difference is the omission of the word ὄδε from v. 32.

---

126 Corley, Private Women, 154, n. 29.
127 Stendahl, "Matthew," §690i, 791; Boring, "Matthew," 411. Farmer has posited that the " prodigal" son in Luke 15:11–32 represents the penitent toll collectors and sinners at table with Jesus ["Who are the 'Tax Collectors and Sinners' in the Synoptic Tradition?" in From Faith to Faith: Essays in Honor of Donald G. Miller on His 70th Birthday (ed. D. Y. Hadidian; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979), 167–74, esp. 169]. This notion has been followed by Gibson, who not only finds an association between toll collectors and prostitutes by means of Luke 15:11–32, but also concludes that the reason members of both groups were so despised was that they collaborated with the Romans ["Hoi telōnai kai hai pornai," JTS NS 32 (1981): 429–33]. However, the idea that toll collectors in Galilee during Jesus' lifetime were considered quislings has already been dismissed in §5.3 above, and the connection of prostitutes to soldiers is without foundation since Galilee was not occupied by Roman troops (Sanders, "Historical Context," 438–40).
128 Stendahl, "Matthew," §690i, 791. See also Exod 19:8.
with the effect that Jesus acknowledges the repentence of those Jews who become his
disciples.\textsuperscript{130} These disparities mean that the logion referring to \textit{τελώναι} and \textit{πόρναι} in
vv. 31b–32 comprises a parallel to the parable of the Two Sons only in the case of
the favoured reading, as cited above.\textsuperscript{131} In the parable, the disobedience of the Jews is
compared with the willingness of the Gentiles to repent. In the saying that follows,
Jesus contrasts the toll collectors and prostitutes, (who believe John’s message and
repent), with the religious leaders, (who do not believe or repent).\textsuperscript{132}

In view of the textual uncertainties, one should not try to extract too much
from the pericope. Yet regardless of the variants, the important issues remain the
same,\textsuperscript{133} viz.: the parable and the saying are both directed against the Pharisees;\textsuperscript{134}
Jesus affirms John’s part in securing the salvation of the toll collectors and
prostitutes, and the efficacy of repentance for entrée to the kingdom; and
eschatological reversal is manifested in the fact that the most despised groups are to
be accepted into the kingdom ahead of the Pharisees.\textsuperscript{135} Since vv. 31b–32 appear to


\textsuperscript{131} Metzger provides sound reasons for accepting the favoured reading as more original (\textit{Textual
Commentary}, 45–46 (56–57 in 1971 ed.). For a different perspective, see Paul Foster, “A Tale of
Two Sons: But Which One Did the Far, Far Better Thing? A Study of Matt 21.28–32,” \textit{NTS} 47

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.; Stendahl, “Matthew,” §690i, 791. The reference to John in v. 32 connects the parable to the
previous passage, esp. to v. 25b (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{133} Boring, “Matthew,” 411 n. 470.

\textsuperscript{134} Note that although the opponents are designated as “chief priests and the elders of the people” in
explains how Matthew has added Pharisees to his Marcan source at strategic points in 21:23–22:46 to
make the series of controversies into a confrontation between them and Jesus (ibid. 408–409). The
dispute with the Pharisees at this stage is connected with their presence among those who heard
John’s message, and their failure to respond (ibid. 412, referring to Matt 3:5–7a).

\textsuperscript{135} Jeremias asserts, on the grounds of the equivalent Aramaic expression, that \textit{οἱ τελώναι καὶ αἱ
πόρναι προσέρχουσιν ζημία} in v. 31 implies that the toll collectors and prostitutes will \textit{displace} the
religious leaders, i.e. “[they] will enter . . . and not you,” (\textit{New Testament Theology}, 116–17).
However, his argument is not persuasive, esp. as he goes on to affirm the “unbounded mercy” of God.
Another view on the verse is that of Walker, who suggests that Jesus’ statement is certainly not a
commendation of the toll collectors and prostitutes, but merely an indication that the religious
authorities are even farther behind (“Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” 227, 229). This comment too, is
unconvincing, particularly because it fails to take account of the underlying emphasis on the value of
repentance.
preserve, at least partially, an authentic saying of Jesus, these findings are important. They indicate the existence of a dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees, at least from Matthew’s perspective. Furthermore, they support the concept that Jesus stood in solidarity with penitents who had become his followers, and may help toward amplifying and clarifying the traditions of his table fellowship. In addition, they show that Jesus relied to some extent on the effect of John’s ministry, and thus may shed light on the relationship between the two figures.

It is timely here to reintroduce some of the issues raised in the literature review in Chapter One. Firstly, we will consider again Sanders’ opinion that Jesus offered the kingdom to the wicked who heeded his call, where the term wicked designates people who indefinitely remained sinners.\(^{136}\) The focus is particularly on whether or not the prostitutes cited in Matt 21:31b–32 appear to have repented. Matthew has Jesus proclaiming exactly the same message as John, i.e. “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near.” (3:2; 4:17). Therefore, although only John’s ministry is mentioned in Matt 21:32, Jesus’ call for repentance must also be acknowledged. His announcement that the toll collectors and prostitutes will enter the kingdom is an affirmation that his own ministry, as well as John’s, has been effective.\(^{137}\) Moreover, the fact that Jesus held such strict views on fidelity within marriage\(^{138}\) means that he would have been extremely unlikely to declare the πόρνες as eligible for the kingdom if they were still engaged in prostitution. Another factor in support of the argument that the prostitutes had reformed is that it would demonstrate direct continuity with the moral practice of the early church: fornication

\(^{136}\) See Chapter One, §3.1.2.2.
\(^{137}\) Even if Matthew’s account of Jesus’ call to repent is entirely fictitious, it must be acknowledged that Jesus, not John, completes the work of salvation.
\(^{138}\) See Chapter One, §2.7.2.2.
(πορνεία) was prohibited by the decree of the Jerusalem Council, and also denounced by Paul.\textsuperscript{139}

The second matter of relevance here arises from two separate claims made by Corley: firstly, her assertion that a connection exists between the πορνεία in Matt 21:31b–32, and the τέλωναι and ἀμαρτωλοί in Matt 9:9–13 and 11:18–19;\textsuperscript{140} and secondly, the assumption that the accusations designating Jesus’ commensals as “sinners” represent rhetorical slander.\textsuperscript{141} It is true that the remarks repeated by Jesus in 11:18–19 (Q 7:33–34) sound very much like opposition slander, and Dunn, in particular, has provided convincing evidence that the epithet “sinners” could have been assigned to a group undeservedly by a rival faction.\textsuperscript{142} However, there are problems with Corley’s notion that this passage should necessarily be linked with the other two. Firstly, the difficulty about connecting it with Matt 9:9–13 is that the texts are derived from different sources, Q and Mark respectively, and there is no certainty that the sinners referred to in combination with τέλωναι are the same in each case.

Secondly, the problem with attempting to link Matt 21:31b–32 with the character slurs from the Q source, is that since there is a very strong case for toll collectors and prostitutes to have been among Jesus’ followers, the opposition’s remarks do not really constitute slander.\textsuperscript{143} Rather, they represent an historical truth, even though, as

\textsuperscript{139} Hauck and Schulz, “πορνη κτλ.,” 592–93; Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25. Although Paul does not report the prohibition of fornication in his account of the dispute at Antioch and its resolution (Gal 2:1–15), he repudiates it elsewhere. See esp. I Thess 4:3; 1 Cor 6:18. Note that the four decrees of the council are derived from the prohibitions of Leviticus 17 and 18; the other three pertain to dietary regulations (Hauck and Schulz, “πορνη κτλ.,” 593; Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 374–75).

\textsuperscript{140} See Chapter One, §3.4.2.2; Corley, Private Women, 152.

\textsuperscript{141} See Chapter One, n. 274.

\textsuperscript{142} “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 276–80.

\textsuperscript{143} While it is distinctly possible that reformed characters would be recognised as former prostitutes, and that name-calling might have taken place, that does not alter the fact that the πορνεία in Matt 21:31b–32 had been prostitutes, and that Jesus was now seen to be in solidarity with them.
we have demonstrated, the members of both groups had reformed. Hence, it is methodologically questionable to suggest that the “sinners” in Matt 9:9–13 are simply women tagged by the opposition party as *prostitutes* because they are at table with men. In light of these difficulties then, it is better at this stage to hold apart the separate traditions, and reserve judgment about the relationship between them until the investigation of the pairing τελώναι and ἀμαρτωλοί is completed.

The cumulative findings at this point are:

- The term ἀμαρτωλοί could have been used in reference to toll collectors, Gentiles, or prostitutes, as separate groups or in any combination.
- Jesus is depicted in solidarity with τελώναι and ἀμαρτωλοί and his commensals almost certainly included toll collectors and prostitutes.
- The toll collectors and prostitutes among Jesus’ followers were presumably reformed characters.
- Jesus was probably approached during the course of a meal on at least one occasion by a woman known as a prostitute.
- Jesus implied that toll collectors and prostitutes who had repented would enter the kingdom ahead of the Pharisees.

In the next subsection we consider the conjunction of toll collectors with thieves, and some other unethical groups.

---

144 It also seems highly improbable that there is any precise connection here with Matthew’s own community, as Corley supposes (*Private Women*, 178). By the time of the final redaction of Matthew, the Christian community at Antioch was evidently very pro-Gentile and inclusive. Hence, the presence of reformed prostitutes in Jesus’ group does not necessarily have any bearing on the constitution of the gatherings described in Matt 14:13–21 and 15:32–39. See also Chapter One, §§3.4.2.2 and 3.4.2.3.
3.4.4. Τελώνει and ἄρπαγες:

In the parable of the Pharisee and the Toll Collector (Luke 18:9–14), the Pharisee, who considers himself among the righteous, places the τελώνης alongside ἄρπαγες, ἀδικοὶ, and μοιχοί, i.e. thieves, rogues, and adulterers.

Luke 18:11:

Φαρισαῖος σταθὼς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προσηχότος, Ὁ θεὸς, εὐχαριστῶ σοὶ γιὰ τὸ εἰμὶ ἄστερον οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἄρπαγες, ἀδικοὶ, μοιχοί, ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης.

The Pharisee, standing by himself, was praying thus, 'God, I thank you that I am not like other people: thieves, rogues, adulterers, or even like this toll collector.'

Since the parable is usually considered to be a Lucan composition,¹⁴⁵ its content concerning toll collectors is less significant than the foregoing NT references. However, the description of the τελώνης in v. 11 has interesting parallels in the Mishnah, especially with regard to his characterisation as a thief—in both m. B. Qam. 10:1–2 and m. Ned. 3:4, toll collectors are equated with robbers.¹⁴⁶ The Pharisee puts himself and his colleagues in the category of the righteous, while he regards all other people as thieves, rogues, and adulterers; apparently, he regards the toll collector as embodying all three types of sinner.¹⁴⁷

---

¹⁴⁵ Though Walker suggests that the early church may have created the parable on the basis of Matt 21:31b ("Jesus and the Tax Collectors," 229). The parable is mentioned again below in §4.2.2 and discussed more fully in Chapter Six, §5.
¹⁴⁶ Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 376 n. 108; "τοῖς," Jastrow 741. On the rabbinic references to tax/toll collectors see also Chapter Six, §4.2.2.
¹⁴⁷ The list covers each type of sin: robbery, involving theft with violence; reprobation, implying failure to observe religious obligations; and adultery, concerning fleshly immorality (Joel B. Green, The Gospel of Luke (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 648, n. 121, following Hedrick.)
The story of Jesus and the ἀρχιτελώνης Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1–10) is probably a Lucan creation also, but it does offer further confirmation of toll collectors’ reputation for dishonesty.

Luke 19:8:

σταθεὶς δὲ Ζαχαχάρας εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον, Τῶν τὰ ἡμιναὶ μου τῶν ὑπαρχῶν,
κύριε, τοῖς πτωχοῖς δίδαμι, καὶ εἰ τινὸς τῇ ἐσπαθάντῃ ἀποδίδωμι τετραπλῶν.

Zacchaeus stood there and said to the Lord, “Look, half of my possessions, Lord, I will give to the poor; and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will pay back four times as much.”

The text is one of the very few about toll collection in the NT milieu and the material it provides is treated by historians as reliable, although interpretations vary slightly. It is very likely that the story is indeed a creation of the evangelist, and that he himself chose the name Zacchaeus (i.e. the pure one or the righteous one). If so, his reason may have been that the humility of the ἀρχιτελώνης demonstrates his true righteousness, and ensures his eligibility for the kingdom, as Luke 14:11 and 18:14b previously indicated. Such an interpretation is thoroughly consistent with the reversal theme in Luke; however, there are other issues in the story as well as humility, and in the following section an alternative reason is proposed for attributing righteousness to Zacchaeus.

A further interesting point about the name is that there is no explicit expression of repentance by the toll collector, although beating his breast may signify

---

148 Sanders (“Jesus and the Sinners,” 31 n. 6; 35 n. 68) and Walker (“Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” 229, 234 n. 66) both cite Bultmann’s view that the story is an expansion of Mark 2:14–17 (Synoptic Tradition, 34, 62).

149 See §3.3 above, and n. 55.


his remorse, and desire for forgiveness. Another possibility is that the toll collector in the parable may not have needed to repent of any specific wrongdoing, since, as Luke 3:12 shows, the role of a τελωνης is not sinful per se. This is an important point to bear in mind as we turn to consideration of Jesus’ attitude toward paying tax.

3.4.5. Jesus’ attitude toward tax:

Although the pericope we will consider here is not directly related to toll collectors, it furnishes important material about Jesus’ own attitudes, and those of his contemporaries, toward the issue of taxes imposed by the Romans. The passage in question is Mark 12:13–17, concerning the payment of tribute to Caesar.

13 Καὶ ἐποστέλλουσιν ἱρὸς αὐτῶν τινας τῶν Ἰερισσαίων καὶ τῶν Ἰερωνικών ἵνα αὐτῶν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγω. 14 καὶ ἔλθον τινες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, οὐδέμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ καὶ οὐ μὲλεί σοι περὶ οὐδενὸς ὁ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὀδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις; ἔξεστιν δούναι κήρυσσεν Καίσαρι ὡς ὧν δομεῖν ἢ μὴ δομεῖν; 15 ὁ δὲ εἶδος αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί με πειράζετε; φέρετε μοι δημαρίου ἵνα ἰδώ. 16 οἱ δὲ ἤρεγκαν. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τίνος ἢ εἰκόνων αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Καίσαρος. 17 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ. καὶ ἐξεθράμμαζον ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

13 Then they sent to him some Pharisees and some Herodians to trap him in what he said. 14 And they came and said to him, “Teacher, we know that you are sincere, and show deference to no one; for you do not regard people with partiality, but teach the way of God in accordance with truth. Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor, or not?

15 Should we pay them, or should we not?” But knowing their hypocrisy, he said to them, “Why are you putting me to the test? Bring me a denarius and let me see it.” 16 And they brought one. Then he said to them, “Whose head is this, and whose title?”

---

152 Re the Lucan theme of reversal, see ibid. 644.
153 See §4.2.2 below.
155 Ibid.
They answered, "The emperor's." 17 Jesus said to them, "Give to the emperor the things that are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's." And they were utterly amazed at him.

The anecdote comprising the nucleus of the pericope has a strong claim to authenticity.\textsuperscript{157} The question put to Jesus by Pharisees and Herodians marks the beginning of a series of three, the latter two relating to the resurrection (vv. 18–27) and the "great commandment" (vv. 28–34). The two groups may be seen as representing the horns of the dilemma facing Jesus, since the Herodians are pro-Roman and would support the tax, while the Pharisees, although resistant to it, would not express that opinion publicly or violently.\textsuperscript{158} The tax involved is the κηρατις (the poll tax or tributum capitis) instituted in 6 C.E.,\textsuperscript{159} and the amount of the impost was probably one denarius per person, i.e. the equivalent of an agricultural worker's daily wage.\textsuperscript{160}

The coin itself was extremely offensive to Jews, since it bore an image of Caesar's head, and an inscription signifying the divine and priestly status of the Emperor.\textsuperscript{161} Two facts add a touch of irony here: firstly, the episode takes place at the Temple; secondly, Jesus evidently does not have a coin himself, and the Pharisees

\textsuperscript{157} See Craig A. Evans, \textit{Mark 8:27–16:20} (Word Biblical Commentary 34B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 242–43 re its ready acceptance by Bultmann and Taylor as preserving an actual episode in Jesus' ministry. Evans regards Mark's account as the earliest of several versions (ibid. 243). See also Chapter Six, §4.1.2.3 with respect to the structure of the anecdote.

\textsuperscript{158} R. McL. Wilson, "Mark," \textit{PCE} §708c, 812; Stendahl, "Matthew," §690n, 791; Boring, "Matthew," 420. Whilst the Pharisees resented being subject to Roman authority, insurrection was not an option for them as it would demonstrate lack of faith in the power of God to liberate Israel (Stendahl, "Matthew," §690n, 791).

\textsuperscript{159} Most likely imposed on males aged 14 to 65, and females from 12 to 65 years ("Tax and Tax Collectors," \textit{Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary}, 276). The opinion about the target population is based on the contemporary system in Syria (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid.; Pheme Perkins, "tribute, tax, toll," \textit{HBD} 1178.

\textsuperscript{161} Stendahl, "Matthew," §690n, 791; Boring, "Matthew," 420. In contrast to the denarius, the didrachma needed for the half-shekel temple tax was a Syrian coin. See Matt 17:24–27; Stendahl, "Matthew," §687o, 788; §690n, 791.
are asked to bring one.\textsuperscript{162} Thus it is within the Temple precincts that they are forced
to produce the offensive coin and to acknowledge that the image is Caesar’s.\textsuperscript{163} Jesus’
response is particularly clever: the imperative ἀπόδοτε means literally to give back to
Caesar what belongs to him.\textsuperscript{164} His reply satisfies the Herodians that he considers the
tax is lawful and should be paid, while it demonstrates to the Pharisees that he does
not advocate violent resistance to paying the tribute.\textsuperscript{165}

The passage provides helpful material for Jesus research since it indicates he
was not involved in a resistance movement.\textsuperscript{166} However, for our purposes the
pericope is of more relevance in demonstrating his belief that payment of the poll tax
was appropriate, and in accordance with Torah. Admittedly, as Llewelyn suggests,
the interpretation of Jesus’ response depends on the perspective of the audience,\textsuperscript{167} as
is clear from the different positions of the Herodians and Pharisees. Nevertheless,
Jesus’ ruling does imply that the Romans have a right to impose taxes,\textsuperscript{168} and in that
light we will now consider the situation from the perspective of tax and toll
collectors.

As we saw during discussion of the historical situation concerning tax
farming, the system in Judaea in the Augustan era was comparable with that of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{162} Boring, “Matthew,” 420.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{164} Stendahl, “Matthew,” §690f, 791.
\textsuperscript{165} Boring, “Matthew,” 420; “Tax and Tax Collectors,” Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary, 278.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid.; Perkins, “tribute, tax, toll,” 1178. Nevertheless, some commentators consider the “Render to
Caesar” statement ambiguous. E.g. Brandon suggests that it could be interpreted to mean that since
everything was God’s, nothing was Caesar’s, so that no tribute was payable to him [“Tax and Tax
Collectors,” Archaeological and Cultural Dictionary, 278, citing Jesus and the Zealots (New York:
Scribner, 1967) 345–47]. However the argument is unconvincing. Another angle is that the statement
is about minimum performance, as distinct from subservience to the governing power [Llewelyn,
“Tax Collection and the τελώνια,” 75 n. 105, citing D. Daube, “Responsibilities of Masters and
\textsuperscript{167} “Tax Collection and the τελώνια,” 75.
\textsuperscript{168} Youtie, “Publicans and Sinners,” 4; and cited in Llewelyn, “Tax Collection and the τελώνια,” 75.
\end{flushleft}
Ptolemaic Egypt,\textsuperscript{169} and we turn now to a consideration of pertinent data. Using documentary evidence from Egypt, Youtie has argued that the unscrupulousness of tax farmers has been overplayed, given that there is scant evidence of actual claims against them in the form of edicts or petitions.\textsuperscript{170} He also finds that in reality, the profits of tax farmers were not excessive, the return on their investment being in the region of about 12% per annum.\textsuperscript{171} Moreover, this figure needs to be considered in light of the personal liability of the tax farmer should there be any shortfall in the amount of revenue actually collected.\textsuperscript{172} The fact that the government apparently needed to offer rewards to induce bidding for contracts also indicates that tax farmers were not as wealthy as they were generally perceived.\textsuperscript{173} The impression of affluence is probably explicable in that as the local middle-class within their communities, they were relatively better off than the majority.\textsuperscript{174}

A particularly important point raised by Youtie is that the poor reputation of tax farmers needs to be considered over against the very real tendency of taxpayers to evade or understate their liabilities.\textsuperscript{175} This phenomenon immediately brings to mind again \textit{m. Ned.} 3:4, which condones the swearing of false oaths to toll collectors about assets on which dues are payable.\textsuperscript{176} Although, as noted previously, not all rabbis approved of such behaviour, the presence of the text in the Mishnah indicates that some Pharisees did evade tax and customs by this means. Clearly, the practice would adversely affect the relationship between toll collectors and Pharisees,\textsuperscript{177} and hence it could be an issue with respect to the \textit{טֵלְהֹוָנִית} befriended by Jesus. This is
probably the case, since our findings show: that Jesus approves payment of tribute to
Caesar; that the toll collectors he supports are reformed characters; and that there is
nothing intrinsically evil about their vocation. We will consider this possibility
further during investigation of the Pharisees in Chapter Six.

4. 'Αμαρτωλοί:

4.1. **Semantic issues:**

The term ἁμαρτωλός occurs frequently in the LXX as an adjective and substantive,
mostly as a translation of שׁוֹרֵר, i.e. *wicked.* It is found often in the Psalms, where it
is used polemically by those who consider themselves “righteous,” to describe
people who are deemed impious. For the Psalmist, the Law is believed to be a
regulating force for *righteous* people, while ἁμαρτωλοί are regarded as having
become lax about Torah observance. The distinction between *righteous* and *wicked*
also occurs prominently in other OT Wisdom literature, (Proverbs, Job, and
Ecclesiastes). Although the epithet “wicked” is sometimes applied with objectivity
to truly sinful people, it is often directed simply to those whose beliefs do not
conform to the official line, and it is clear that the contraposed categories are often
sociological rather than moral. Yet a thread common to the prophetic and Wisdom
literature is that the type of behaviour allegedly earning divine disapproval mostly
involves unethical or immoral acts against other persons, e.g. dishonesty, deceit,
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176 See §§3.3 and n. 61.
177 Youtie, “Publicans and Sinners,” 18.
178 Rengstorff, “ἀμαρτωλός,” 320, 323; Robin C. Cover, “Sin, Sinners (OT),” *ABD* 6:37; E. P. Sanders,
“Sin, Sinners (NT),” *ABD* 6:43. Note that in the Greek world, too, the term ἁμαρτωλός implies one
who acts against the divine will for order and right (Rengstorff, “ἀμαρτωλός,” 320).
179 Rengstorff, “ἀμαρτωλός,” 321. References to ἁμαρτωλοί are particularly prevalent in Psalms 9:36; and
118 (i.e. in the NRSV, to the “wicked” in Psalms 9: 10; 37; 119).
181 According to the wisdom tradition, God will bless the righteous and punish the wicked. Even
though this belief is demonstrated to be fallacious when applied to individuals such as Job, the notion
is prevalent throughout the OT [Cover, “Sinners (OT),” 37].
slander, oppression, abuse of power, etc. According to some OT passages, the wicked are unpardonable and will be punished. However, elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the means for atonement of sin is delineated, and the availability of divine forgiveness is emphasised; in fact, both the latter areas comprise vital facets of Judaism.

The use of the term ἁμαρτωλοί in the NT is comparable with many of the occurrences in the LXX, in that it is employed mostly with a derogatory sense, and in a factional context. Its meaning is difficult to interpret, owing to its frequent association with τελώναι, and the fact that if it is used as sectarian slander, the subjects may not actually be wicked. Some scholars consider that the group called ἁμαρτωλοί essentially includes toll collectors, but this is problematical, especially when attempts are made to press the latter into a category to which they do not seem to belong. For instance, Johnson argues that as social outcasts, τελώναι are included among the poor, although they are generally characterised as rich. Jeremias asserts that it is necessary to consider Jesus’ followers from two different perspectives: from their opponents’, as distinct from Jesus’ view. According to this argument, τελώναι
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182 Ibid. See also Dunn, “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 276.
183 Cover, “Sinners (OT),” 37.
184 Ibid.
185 Ibid. 39–40; Sanders, “Sinners (NT),” 42.
186 Dunn, “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 276; Rengstorff, “ἁμαρτωλός,” 327.
188 Dunn, “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 279.
189 E.g. Farmer, “Who are the ‘Tax Collectors and Sinners’?” 167, 172 n. 3; and less specifically, Wright, Victory of God, 266, 267 n. 97.
190 The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts (SBLDS 39; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1977), 132–44, esp. 138–39. Johnson’s argument relies on the perception of toll collectors as outcasts in terms of their spiritual status (ibid. 139). But see Farmer, who points out that they were not necessarily irreligious, or social outcasts, citing John, the toll collector of Caesarea mentioned by Josephus (“Who are the “Tax Collectors and Sinners’?” 168, 172 n. 4). Re John the toll collector, see also Sanders, “Sinners (NT),” 43.
are typical ἀμαρτωλοί,⁹² and οἱ νηπίωτοι (the simple ones) is a contemptuous term coined by the opposition faction, and applied to Jesus’ followers.⁹³ Hence, for the opponents, in his view, the disciples of Jesus comprise mainly disreputable people, including the Amme Ha’aretz and the ignorant, while in Jesus’ eyes, these same individuals are “the poor,” who labour and are heavy laden.⁹⁴ However, Jeremias’ hypothesis may be dismissed, since Sanders has competently refuted the notion that ἀμαρτωλοί can simply be equated with the people of the land,⁹⁵ and there is no justification for regarding the term οἱ νηπίωτοι as deriving from Jesus’ opponents, and thus implying contempt.⁹⁶

Sanders approaches the combination of toll collectors and sinners from a different angle, positing that the group named τελωναὶ is used in the Synoptics to represent ἀμαρτωλοί.⁹⁷ His interpretation is that the “sinners,” i.e. toll collectors, together with the prostitutes associated with them in Matt 21:31–32, have a way of life that is antithetical to God’s will.⁹⁸ This belief leads him to the conclusion that Jesus caused offence to the religious authorities by saying, or implying, that even the most heinous sinners among his followers would be eligible for the kingdom, and that the acts of atonement prescribed in the Torah were unnecessary as prerequisites.⁹⁹ Now, although Jesus would undoubtedly have offended pious Jews by claiming that toll collectors and prostitutes would enter the kingdom before them,

---

⁹² Ibid. 110.
⁹⁴ Ibid. 112. Green, likewise, regards “the poor” as those of low socio-religious status, and includes toll collectors and sinners in this category (Gospel of Luke, 211, 247).
⁹⁵ See the review of Sanders’ work in Chapter One, esp. n. 129.
⁹⁶ Jeremias also imagines a note of contempt attached to the words μικρός and ἐλέγχωτος, and cites Mark 9:42; Matt 10:42; 18:10, 14 (the little ones); Matt 25:40, 45 (the least). Yet it is illogical to suppose that Jesus would use the terms in these contexts if they had negative overtones. By way of contrast, Luke 7:33–34 definitely sounds like opposition slander, particularly in view of the repeated words καὶ λέγετε (καὶ λέγωμεν in Matt 11:18–19).
⁹⁷ Sanders, “Sinners (NT),” 43.
it has already been demonstrated that his followers should be construed as reformed characters, and not as truly wicked.200 Therefore, that component of Sanders’ theory must be set aside. On the other hand, it is acknowledged that Jesus did promise the kingdom to those who followed him; thus Sanders is correct in observing that he caused offence by linking God’s grace to an individual’s personal response to himself.201

This brief review has shown that as yet, there has been no completely satisfactory explanation as to the identity of the ἀμαρτωλοί in the Synoptics, or of their association with τελώναι. In an attempt to resolve these issues we will now examine the NT texts which refer to sinners, either with or without toll collectors. At the same time we will endeavour to determine how these groups are related to Jesus’ table fellowship practice, and whether there is any significance in the fact that sometimes the τελώναι and ἀμαρτωλοί are found in combination, while elsewhere one party or the other occurs alone.

4.2. Relevant NT texts:

4.2.1. Jesus’ welcome to sinners:

Luke 15:1–2:

1 Ἡσαυ δὲ αὐτῷ ἔγγιζοντες πάντες οἱ τελώναι καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. 2 καὶ διεγόγγυζον ὁ τε Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες δι’ ὁμοίῳ ἀμαρτωλοῦς προσδέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς.

1 Now all the toll collectors and sinners were coming near to listen to him. 2 And the Pharisees and the scribes were grumbling and saying, “This fellow welcomes sinners and eats with them.”

198 Ibid.
199 Ibid. 43–44.
200 See §3.4.3 above.
201 Sanders, “Sinners (NT),” 44.
This brief introduction to the three parables about the *lost* is generally accepted as a Lucan addition. The use of the periphrastic imperfect of ἐγγίζω in v. 1 probably implies that it was the *custom* of the toll collectors and sinners to come and hear Jesus, not that a particular occasion is in view. In v. 2 there is a strong link with the episode in Luke 5:27–32 concerning the Pharisees’ and scribes’ grumbling about Jesus’ commensals, with several terms in common, notably the verb [δια]γγύζω. The apparent *non sequitur* here is interesting, and evokes a variety of responses. Walker suggests that while the toll collectors and sinners may indeed have come to hear Jesus, and this could have been construed as Jesus *receiving* them, the charge about table fellowship need not be true. Jeremias has it that Jesus invites sinners to table fellowship in his house. Green considers that ἀμαρτωλοίς in v. 2 is synecdoche for οἱ τελώναι καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτωλοί in v. 1, and hence that Jesus extends hospitality to toll collectors and sinners. Of these three possible interpretations, the first does not give sufficient credence to the well-attested tradition concerning Jesus’ table fellowship, and the last two are unsuitable since they imply that Jesus is acting as host to the sinners, i.e. in a role that is inconsistent with his itinerant status.

An alternative approach is to take the content of the two verses at face value, and accept that προσέχεται in v. 2 is applicable to sinners but not to toll collectors. The verb is usually translated here as *welcomes* or *receives*, while elsewhere in Luke

---

203 Ibid.
205 As Walker remarks (“Jesus and the Tax Collectors,” 231).
206 Ibid.
209 Ibid. 571.
it pertains to expecting, looking forward, or waiting for.\textsuperscript{210} In Rom 16:2 and Phil 2:29 too, it is rendered as welcome, but receive hospitably\textsuperscript{211} would catch the sense more fully in these passages. Although table fellowship is not specifically mentioned in either case, there is an implicit request for the newcomer to be treated hospitably, and an offer of hospitality would certainly be an expectation in the circumstances. Yet Paul’s appeal for a warm welcome to be given to Phoebe and Epaphroditus is addressed to the entire Christian communities in Rome and Philippi, rather than to a single person to act as host. On similar grounds, receives hospitably might seem an appropriate translation in Luke 15:2, particularly since there is a reference to eating. It would not necessarily suggest that Jesus himself acts as host to the sinners, but merely that his attitude toward them is compassionate and welcoming.\textsuperscript{212}

Nonetheless, issues are emerging as to the precise manner in which Jesus “receives” or “welcomes” sinners, and whether his relationships with sinners and with toll collectors are different. In order to probe this question further we will next consider the two synoptic passages in which Jesus is depicted as a guest in the home of a toll collector.\textsuperscript{213}

\begin{flushright}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{210} Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 770; Luke 2:25, 38; 12:36; 23:50. Likewise, it means wait for in Acts 23:21. In Acts 24:15, it has the sense of accept, or hold. In the LXX, προοδέχομαι sometimes means take pleasure in or have goodwill towards (Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 770, citing Mic 6:7 as an example). These senses have been suggested as applicable to Luke 15:2, but have little merit. The fact that the meaning for προοδέχομαι in Luke 15:2 differs from elsewhere in the Gospel perhaps indicates that the passage derives from a source (ibid.).
\item \textsuperscript{211} See “προοδέχομαι,” LSJ 1505.
\item \textsuperscript{212} An interesting parallel for the use of προοδέχομαι in Luke 15:2, is 1 Chr 12:19 in the LXX (12:18 in the NRSV). It describes the situation at Ziglag, where David received (προοδέχατο) some Benjaminites and Judahites who avowed their solidarity with him against Saul.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Since itinerancy is one of the most secure data about the historical Jesus, I take the view that the feast described in Mark 2:14–17 took place in Levi’s house, although ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ in Mark 2:15 is ambiguous.
\end{itemize}
\end{flushright}
4.2.2. Jesus as guest of toll collectors:

Mark 2:14–17:

14 καὶ παρέγινεν ἑδὲν Λεονὸς τὸν τούτῳ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. 15 Καὶ γίνεται κατακείσθαι αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελώναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ συνανεκείντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὑπὰ γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουσαν αὐτῷ. 16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἔδωκαν ὅτι ἔστηκεν μετὰ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἦν μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔστηκε. 17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὅτι] οὐχ ἔχουσιν οἱ ἵστορες ἵστασιν ἀλλʼ οἱ κακοὶ ἔχουσι· οὐκ ἠθέναν καλέσαν δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοὺς.

14 And as he passed on, he saw Levi the son of Alphacus sitting at the toll booth, and he said to him, “Follow me.” And he rose and followed him. 15 And as he sat at table in his house, many toll collectors and sinners were sitting with Jesus and his disciples; for there were many who followed him. 16 And the scribes of the Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with sinners and toll collectors, said to his disciples, “Why does he eat with toll collectors and sinners?” 17 And when Jesus heard it, he said to them, “Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.”

Luke 19:1–10:

1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Χεριχά. 2 καὶ ἵδον ἄνηρ ἀνώτατος καθήμενος Ζαχαρίας. 3 καὶ τὸ ἐξέδωκεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐδείξας τῇ ἤλευξιν τῆς πλούσιος. 4 καὶ ὅτε ἀνέφεραν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τῆς ἀρχιτελώνης καὶ αὐτὸς πλούσιος. 5 καὶ καταβρέθηκεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ Ἰησοῦν. 6 καὶ ἐξέδωκεν τῷ Ἰησοῦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ τοπίῳ τῷ Ἴδην ἀρχιτελώνης. 7 καὶ ἐξέδωκεν τῷ τοπίῳ τῷ καθῆκεν. 8 καὶ ἐξέδωκεν τῷ τοπίῳ τῷ καθῆκεν. 9 καὶ ἐξέδωκεν τῷ τοπίῳ τῷ καθῆκεν. 10 καὶ ἐξέδωκεν τῷ τοπίῳ τῷ καθῆκεν.

214 The NRSV reading “tax booth” has been altered to cohere with the translation of τελώνιον as toll collector.
The story about Levi and the banquet comprises the Marcan source for the synoptic combination τελώνας καὶ ἀμαρτωλοί, and contains the only references to toll collectors in Mark.216 Many scholars regard the call and the banquet scenes as deriving from separate traditions,217 and in fact, the feast component of the pericope may also be composite, with vv. 15–16 perhaps having been created to accommodate the unattached logion in v. 17.218 Moreover, it is possible that Luke 19:1–10 is not

215 Or “the scribes and the Pharisees” (Aland, Synopsis of the Four Gospels, 42 note h).
217 E.g. ibid. 232; Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 56, following Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1971), 47–48, nn. 61–62, 64 n. 1; Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 41, n. 72.
218 So Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 18, 163.
from an independent source, but merely comprises an expansion of Mark 2:14–17.\(^{219}\)

Yet, despite the problems associated with the two stories,\(^{220}\) it is generally accepted that the tradition they preserve is authentic, i.e. that Jesus attended at least one feast at the home of a toll collector, and that other toll collectors, as well as “sinners,” were present. Furthermore, the composite nature of Mark 2:14–17 does not affect the proposed interpretation at all adversely; on the contrary, it strengthens the case, as we will see below in this subsection and in §4.2.4.

We will consider firstly Mark 2:14–17, and whether the Luke 15:2 reference to Jesus’ hospitable reception of sinners might be relevant to this account of Levi’s banquet.\(^{221}\) In the discussion concerning ἄκλητοι in §4 of Chapter Four, we saw that it was customary in the NT period for relatives, friends, or entourage of an invited guest, to attend a banquet without a formal invitation. Therefore, we may plausibly imagine that some of the disciples, so-called “sinners,”\(^{222}\) could have gained entry to Levi’s banquet by virtue of their relationship with Jesus. This would not normally have been considered ill-mannered, and it would account for the awkward addition in Mark 2:15b of the phrase: “for there were many who followed him.” Further, since προσδέχομαι is used in Luke 15:2 with respect to Jesus’ acceptance of sinners, the notion can be justified on the grounds that one of the meanings of this verb is to

\(^{219}\) Ibid. 33–34. But note Dibelius’ belief in the story’s authenticity (ibid. 388).

\(^{220}\) One of the most glaring problems about the Levi story is that in order to discover the identity of Jesus’ commensals, the scribes (or scribes and Pharisees) would need to have been present at the occasion, a circumstance which Bultmann describes as “impossible” (ibid. 18 n. 3). Culpepper (“Gospel of Luke,” 127–28) suggests that a large feast in Galilee would have attracted considerable attention, and that the Pharisees would have been among those gathered, but this seems rather farfetched. However, it is certainly possible that one of more Pharisees observed Jesus and others entering Levi’s house, and that their criticism of Jesus’ open commensality ensued.

\(^{221}\) The strong connection between Luke 15:2 and 5:27–32 has been noted. The link may also apply to Mark 2:14–17 since it was the source for the latter text.

\(^{222}\) It is worth repeating here the conclusion from §3.4.3 above that Jesus’ followers should be regarded as reformed characters, although they continued to attract the label “sinners.”
guarantee, or take a liability upon oneself. Hence, Jesus can be seen as the guarantor for those accompanying him; in other words, they attend “in his name.”

The second point of interest is the role played by the toll collector host in each of the stories. Looking firstly at Luke 19:1–10, we see that Zacchaeus is regarded by the opposition party as a “sinner” (v. 7). Yet, in sharp contrast to that label, Jesus affirms that because (καθότι) Zacchaeus is a “son of Abraham,” salvation has come to his house. There is an obvious problem with v. 9, in that πρὸς αὐτὸν must be interpreted as to him, i.e. to Zacchaeus, although Jesus’ statement is actually addressed to the critical bystanders. However, this difficulty in no way detracts from the significant point here, which is in the meaning behind the expression “son of Abraham.” The epithet does not simply refer back to the toll collectors who respond to John, and to his warning that God is able to raise up children to Abraham from stones (Luke 3:7–14). Rather, the reason for placing Zacchaeus in relationship with the great patriarch is to draw attention to his hospitality to Jesus, and to compare it with the famous story in Genesis 18, of Abraham’s provision for the three heavenly messengers. The high value placed on hospitality in Judaeo-Christian tradition is evident in the fact that Rahab, as well as Abraham, is regarded as a faith hero on account of her welcome to the two Israelite spies. Its significance is particularly marked in the cases of Abraham and Zacchaeus, in that both provide
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223 See “προσδέχομαι,” II, 6, LSJ 1505.
224 The connection between this notion and Jesus’ words “in my name” in Mark 9:37 is explained in Chapter Seven, §5.
225 Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 33. The difficulty is not present in those texts which read πρὸς αὐτούς, and thus make sense of the fact that Jesus is speaking of Zacchaeus in the third person (ibid. 34).
227 Ibid. 249–52, following Alan C. Mitchell, “Zacchaeus Revisited: Luke 19,8 as a Defense,” Biblica 71 (1990): 153–76. Note that the verbs ἐπιστέchen (v. 6) and καταλύω (v. 7) both affirm that Jesus receives complete Mediterranean hospitality (i.e. board and lodging) at Zaccheaus’ house (Hamm, “Zacchaeus Revisited,” 250).
hospitality to envoys of God—viz. the three angels, and Jesus, respectively. Hence, returning now to the meaning of Zacchaeus, we see that the name "the righteous one" is entirely appropriate for the toll collector on the grounds of his hospitable welcome to Jesus.

When we apply this finding to Mark 2:14–17, it is apparent that Levi, like Zacchaeus, is accounted as righteous, and wins salvation by dint of his hospitality to Jesus. Moreover, a possible reason emerges for differentiating between toll collectors and sinners: the former are characterised as hosts to Jesus, the latter as followers who share the benefits of Jesus’ status as a guest. The distinction is by no means absolute: as toll collectors, Levi and Zacchaeus would both be regarded as sinners. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the other toll collectors at Levi’s house are present as friends of the host, or if they should be counted among the “sinners” who accompany Jesus. Nevertheless, the concept does allow for the possibility that an authentic core underlies the synoptic demarcation between toll collectors and sinners.

Even though the tradition linking toll collectors with hospitality may derive from a single historical incident, it may be illuminating with regard to Jesus’ attitude to wealth. Of the three accounts about the call of Levi/Matthew, Luke’s version, in particular, raises the question as to how he could have hosted a great feast if he indeed “left everything” (5:28). While it is possible to circumvent the tension involved here, it is preferable to put aside this Lucan addition, and to focus on Mark’s account, and the role of Levi as both follower and host. Even if Levi

228 See Joshua 2; Jas 2:25; Heb 11:31; and also Chapter Three, esp. §4.3.
229 See §3.4.4 and nn. 150–52 above.
230 See esp. Luke 10:7; 18:13; and §3.3 above.
231 The latter would appear more likely if Mark 2:15b is interpreted literally.
232 I.e. assuming that the occasion described in Mark 2:15–17 represents the truth to some degree, even though Luke 19:1–10 may largely be an expansion of it.
233 See, e.g. Green, who suggests that “left everything” implies Levi’s repentance, and the reorientation of his life around God’s purpose and Jesus’ mission (Gospel of Luke, 246).
renounced his vocation to become a follower of Jesus,\textsuperscript{234} he appears not to have been required to give up his worldly goods. In this respect, his situation is in contrast to that of the would-be follower in Mark 10:17–22,\textsuperscript{235} who is instructed by Jesus to sell his possessions and give to the poor, in order to gain eternal life. As well as pointing to the fact that Jesus did not require all of his followers to become itinerant,\textsuperscript{236} the comparison between the two men affirms the salvific value of Levi’s hospitality to Jesus. It is noteworthy that John the Baptist, too, places significant emphasis on hospitality, advocating that anyone who has food must share it with those who have none.\textsuperscript{237} Therefore, it is apparent that the provision of hospitality, especially to Jesus, is regarded as indicative of repentance, as well as being a means of salvation. Conversely, as we see from the parable about the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31), failure to offer hospitality leads to damnation, since it demonstrates an unwillingness to repent.\textsuperscript{238} Significantly, these insights probably resolve the question as to why there is more emphasis on table fellowship than repentance in texts relating to toll collectors and sinners.\textsuperscript{239}

It is also clear now that although many of Jesus’ followers are oppressed and marginalised, the classification “the poor” does not satisfactorily cover all of Jesus’ followers, and is particularly unsuitable for toll collectors. However, it is certain that humility is an essential requirement for discipleship,\textsuperscript{240} and therefore the categories of...

\textsuperscript{234} Note that according to Luke 3:12–13, John did not call on toll collectors to leave their vocation when they came to him for baptism, but only to limit revenue-collection to the prescribed dues (ibid.). \textsuperscript{235} See also parr. Matt.19:16–22; Luke 18:18–23. \textsuperscript{236} In Luke, women play an important role in providing for Jesus. While some do not appear to be itinerant (e.g. in 8:3, 10:38), others do, esp. Mary Magdalene and Joanna (cf. 8:3 with 23:49, 55; 24:10). It seems probable that Peter’s wife and his mother-in-law had a ministry of hospitality to Jesus and his disciples at Capernaum (Mark 1:29–34). \textsuperscript{237} Luke 3:11. \textsuperscript{238} Hamm, “Zacchaeus Revisited,” 251. \textsuperscript{239} See §§3.1.2.2 and 3.1.3 in Chapter One. \textsuperscript{240} E.g. Mark 9:35; 10:43; Matt 18:4; 23:12; Luke 14:11; 18:14.
μικροί (the little ones), οἱ ἐλαχιστοὶ (the least), and οἱ νήπιοι (the simple ones) are all applicable to the followers of Jesus, without being derogatory. A conspicuous example of commendable humility in a toll collector occurs in Luke 18:9–14. However, the main thrust in this parable is the contrast between the appropriateness of the toll collector’s stance, and the self-centredness of the Pharisee. By way of comparison, the major point concerning toll collectors in the texts that we have examined is that they demonstrate their repentance, and their eligibility for the kingdom, by means of hospitality. This conclusion will be affirmed below, as we consider a text referring to sinners.

4.2.3. The call to love of enemies:

Luke 6:27–36:

27 Ἀλλὰ ἤμεν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούσαιςν, ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἡμᾶς. 28 εἰλογείτε τοὺς καταραμένους ἡμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περί τῶν ἐπηρεαζόμενων ἡμᾶς. 29 τῷ τύπτοντι σε ἐπὶ τὴν οικογένεια πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροῦτος σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτώνα μὴ καλύψῃς. 30 παντὶ αἰτοῦτι σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροῦτος τά σά μὴ ἀπαίτει. 31 καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ἡμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ἰμαῖς. 32 καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ἡμᾶς, ποιά ἢμιν χάρις ἔστιν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπώσων. 33 καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιήτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ἡμᾶς, ποία ἢμιν χάρις ἔστιν; καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν. 34 καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ’ ὄν ἱλπίζητε λαβεῖν, ποιά ἢμιν χάρις ἔστιν; καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἵσα. 35 πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες; καὶ ἐσται ὁ μισθὸς ἡμῶν πολύς, καὶ ἔσται αὐτὸς χρήστος ἔστιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀχαρίστοις καὶ πονηροῖς. 36 Γίνεσθε ἀλλήλων καθά παρασκευάζοντες, καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ οἰκτίρμων ἔστιν.

241 E.g. Mark 9:42; Matt 10:42; 18:10, 14.
242 E.g. Matt 25:40, 45.
27 But I say to you that listen, "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, 28 bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. 29 If anyone strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from anyone who takes away your coat do not withhold even your shirt. 30 Give to everyone who begs from you; and if anyone takes away your goods, do not ask for them again. 31 Do to others as you would have them do to you. 32 If you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them. 33 If you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners do the same. 34 If you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, to receive as much again. 35 But love your enemies, do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return. Your reward will be great, and you will be children of the Most High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and the wicked. 36 Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful."

The Matthaean parallel (5:46–47) to vv. 32 and 34 of the cited passage has already been examined in §3.4.2, but since Luke’s version of the pericope has “sinners” instead of Matthew’s “tax collectors” and “Gentiles” in the equivalent verses, it is necessary to review it separately. The section to be perused here is larger, since we need to consider in their full context, the important sayings about love of enemies, and related conduct.

Luke 6:27–28, with its four lines grouped into parallel pairs, reflects a Semitic origin and is more likely authentic than the abbreviated version in Matt 5:44. On the other hand, the shift from second person plural to singular in the two following verses indicates that sources have been conflated at this point. In v. 31 there is a return to the second person plural, perhaps indicating the original position

---

244 The parable is discussed further in §5, Chapter Six.
246 Ibid. 296. Matt 5:39–42 is more likely to be original than Luke’s abbreviated form in vv. 29–30 (ibid. 293).
247 Ibid. 297.
in Q of the so-called “golden rule.”\footnote{Contra Nolland, who argues that Luke probably re-positioned the verse (Luke, 297). Matthew places the rule in 7:12 (ibid.).} As Green has shown, this verse is placed centrally among the three interwoven injunctions: to love one’s enemies (vv. 27b, 32, 35a); to do good (vv. 27c–29, 33, 35a); and to give (true) gifts (vv. 30, 34, 35a).\footnote{Gospel of Luke, 270.} It also fits quite well into its Lucan context, especially as it twice features the verb ποιέω, which with its cognates comprises the keyword in the passage.\footnote{Ibid. 273. The keyword occurs also in vv. 27 and 35, and three times in v. 33 (ibid. 273).} However, since the golden rule occurred in various forms in Jewish and Hellenistic literature long before Jesus’ era,\footnote{Ibid. 272; Nolland, Luke, 298.} and it essentially constitutes conventional wisdom,\footnote{202 The proverb simply does not possess the radical character of other sayings in this passage which are considered authentic, (esp. “Love your enemies”), and some scholars believe that it expresses an egoistical view that does not cohere with Jesus’ attitudes. See Robert W. Funk, Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar, The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus (New York: Macmillan, 1993), 296, 156, 476.} its citation here is not relevant to the present argument.

With regard to Luke 6:32–34 and the partial parallel in Matt 5:46–47, it is uncertain as to which terminology derives from Q—sinners, or tax collectors and Gentiles, respectively.\footnote{253 Nolland considers Luke has made more changes to the original than Matthew, but concedes that the evangelists may have inherited different sources (Luke, 299).} It is likely that in the former text the term ἀμαρτωλοί has a meaning similar to that in Luke 24:7, where the “sinful people” concerned are the Romans, i.e. in essence, Gentiles.\footnote{254 Rengstorf, “ἀμαρτωλοί,” 328.} This raises the possibility that the original text in Q contained the term ἑθνικοί, at least in 6:33 (as in Matt 5:47), and that Luke altered it, in keeping with his positive attitude toward the Gentile mission.\footnote{255 In Acts, Luke avoids the term ἑθνικοί, and uses ἑθνοί in reference to Gentiles (ibid.). Re Luke’s favourable attitude toward Gentiles, see Looper, Attitude towards the Law, 306, 316, 358, 369–79, 513.} It would then refer to those who do not observe the Law, and so be equivalent to sinners. Yet as it stands, ἀμαρτωλοί in Luke 6:32–34 is best interpreted as meaning genuinely wicked.
people. The verses then highlight the difference between the radical, proactive
behaviour that is urged in vv. 27–28,256 and the basic human responses that are
practised even among sinful people. Reading the passage in such a way underlines
the fact that ἀμαρτωλοὶ in this context should not be regarded either as opposition
slander, or as referring to Jesus’ followers.257

V. 35a comprises a summary of the conduct that the listeners are exhorted to
follow, expressed as a triad of loving, doing good, and true giving;258 35b then
proclaims that those who behave in this way are imitating divine nature, and hence
demonstrating that they are God’s children.259 Emphasis is placed on the fact that
God is always compassionate, even if the beneficiaries are ungrateful and selfish.260

To comprehend how radical are the injunctions of Luke 6:27–36, it is
necessary to compare them with the ethos of reciprocity that governed contracts and
exchange in the Graeco-Roman social world. The three recognised categories are
generalised, balanced, and negative reciprocity;261 of these, only the first is pertinent
here. Generalised reciprocity refers to altruistic actions in which one party provides
some service or assistance to another, without any specific expectation of return;
however, the obligation to return the favour at some future time is always implied.

Typical examples are: guest-friendship; the giving of gifts; and the sorts of assistance

---

256 Although the injunction to love enemies has a number of parallels in ancient literature, Jesus’ call
is not precisely the same as any of them. It is notably different from Qumran practice, which
advocates loving sons of light, and hating sons of darkness (e.g. 1QS I, 9–10). See Nolland, Luke,
294–96; and also n. 268 below.
257 The term sinners is used in three ways in Luke. It always refers to sinful individuals, but to truly
wicked people only in 6:32–34; 13:2; 24:7. When used by opponents to describe Jesus’ followers it
can be termed slander because they are reformed characters (5:30, 32; 7:34; 15:2). In the other cases,
the individuals’ forgiveness, as well as their sinfulness, is acknowledged (7:37, 39; 15:1, 7, 10; 18:13;
19:7).
259 It is important to note Green’s point that rather than being a qualifying factor, the imitation of
divine compassion demonstrates that one is a child of God (ibid. 274, n. 59).
260 Ibid. 274.
provided within family groups and among friends.\textsuperscript{262} In contrast, Jesus proclaims to his hearers that benevolent, compassionate deeds are to be done without anticipation of any reward.\textsuperscript{263}

The enemies one is exhorted to love may be understood simply as referring to those who are opposed to Jesus and his followers.\textsuperscript{264} However, of more importance for our purposes is the implication that beneficence is to be shown beyond the boundaries of family and friends, to those who would normally be considered outsiders.\textsuperscript{265} Hence the command to love enemies can be applied specifically to the theme of hospitality (φιλοξενία) in its ancient sense, i.e. literally love of strangers, foreigners, or enemies,\textsuperscript{266} even though the verb used in Luke 6:27, 35 is ἀγαπάω rather than φιλέω, and the object is ἐχθρούς, as against ζένος. The validity of this interpretation is supported by Paul’s quotation (Rom 12:20) of Prov 25:21,\textsuperscript{267} asserting that if an enemy (ἐχθρός) is hungry and thirsty, one should give him food and drink.\textsuperscript{268} Moreover, the contradiction of reciprocity conventions that is urged in

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{262}{Ibid. Note that Neyrey lists hospitality as exemplifying generalised reciprocity, but guest-friendship has been substituted because the ancient sense of the former term makes it unsuitable as an example.}
\footnotetext{263}{The verb ἀπελπίζω in v. 35 has the sense of despairing, i.e. of receiving anything, owing to the contrast in v. 34 of ἵνα δανίσητε παρ’ ὅν ἐπίζετε λαδεῖν (Green, Gospel of Luke, 269; “ἀπελπίζω,” BAGD 84).}
\footnotetext{264}{Green, Gospel of Luke, 272.}
\footnotetext{265}{Ibid.}
\footnotetext{266}{See Chapter Three, §1, and n. 2.}
\footnotetext{267}{I.e. Prov 32:21 in the LXX.}
\footnotetext{268}{The following verse, Rom 12:21, enjoins overcoming evil by doing good. Thus Rom 12:20–21 forms a close parallel to Luke 6:27, the focus in both texts being the love of enemies, and doing good to them. In ancient literature there are several other texts containing sentiments similar to Jesus’ call to love one’s enemies (Nolland, Luke, 294–96). One from the Egyptian Wisdom text Instruction of Amen-em-opet is probably the most pertinent, as it comprises a parallel to Prov 25:21–22. The command is given with respect to treatment of the enemy: “Fill his belly with bread of thine, so that he may be sated and may be ashamed . . . .” According to Nolland, Jesus’ injunction is not identical with any of the examples he quotes (Luke, 296), and it is true that the policy of non-retaliation and proactive goodwill is radical in contrast to contemporary socioeconomic mores. On the other hand, the notion of opting for hospitality in preference to hostility is not unique, although in the Synoptics such conduct may be interpreted as specifically relevant to the kingdom. See Chapter Three, §2.2.}
\end{footnotes}
Luke 6:27–35, is closely paralleled in 14:12–14, where Jesus advocates that one should invite people who cannot return the favour.\textsuperscript{269} Both of these texts are also reminiscent of Isa 58:7, where the Lord’s will is shown to be for people to share their bread with the hungry, and to invite the homeless poor into their houses.

In light of this background then, we see that in Luke 6:27–35 there is a significant emphasis on hospitality, and that the listeners are urged to imitate God’s style of benefaction, without anticipating a return of favours in any worldly sense. An important factor gleaned from vv. 27a, 29b, and 30, is that those listening evidently include some with goods that could be stolen, and with sufficient means to be able to give, or lend\textsuperscript{270}—indeed, people able to offer hospitality. This brings to mind the finding from our examination of Mark 2:14–17 and Luke 19:1–10, as to the salvific value of the toll collectors’ hospitality. Levi and Zacchaeus may both now be seen as having demonstrated their righteousness by their imitation of God’s compassion for the poor. The potential hosts among the listeners in Luke 6:27–35 are urged to do likewise.

4.2.4. Jesus as friend of toll collectors and sinners:

Luke 7:33–34:

33 ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἐκ ἐσθίων ἀρτοὺς μὴ πίνων οἶνον, καὶ λέγετε, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. 34 ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Τίδει ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν.

33 For John the Baptist has come eating no bread and drinking no wine, and you say, “He has a demon”; 34 the Son of Man has come eating and drinking, and you say, “Look, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of toll collectors and sinners!”

\textsuperscript{269} The link between the two passages is observed by Marshall, who considers that the sentiments derive from Jesus (Gospel of Luke, 583).
\textsuperscript{270} Green, Gospel of Luke, 271.
The authenticity of this passage and its Matthaean parallel (11:18–19a) has already been argued as virtually certain, on the grounds of the criterion of embarrassment.\textsuperscript{271} Further, although the sayings criticising John and Jesus are acknowledged as representing opposition slander,\textsuperscript{272} we have seen that there are good reasons to regard the traditions concerning Jesus’ table fellowship as reliable. Hence, in view of the feasting imagery in the passage, it also seems certain that the depiction of Jesus as a “friend” of toll collectors and sinners refers to the fact that they are his commensals.\textsuperscript{273}

While scholars have focused considerable attention in recent years on these traditions, the main effort has been directed towards determining the identity of the sinners and toll collectors, and the meaning attached to Jesus’ table fellowship with them.\textsuperscript{274} Yet the part of the accusation labelling Jesus as a “glutton and drunkard” has been largely neglected, and the tendency has been simply to regard these terms, together with “toll collectors and sinners,” as opposition rhetoric. Usually, the main point of the accusation is considered to be the contrast between John’s asceticism and Jesus’ banquet revelry,\textsuperscript{275} and while that is an accurate perception, it overlooks a vital clue.

To appreciate the significance of the epithet “glutton and drunkard” it is necessary to recall the symotic era, and our findings concerning the παρέωτος, i.e.

\textsuperscript{271} See esp. Chapter Two, §3.2.
\textsuperscript{272} See above, §3.4.3, and esp. n. 142.
\textsuperscript{273} Smith considers that this part of the verse was a later addition, since it has no corresponding phrase referring to John (“Historical Jesus at Table,” 478). However, since friendship is typically demonstrated by means of table fellowship, he concedes that the tradition expressed here may have existed independently (ibid.).
\textsuperscript{274} E.g. the work of Sanders, Corley, D. E. Smith, Walker, Farmer, etc. as discussed previously.
\textsuperscript{275} E.g. see Smith, “Historical Jesus at Table,” 478; McMahan, “Meals as Type-Scenes,” 174; Corley, “ReallyProstitutes?” 519; idem, Private Women, 89. Freyne interprets the glutton and drunkard accusation from a political perspective: he posits that Jesus’ opponents used it to discredit him by suggesting he subscribed to the value-system associated with Herod’s lifestyle (“Galilean Questions,” 84–85).
the stereotypical ἄκλητος: he was characterised particularly by arriving at meals uninvited, and by an insatiable appetite for food and drink; indeed, he was always expected to be drunk. In light of this background then, it is distinctly possible that the historical Jesus had a reputation for turning up at meals without a formal invitation, and that knowledge of this custom was exaggerated and used against him by his opponents. This is not to suggest that Jesus actually showed any moral resemblance to the παράστασις of Greek comedy, but rather that the slander was based upon the truth, as was the criticism over his table companions. The hypothesis will be fully investigated in Chapter Seven, but we will briefly explore the implications here.

It was mentioned above that the story in Mark 2:15–17 about Levi and the banquet was probably fabricated by the evangelist in order to provide a locus for the sayings in v. 17. In fact, it is quite likely that the call story in v. 14 was also a creation of Mark, based on the theme of a sudden summons from Jesus, and a transition to “following” him. If that is so, it would suggest that the way in which Jesus obtained an offer of hospitality in Luke 19:1–10 could possibly be closer to the reality about Levi’s banquet, than the Mark 2:14–15 account. Although it has been acknowledged that Luke may have contrived the Zacchaeus story on the basis of the call of Levi and the subsequent banquet (Luke 5:27–32 following Mark 2:14–17), it may still represent an authentic tradition about the historical Jesus, in combination with material inherited from Mark. This is highly probable, since the hypothesis that Jesus was known as an ἄκλητος can be substantiated on other grounds, and is not merely dependent on Luke’s special source and Q 7:34.

276 See Chapter Four, §4.
277 See §4.2.2.
On the strength of the *glutton and drunkard* accusation therefore, it is proposed that on at least one occasion, the historical Jesus arrived at the home of a toll collector as an ἁκληπτος. The notion necessarily impacts on Jesus' status as a guest, and that in turn affects his relationship with the host, and whether or not he could plausibly have been "followed" into the house by his associates. These issues will be addressed in Chapter Seven, but we must first consider, in Chapter Six, Jesus' relationship with some other supposed commensals, the Pharisees.

5. **Summary:**

Chapter Five makes a detailed investigation of τελώναι and ἀμαρτωλοί, who according to synoptic accounts were commensals of Jesus. The τελώναι depicted as associates of Jesus in Galilee are believed to be toll collectors. They are considered dishonest, but would not have been regarded as quislings, although their counterparts in Judaea may have been.

NT references to τελώναι are confined to the Synoptics, where they are often paired with other groups, especially ἀμαρτωλοί. They are placed alongside ἑθνικοί only in Matthew, and in all three instances the references are uncomplimentary. In the NT, the term ἑθνικοί refers to Gentiles, i.e. non-Jews, who do not observe the Law; hence in these passages τελώναι and ἑθνικοί may both be seen as equivalent to ἀμαρτωλοί. An investigation of the authorship of Matthew provides a possible reason why toll collectors and Gentiles are sometimes portrayed as despicable sinners, and at other times as faith heroes: the Gospel contains some conservative, pro-Jewish elements, as well as pro-Gentile material.

---

The pairing of τελῶνα with πόρνα is also unique to Matthew (21:28–31), and occurs in the presumably authentic saying that toll collectors and prostitutes will enter the kingdom ahead of Pharisees (v. 31b). The passage is significant for three reasons: it is indicative of conflict between Jesus and at least some of the Pharisees; it shows that Jesus was in solidarity with penitents who became his followers; and it demonstrates that he relied to some degree on John’s ministry. Another important finding relating to the pairing of toll collectors with either Gentiles or prostitutes, is that members of any of the three groups may be labelled “sinners,” although the toll collectors and prostitutes are reformed characters. Toll collectors and sinners are very likely to have been Jesus’ commensals, and it is probable that on at least one occasion, a prostitute approached him during a meal.

Although the demarcation is not absolute, toll collectors are characterised as hosts to Jesus and his followers, while the latter, the so-called “sinners,” represent those who share the benefits of Jesus’ status as a guest. Provision of hospitality demonstrates the host’s repentance and compassion, and is salvific, while inhospitality leads to damnation. Humility, also, is an essential requirement for salvation.

In contrast to the reciprocity conventions of his day, Jesus calls for love of enemies, i.e. for beneficence to be shown beyond the bounds of family and friends. The command to love enemies specifically confirms the salvific value of hospitality (φιλοξενία), since the true sense of the word is love of strangers, foreigners or enemies. Potential hosts are urged to imitate God’s compassion for the poor by means of hospitable conduct.

Examination of Luke 7:33–34 suggests that the reason Jesus was called a “glutton and drunkard” is that he had gained a reputation for arriving at meals
uninvited. It is posited that on at least one occasion, Jesus turned up ἄκλητος at the home of a toll collector. This concept has implications for Jesus’ status as a guest, and for his relationships both with the host, and with associates who may have become his commensals by “following” him into a house.
Chapter Six

JESUS AND THE PHARISEES

1. Introduction:

The tradition of Jesus’ commensality with Pharisees is unique to Luke (7:36–50; 11:37–52; 14:1–24), and usually considered redactional. Yet it is possible that careful investigation might indicate a historical core behind the Lucan accounts depicting the Pharisees as hosts to Jesus, especially in view of the fact that Jesus could have arrived uninvited. Luke 14:1 readily permits such an interpretation, and although the use of the term κεκληκὼς in 14:12 implies that the host had invited Jesus, it does not necessarily indicate that a formal invitation had been issued in advance. The same points are applicable to the term καλέας in Luke 7:39, and the seemingly casual invitation mentioned in 7:36.

Furthermore, since the Pharisees feature so prominently as critics of Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners, it is necessary to examine the relevant synoptic passages. Following a brief overview of the Pharisees’ supposed conflicts with Jesus and/or his disciples, we will discuss the issues involved with attempts to identify the Φαρισαίοι of the NT, and with evaluating whether, and how, they relate to the ἱαβέριν of the rabbinic literature. We will then consider the passages pertaining to the (hand)washing dispute (Mark 7:1–23; Matt 15:1–20; Luke 11:37–54), which is depicted as leading to a major confrontation between Jesus and the Pharisees. The Marcan version, in particular, gives rise to significant table fellowship issues which are relevant for Chapter Seven. In addition, we will discuss two further areas that may well have caused friction between the parties. The chapter concludes with a summary.
2. Overview of the conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees:

According to NT tradition, the Pharisees play a significant role in interaction with Jesus, mostly as his opponents. However, in recent scholarship, Sanders, in particular, has posited that the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees has been greatly exaggerated in the Gospels. There is certainly some truth in this view. The disparity between the accounts given in the four Gospels, and the artificiality of the debates, strongly suggest that the portrayals are not historically accurate, and that the evangelists have employed the Pharisees for theological and dramatic purposes. It is especially noticeable that in Luke, the manner in which they are depicted is different from that of the other Gospels, with some Marcan features omitted, and others added. Moreover, as part of Luke’s motif of reversal, there is a more obvious use of the Pharisees as a foil over against Jesus and his followers, especially toll collectors and sinners. Luke also has the Pharisees show a more positive attitude to Jesus than the other evangelists, especially in table fellowship situations, and this perspective is maintained in Acts. However, despite the differences in the various Gospel accounts of the Pharisees, the issues over which conflict is said to have occurred are

---


5 Ibid. 175–76.

6 Ibid. 175; Sanders, *Synoptic Gospels*, 288.

7 Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees*, 174–75. In Acts 5:33–40, the Pharisee Gamaliel is shown in a positive light, probably in order to affirm the continuity of Christianity with Judaism (ibid. 184–85). Likewise, in Acts 15:5 some Pharisees in Jerusalem are depicted as remaining in the party after becoming Christians (ibid. 185). As Saldarini observes, these accounts are very unlikely to be historical, since even Christians who tried hard to be Torah-observant would have been in conflict with the Pharisees (ibid. 186). On Luke’s presentation of the Pharisees to demonstrate the continuity between Judaism and Christianity, see also John T. Carroll, “Luke’s Portrayal of the Pharisees,” *CBQ* 50 (1988): 604–21. Note too that Luke’s relatively positive portrayal of relationships between Jesus and some of the Pharisees is consistent with his emphasis on the availability of salvation for penitents (Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 537). E.g. in Luke 18:18–23, there remains a possibility for the rich man’s
comparatively uniform, viz. ritual purity, Sabbath observance, tithing, and fasting.  

These are evidently comparable with known concerns of Pharisees in the early to mid-first century, so that there is very probably some historical basis for the disputes depicted in the Gospels.

A significant point to observe is that in the Synoptic Gospels, the Pharisees are prominent only during the sections dealing with Jesus’ ministry, while they fade from view in the Passion Narrative, and are not implicated in Jesus’ death. Hence the tension between Jesus and some of the Pharisees is relevant mainly to what I have termed the Commensality Tradition. The relevance of this factor will become apparent in due course.

3. Definition and identification:

3.1 The Pharisees:

There are three separate sources for studying pre-70 C.E. Pharisaism—the NT, Josephus, and the rabbinical literature—but their content is obscure and of limited use. Even the meaning of the name Φαρισαίοι (Pharisees) remains uncertain.

salvation, since he does not go away after Jesus’ instruction to sell his possessions and give the proceeds to the poor (v. 23, cf. Mark 10:22; Matt 19:22).

8 Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 149 (Mark and Matthew), 177 (Luke). Saldarini lists the issue of divorce also, but this is presented as a “test” for Jesus, rather than a dispute with him, and only so in the first two Gospels (Mark 10:2–12; Matt 19:3–9 cf. Luke 16:18).

9 Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 150.

10 In the Synoptics, the only reference to the Pharisees concerning Jesus’ actual death is in Matt 27:62, where together with the chief priests, they come before Pilate to request that the tomb be made secure. This is curious in that earlier, in each of the Synoptic Gospels, the Pharisees are shown as involved (mostly with others), in plots against Jesus (Mark 3:6; Matt 12:14; Luke 6:11; 11:53–54). [It is interesting that the expressions used in Luke are milder than in Mark and Matthew, and that in Luke 13:31 the Pharisees even warn Jesus about Herod.] However, as Sanders has emphasised, the Pharisees are not involved in the execution of Jesus. (See Chapter One, §3.1.1.) See also Carroll, “Luke’s Pharisees,” 606 n. 11.

11 See Chapter One, §§3.2.1.3 and 3.2.3.

12 Saldarini, “Pharisees,” 289. One of the problems is that two of the sources (the NT and Josephus) are in Greek, while the third, the rabbinic literature, is in Hebrew and Aramaic; the difficulty is in finding the Semitic term that corresponds to Φαρισαῖοι (Steele, “Table-Fellowship with Pharisees,” 98).

13 It is interesting that the name Φαρισαῖοι (used in the NT and by Josephus) was imposed by outsiders, not used by the group members themselves (Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees,
although it is probably derived from the Hebrew and Aramaic root prš, which is traditionally understood as to separate, or interpret. However, a preferable interpretation of the verb is to specify, thus providing a meaning for “Pharisees” of specifiers (parōshim) rather than separatists (p’rāshim). Moreover, it is probable that when Josephus uses the term ἄκριβεω (and cognates) with respect to the Pharisees, it should be interpreted as strictness and/or precision. This would mean that they were regarded as being precise in their definition of the Law, and perhaps also that they were strict in adhering to it. Such an interpretation coheres with Luke’s application of ἄκριβεω and its cognate ἄκριβκταως to Pharisees mentioned in Acts 22:3 and 26:5, respectively. It also underlines the relationship between this group and the Mishnah, the bulk of which comprises precise discussion on legal matters.

Identifying the study and interpretation of the Law as major concerns of the Pharisees raises an issue that is significant for the present research. A long-standing view of scholars has been that the Pharisees characteristically ate their ordinary

---

221). It is therefore possible that they referred to each other as haberim. See also §3.2 below, esp. nn. 21, 28, 36.

14 Ibid.; “וְהָע”, KBL 782.

15 Sanders, Practice and Belief, 421, 536 n. 16, following A. I. Baumgarten, “The Name of the Pharisees,” JBL 102 (1983): 411–28. Note Sanders’ observation that the Pharisees should be regarded as a party, not a sect like the Qumran community [Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies (London: SCM, 1990), 241].

16 Dunn, “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 270; Sanders, Practice and Belief, 421. See J.W. 2.162; 1.110; Life 191; Ant. 17.41.

17 Sanders, Practice and Belief, 421; see also ibid. 385. In Josephus’ writings, the sense in which the Pharisees are the “strictest” in observing the Law is most accurate, not most extreme; the Essenes were much more strict than the Pharisees (Sanders, Historical Figure of Jesus, 47). Of relevance here is the term “the seekers after smooth things,” used in several of the Dead Sea Scrolls, probably in reference to the Pharisees (Sanders, Practice and Belief, 382; Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 279–80). The phrase in Hebrew is dōrshē ha-ḥalqāḥōt, which may have been intended as a pun for dōrshē ha-ḥalakhōt, i.e. seekers of correct behaviour (Sanders, Practice and Belief, 532 n. 1). The latter terminology would have aptly described the Pharisees, but from the perspective of the Qumran community, with their much stricter code, the Pharisees’ praxis would have been too lenient, and open to ridicule (ibid.). For the historical background re “the seekers after smooth things,” and the likelihood that the Pharisees were part of the coalition which opposed Alexander Janneus, see Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 278–80.
meals at home with the same degree of ritual purity as priests in the temple. Closely connected with this belief is the assertion that the purity concerns of the Pharisees were almost entirely focused on their own food. Sanders disputes these claims, demonstrating persuasively that Pharisees did not live like priests, and observing that most of the rabbinic passages about food purity pertain only to tithes and offerings for the priests, not to the Pharisees' food. Further, he posits that the study and application of Torah and extra-biblical traditions are the chief distinguishing features of Pharisaism, and that the second important identifier is the Pharisees' belief in life after death. Sanders does allow that achievement of a high level of purity was a significant concern for the Pharisees, but places this as perhaps third in importance among their code of beliefs, in contrast to the priority which Neusner assigns to that goal.

---

18 Dunn, “Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,” 270; Sanders, Practice and Belief, 420–21.
21 See Jewish Law, 131–254, esp. 234, 174. Note that Sanders' views in Jewish Law (1990) and Practice and Belief (1992) show a marked shift from those expressed in his Jesus and Judaism (1985). In Jesus and Judaism, he accepts that habarim maintained a high standard of purity, probably because they wished to treat the world as a holy place like God's sanctuary, the temple (see esp. 256, 398 n. 47, and also 20, 181). In this he is following the rev. ed. of Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 2:388 n. 16, which in turn relies particularly on the work of Neusner (Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 359 n. 67). He does state that the standard of purity attained by the habarim was lower than that of priests (ibid. 181), but is not nearly as outspoken on this matter as in his subsequent publications. Further, Sanders argues strongly in Jesus and Judaism against the equation of habarim and Pharisees, even though he admits there was probably considerable overlap between the groups before 70 C.E. (ibid. 187–88, 362 n. 50, 390 n. 91). In his later work, Sanders acknowledges that the two groups are more closely connected than he previously thought (Jewish Law, 250 cf. Jesus and Judaism, 187–88). See also §3.2 below.
22 Sanders, Jewish Law, 236, 244.
23 Ibid. 236. Neusner proposes that the Pharisees were converted from a political party into a table fellowship sect (Sanders, Jewish Law, 153, citing Neusner, Rabbinic Traditions, 3:305–306). Sanders accepts that the degree of purity attained by the Pharisees was somewhere between that of ordinary people, and the priests and their families (Jewish Law, 236). The position is clarified by Günter Stemberger, who observes that compared with the priests, Pharisees ranked quite low on the ritual purity scale. They were on the second lowest level, just above Amme Ha'aretz (Jewish
3.2. The habērim:

In the rabbinic literature there are several references to ḥābūrā and ḥābērīm, terms usually translated, respectively, as association or fellowship, and associates.24 Those most relevant to the subject of table fellowship are in m. Demai, and involve regulations about tithing and ritual purity, in relation to produce that is not certainly tithed.25 As we have seen above, scholars often use the term habērim as if associates were identical to Pharisees, while in fact, some uncertainty remains over the dating of the rabbinic references, and the identity of the fellowship’s members.26 Moreover, as Saldarini observes, the cognates of ḥbr are not technical terms, and do not necessarily relate to a formal organisation; e.g. habērim may be used simply in reference to other folk in one’s town.27 Nevertheless, it is reasonable to accept that the Pharisees developed Mishnaic rules such as Dem. 2:2–3 and 6:6, which appear to date from the first century, and that the habērim mentioned in them are connected closely with that party.28

The etymology of the Hebrew and West Semitic root ḥbr is extremely complex,29 and much of the material is irrelevant to the present context. However,

---

24 Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 216. See also “党和政府,” “党和政府,” Jastrow 416, 421–22, respectively. For convenience, an anglicised form of these and related words is used hereafter, unless accents are required for precise citations.
26 Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 220.
27 Ibid. 216.
28 Ibid. 217; Sanders, Jewish Law, 250. Sanders notes three passages which indicate a close link between habērim and Pharisees: m. ‘Ed. 1:14; m. Demai 6:6; and t. Sabb. 1:15 (Jewish Law, 250, 233). For the third, Sanders’ argument rests on the debate between the Houses as to whether a Pharisee with a discharge may or may not eat with an Am Ḥa’aretz (Jewish Law, 207–208, 232–33, 250). In each of the three cases, a parallel may be seen between Pharisees and habērim.
one significant detail is that hbr retained a sense pertaining to comradeship, alliance, and unity with remarkable consistency in the literature of the region: at Ugarit, in Egypt, in the OT, in intertestamental literature, and at Qumran. The root hbr was also used on Hasmonean coins in reference to the Jewish league. At Palmyra, the members of a religious organisation are termed habirim, and it has been suggested that the fellowship meals of the Pharisaic associates should be seen in a similar light. If so, the implication is that some aspects of the Pharisees’ habura meals are comparable with the Palmyrene marzeah dated from the first century C.E. onwards. Certainly, some resemblance exists between the marzeah at Palmyra and the Pharisees’ fellowship gatherings, both in the terminology used for members, and the religious focus of their meetings. Moreover, from what we know of Jewish banqueting customs, wine would have been an essential component of habura meals.

30 Ibid.
31 The root is found in the tale of Wenammon, where it has the meaning unite, and is used in reference to trade associations (ibid. 194, n. 18). Re Wenammon, see Chapter Three, §2.2, and n. 21.
32 In the prophetic literature and Deuteronomy, the root has a similar meaning, but is used pejoratively, and sometimes with a magical sense (Cazelles, “chāḥbar,” 195). However, it has a neutral meaning, concerned with union, in Ezek 37:16–19; Gen 14:3; Judg 20:11; Exod 26:6. (Cazelles, “chāḥbar,” 195–96).
33 E.g. in Sirach, with a sense of alliance (ibid. 197).
34 The root and its cognates are rarely used at Qumran, but it occurs e.g. in 1QS XI, 8 (ibid. 197).
35 John Hycanust used for himself the title “head” (swr) of the hbr (ibid. 197).
36 In this section the habirim mentioned in rabbinic literature are treated as if synonymous with Pharisees only to distinguish them from the members of the Palmyrene marzeah. In fact, habirim may perhaps have been a subset of the Pharisees, so that all associates would have been Pharisees, but not vice versa. So Neusner, “The Fellowship (רַשָּׁע) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth,” HTR 53 (1960): 125. But see n. 13 above, and Salderini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 218, nn. 42–43.
39 Although the Palmyrene marzeah was primarily focused on banqueting (see e.g. Bryan, “Texts Relating,” 215, 226), the religious component of the gathering was also important, with most texts indicating Bel as the divine patron (ibid. 213–26).
as at any marzeah. In addition, the exclusive nature of the gatherings is evident in both cases, with entrée normally being restricted to members.  

Nevertheless, we should not read too much into the limited evidence, nor assign too technical a meaning to the terms relating to the Jewish haberim. It is perhaps best to see them, and their shared meals, as Sanders does, i.e. as groups of lay people who were committed to a high standard of purity, and who met for fellowship meals on the Sabbath. He points out that the Sabbath would have been the only regular opportunity for colleagues and/or neighbours to gather together for a shared meal, owing to the demands of work on other days. The easiest way to arrange such a fellowship meal was for each participant to contribute a prepared dish, but this was problematical since carrying burdens from house to house on the Sabbath was forbidden. However, it seems that the haberim managed to circumvent the Law in this regard by symbolically joining their separate dwellings, which theoretically would then comprise just one house. Mention is made in the Mishnah of a situation in which five separate haburoth were gathered into one banqueting-hall, so evidently the numbers at some of the meals could be considerable. Participants would not be confined to the inhabitants of the “fused” dwelling, since others could attend providing the distance travelled were within the Sabbath limits.

---

40 See Chapter Four, §§3.4.1, 3.4.2.
41 Eligibility for attending a Palmyrene marzeah was apparently indicated by means of tesserae: small, flat pieces of clay, metal, or stone, with designs and often writing, on both sides (Bryan, “Texts Relating,” 220). With regard to the Pharisaic haberim, the exclusive nature of their table fellowship is best seen in terms of marking boundaries between themselves and Amme Ha’arets. See Sanders, Jewish Law, 240–42. Probably, the Palmyrene marzeah was exclusive to males, and the banquets of the Jewish haberim certainly would have been. See Chapter Four, n. 116; and §§3.4.2, respectively.
42 Historical Figure of Jesus, 45.
43 Ibid., with specific reference to Jer 17:19–27.
44 Ibid. See also §4.2.1 below, on ‘Erubin.
45 ‘Erub. 6:6.
46 Under the provisions of ‘Erubin the permissible distance could be increased. See §4.2.1.
Apparently, visiting sages or teachers would frequently attend such ḥabura meals, and since studying the Torah and its interpretation has been identified as the primary focus for the Pharisees, it is plausible to imagine that their shared meals were used for this purpose.

In the past, it has been supposed that the fellowship meals of the ḥaberim had a particularly sacral quality, and even that they could be comparable with the Last Supper. However, scholars have now concluded that the fellowship gatherings of the haburoth were similar to ordinary Jewish meals, and should not be compared either with communion-meals such as those of the Qumran community, or with the Last Supper. In any case, the contrast needed for our purposes is between the meals of the haburoth, and the historical Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. Two features are discernible when such a comparison is made. These are: firstly, the relative exclusiveness of the haberim, as against the open commensality of Jesus; and secondly, the Pharisees’ manipulation of the Torah to accommodate their wish to dine with their colleagues, over against their supposed criticism of Jesus with regard to his choice of table companions. We will keep these matters in mind as we consider the alleged conflicts between some of the Pharisees and Jesus, and two further areas in which disputes might well have occurred.

---

50 Marshall, Last Supper 20, 158 nn. 10–11; Neusner, “Two Pictures,” 534–35; Sanders, Practice and Belief, 442–43. In this respect the meals of the Jewish haberim probably differed also from the Palmyrene marzeah, which appears to have had a specifically sacral orientation. Priests and gods feature prominently in the texts, and the marzeah at Palmyra was evidently like the Greek ἔλαιος (see Bryan, “Texts Relating,” 170–97, esp. 175; Chapter Four, n. 120).
4. Disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees:

4.1. *The (hand)washing dispute:*

4.1.1. The significance of the dispute:

While both Mark and Q depict many areas of conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees, the synoptic accounts of the (hand)washing dispute serve as a convenient vehicle for highlighting the relevant issues. We saw in Chapter Five during discussion of the authorship of Matthew,\(^{51}\) that while Matt 15:1–20 follows the Marcan account of the controversy fairly closely, a major departure is his omission of the statement in Mark 7:19c that Jesus declared all foods clean. There are also several other important differences between these two versions, and Luke’s is different again, so that it will be necessary to examine all three accounts. We will consider the Marcan pericope first, then Matt 15:1–20, before commenting on Luke’s version of the controversy.\(^{52}\)

4.1.2. Mark’s version of the incident:

4.1.2.1. The literary context:

Mark 7:1–23 is an extremely complex passage, containing several important themes. In fact, the saying in v. 15, and the declaration in v. 19c, are so crucial for Jesus research that it is easy to miss the overarching motif in the wider context of Mark 6:17–8:21, in which the teaching of Jesus is in contraposition to that of the Pharisees. In this section, there is a repeated emphasis on food, particularly on bread/loaves, and on the leaven (i.e. teaching) of the Pharisees.\(^{53}\) The confrontation arising from the handwashing incident is placed centrally within highly significant material. The preceding section includes:

\(^{51}\) See §3.4.2.

\(^{52}\) Gos. Thom. 14:5 is a close parallel of Mark 7:15, but occurs in a different context, and is not relevant to the handwashing conflict. It is discussed in Chapter Seven, §3.1.3.4.
• the account of John’s death at the hands of Herod (6:17–29) [recalling the plot of
the Pharisees and Herodians to kill Jesus, in 3:6];

• the feeding of the five thousand (Israelites) [6:30–44];

• Jesus’ walk on water, and the disciples’ failure to understand about the loaves
(6:45–52).\(^{54}\)

The handwashing dispute itself is centred on food, and in the Greek text, refers
specifically to eating bread (7:2). It is immediately followed by:

• Jesus’ outreach into Gentile territory, and the encounter with the Syrophoenician
woman, with once again a focus on feeding and bread (7:24–31);

• the feeding of the four thousand (Gentiles) [8:1–9];

• Jesus’ warning about the yeast of the Pharisees and Herod, and further references
to the disciples’ lack of understanding about the loaves and the feeding miracles
(8:14–21).\(^ {55}\)

Hence, from the literary context of Mark 7:1–23, an innate connection is discernible
between food/dining imagery, and the dispute between the Pharisees and Jesus (and
his disciples). Thus according to Mark’s theology, and perhaps in reality, the major
conflict between the parties arose over issues concerning ritual purity at table. As we
will see, Luke’s placement of the (hand)washing episode in juxtaposition with Q
material concerning the purity of tableware and the denunciation of Pharisees (and
lawyers), adds weight to the concept that the friction did in fact result from disparate
views on purity and dining.


\(^{54}\) Ibid.

\(^{55}\) Ibid. 124–25.
4.1.2.2. The text:

Mark 7:1–23:

1 Καὶ συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ. 2 καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὃτι κοιναὶς χεραίνει, τούτ’ ἦσαν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίοντο τοὺς ἄρτους 3 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυκνὴ νίφασιν τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίοντο, κρατοῦσι τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, 4 καὶ ἀπ’ ἀγορὰς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίζονται οὐκ ἐσθίοντο, καὶ ἔλλα πολλά ἔστιν ἐκ παρέλαβες κρατεῖν, βαπτισμός ποτηρίων καὶ ἕστηκαν καὶ χαλκίων [καὶ κλινών] 5 καὶ ἐρωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, Διὰ τί οὖν περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοιναὶς χεραίνει ἐσθίοντο τῶν ἄρτων; 6 δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Καλὸς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαίας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται [ὅτι] Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾶ, ἀπ’ ἔμοι. 7 καὶ ἐξεθαλάσσεσαν τὸν πόλεμον τὴς πόλεως. 8 ἄφέντες τὴν ἐντολήν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 9 Καὶ ἔλεγαν αὐτοῖς, Καλὸς ἐπιτύπωσεν τὴν ἐντολήν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τὴν παραδῷ ὑμῶν στήσητε. 10 Μωυσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν, Τίμω τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, καὶ, ὁ κακολογοῦντας πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανατέται τελευτάτω. 11 ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε, Ἐὰν ἔπη ἁθρόπος τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ τῆς μητρὸς, Ἰησοῦς Ἰσκαλίνους, δὲ ἔστις, Δώρου, δὲ ἔστις ἐν ἔμοι ὅφελος ῞ησυς, 12 οὐκετί αἱ ἁθροί αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς ποιήσαι τὸν πατρὸς ἢ τῆς μητρὸς. 13 ἀκυρωῦσας τὴν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδῷ ὑμῶν ή παρεθύματε καὶ παράδοσας τοίνυπτα ποιῆσαι. 14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν δώρου ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ἠκύρωσα γαρ τοὺς πάντας καὶ σώνετε. 15 οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐξωθήνων τοῦ ἁθρόποιος εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν δύνανται κοινωνήσαι αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἁθρόποιος ἐκπορευόμενα ἐστὰ τὰ κοινωνία τὸν ἁθρόποιον. 17 Καὶ ὥτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ δώρου, ἔπρωτός αὐτῶν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολὴν. 18 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὗτος καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀρχεῖτε ἐστε; αὐτὰ διότι τὸν ἄγιον ἐκπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἁθρόποιον δύνανται κοινωνήσαι αὐτῶν, 19 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ ἐκ τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀθρόποιον ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα. 20 ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι Τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἁθρόποιος ἐκπορευόμενον, ἔκεινο κοινωνία τὸν ἁθρόποιον. 21 ἔσωθεν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἁθρόποιων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ.
1. Now when the Pharisees and some of the scribes who had come from Jerusalem gathered around him, 2 they noticed that some of his disciples were eating with defiled hands, that is, without washing them. 3 (For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, do not eat unless they thoroughly wash their hands, thus observing the tradition of the elders; 4 and they do not eat anything from the market unless they wash it; and there are also many other traditions that they observe, the washing of cups, pots, and bronze kettles.) 5 So the Pharisees and the scribes asked him, “Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with defiled hands?” 6 He said to them, “Isaiah prophesied rightly about you hypocrites, as it is written, ‘This people honors me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; 7 in vain do they worship me, teaching human precepts as doctrines.’ 8 You abandon the commandment of God and hold to human tradition.” 9 Then he said to them, “You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God in order to keep your tradition! 10 For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and, ‘Whoever speaks evil of father or mother must surely die.’ 11 But you say that if anyone tells father or mother, ‘Whatever support you might have had from me is Corban’ (that is, an offering to God) — 12 then you no longer permit doing anything for a father or mother, 13 thus making void the word of God through your tradition that you have handed on. And you do many things like this.” 14 Then he called the crowd again and said to them, “Listen to me, all of you, and understand: 15 there is nothing outside a person that by going in can defile, but the things that come out are what defile.” 17 When he had left the crowd and entered the house, his disciples asked him about the parable. 18 He said to them, “Then do you also fail to understand? Do you not see that whatever goes into a person from outside cannot defile, 19 since it enters, not the heart but the stomach, and goes out into the sewer?” (Thus he declared all foods clean.) 20 And he said, “It is what comes out of a person that defiles. 21 For it is from within, from the human heart, that evil intentions come: fornication, theft, murder, 22 adultery, avarice, wickedness, deceit,
licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, folly. 23 All these evil things come from within,
and they defile a person.”

The v. 1 setting for the episode is patently artificial, but several verses of the pericope are very likely pre-Markan, and v. 15 is virtually certain to be authentic. A precise interpretation of purity rituals described in vv. 2–5 is difficult for a number of reasons. The parenthetical vv. 3–4 have evidently been inserted to clarify the procedures for a Gentile audience, but are enigmatic; they may be pre-Markan, although the phrase καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in v. 3 is surely from Mark. Further, the meaning of πνευμή in v. 3 is uncertain; it relates perhaps to a particular mode of washing, which may have involved either pouring water over the hands, or dipping them only to the wrist. Another problem is that there is a variant to v. 4: “and when they come from the marketplace, they do not eat unless they purify themselves.”

The effect of this is that persons who have come from the marketplace have to immerse (βαπτίζωνται) before they eat, rather than the produce being washed before consumption. The use of περίπατεω (literally walk) in the sense of live or behave could suggest a Palestinian provenance, and hence an early dating, for the reference in v. 5 to παράδοσις. However, the verse may contain elements from several sources; e.g. the issue over purity, and that concerning the tradition of the

---

56 E.g. see Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 265; Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 47.
57 Bultmann lists v. 15 as domimical, and sees it as characteristic of Jesus’ preaching (ibid. 74, 105). See also Dunn, “Jesus and Ritual Purity: A Study of the Tradition-History of Mark 7.15,” in idem, Jesus, Paul and the Law, 38, 54 n. 12; and further discussion below.
59 Ibid. See also n. 66 below.
60 Wilson, “Mark,” §703a, 807.
62 This is the preferred reading in the RSV. See Aland, Synopsis of the Four Gospels, 141.
64 See Hooker, According to St Mark, 175–76 for discussion re the alternative reading, which has the verb βαφτίζω in lieu of βαπτίζω.
elders, may derive from different times and places. Despite all these difficulties, however, it is possible that the issue concerning the impurity of the disciples’ hands was part of a pre-Marcan anecdote comprising material from vv. 2 and 5, with v. 15 as the punchline. In any case, the historicity or otherwise of the anecdote’s other components ultimately has little bearing on the interpretation of v. 15.

Vv. 6–13 of the pericope are probably expansions of the material in vv. 2 and 5 concerning the tradition of the elders, and perhaps arose in the context of a Gentile community experiencing conflict with Jews or Jewish Christians over Torah interpretation. Though some sections are more likely to be from the evangelist, some may be pre-Marcan, and vv. 10–12 may well represent an early tradition about Jesus’ critique of Pharisaic practices concerning the corban laws. Although

---

65 Wilson, “Mark,” §703a, 807. See also “περιπατεῖ,” 2. fig., BAGD 649 for other NT usage.
66 See Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 129–31, n. 18; Marcus, Mark 1–8, 447–48. Booth has gone to great lengths to show that handwashing prior to eating ἡπλίν was customary in Jesus’ time, and that the question put to Jesus in v. 5 is credible for that era. However, there are methodological weaknesses in his argument, esp. his reliance on an early dating for the Tosefta (Laws of Purity, 131–32), and his dependence on the “evidence” of Mark 7:3 that “some Pharisees washed before eating ordinary food” as early as 65–67 C.E. (ibid. 127). A major problem with the latter argument is that it does not take into account the likelihood that vv. 3–4 are not of Palestinian provenance. [Although the origin of Mark’s gospel is unknown, it is probably not Palestine, since the author appears unfamiliar with the territory (Hooker, According to St Mark, 7–8). On the provenance of Mark, see also Marcus, Mark 1–8, 25–37, esp. 36–37.] The information given in the parenthetical addition (vv. 3–4) is possibly based on Mark’s impressions of Jewish practice in the Diaspora in the mid-60s, and is not necessarily applicable to Pharisees in Palestine at that date. Another weak point is Booth’s suggestion (Laws of Purity, 202) that the reason for the question was that the Pharisees were urging Jesus and his disciples to become ἱβαριμ—a highly unlikely scenario. Booth does acknowledge that handwashing before eating ἡπλίν was not practised by all Pharisees, and sees it as a supererogatory custom of ἱβαριμ (ibid. 202). Loader provides a similar view, citing the evidence of several texts where washing is connected with attaining purity (“Mark 7:1–23,” 133–35). As well as discussing the most relevant texts mentioned by Booth, he quotes Jas 4:8, which connects cleansing the hands with purifying the heart (ibid. 134). This is a significant point, as it provides a plausible reason for handwashing to have been practised by pious Jews. However, it does not necessarily mean that v. 5 contains the actual question that prompted Jesus’ response (v. 15). An alternative view is held by Sanders, who contends that the handwashing dispute was manufactured by Mark to provide a setting in which “the tradition of the elders” and the corban issue could be raised (Jewish Law, 91). See also ibid. 232; idem, Practice and Belief, 223–24, 437–38; and n. 69 below. Note that the term ἡπλίν refers to ordinary food, including non-sacrificial meat, and the agricultural produce remaining after tithing or the offering of first fruits (Booth, Laws of Purity, 130). See also Chapter Four, §§2.3 and 2.4.1.
68 Ibid. 129–130, 133, n. 21.
69 Ibid. 130. Bultmann considers it probable that vv. 9–13 are pre-Marcan, and sees the section as originating in the Palestinian church (Synoptic Tradition, 17–18). On corban see also Sanders, Jewish
the framing vv. 9 and 13 are probably from Mark, it is arguable that the comment “you do many things like this” (13b) could refer to the Pharisees’ manipulation of Torah in matters such as table fellowship and tax collection, which are discussed below.\(^7^0\)

In the remaining verses (14–23), there are probably three strands: the legion in v. 15; pre-Marcan tradition; and additions from Mark himself. The most significant insertion is the parenthetical phrase καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα of v. 19c, which is generally accepted as being from Mark.\(^7^1\) The assembling of the crowd to hear the pronouncement in v. 14 is typically Marcan, as are the gathering of the disciples for a private explanation, and the introductory question about their failure to comprehend the saying (17–18a).\(^7^2\) The remainder, vv. 18b, 19ab, 20, and perhaps 21–23, may be considered pre-Marcan.\(^7^3\)

---

\(^7^0\) Law, 53–57, 91, 109. He points out that the only evidence for the use of corban to deprive a family member is in Philo, Hypothetica 7.3 and that (as also for the references in Mark 7 to handwashing), it is more plausible in the Diaspora than for Palestine (ibid. 54, 57). Note, however, that while Sanders treats the Jdt 12:7–8 reference to washing as applicable to Diaspora practice (ibid. 260), Booth supplies information suggesting both that Judith resided in Palestine, and that the incident may actually have occurred there (Laws of Purity, 159–60). If this is true, the text refers to the custom of a Jewess in Palestine, and is not relevant to the Diaspora. Further, Booth shows that the custom probably involved immersion, rather than handwashing (ibid. 160). Cf. Sanders’ conclusion that the Diaspora practice was more likely to have involved handwashing than immersion (Jewish Law, 260–61).

\(^7^1\) Hooker, According to St Mark, 180; Booth, Laws of Purity, 49–50. Cf. Gundry, who considers that the grammatical awkwardness in vv. 17–23 indicates that Mark is working with tradition here, as well as in v. 15, and that the passage would be smoother if the former verses were redactional [Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993), 367].

\(^7^2\) Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 128; Marcus, Mark 1–8, 447.

\(^7^3\) Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 128–29. The list of vices in vv. 21–22 is stylised, with the first six nouns being plural, the second six singular (ibid. 129 n. 14; Hooker, According to St Mark, 180). Similar lists occur elsewhere in Greek literature, and in the NT, e.g. Rom 1:29–31 (ibid. 181–82). However, as Gundry asserts, this does not necessarily indicate a Hellenistic origin (Mark, 366). Cf. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 17.
4.1.2.3. The parable:

Mark 7:17 refers to the logion in v. 15 as a παραβολή, and this is appropriate since in rhetorical terminology the word refers to a comparison that is realistic and can be readily imagined. However, the equivalent Hebrew word בֶּבֶן is even more pertinent, since it captures the qualities typical of the authentic sayings of Jesus. The anecdote presupposed behind Mark 7:1–23 fits well with a pattern that is familiar from elsewhere in the gospel. The pattern is found in several passages, each having at its core a question about Torah (mostly deriving from a somewhat extreme position), followed by a response from Jesus comprising a clever aphorism in bipartite form. Relevant examples are:

2:15–17: containing the question about Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners (16b), and the response: “Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick.” (17a).

12:13–17: containing the question about paying taxes (14b), and the response: “Give to the emperor the things that are the emperor’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” (17a). [Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 131]

Clearly, the pattern is also applicable to an anecdote comprising, supposedly, Mark 7:(2), 5, 15. Loader observes that Jesus’ responses are appeals to reasonableness, rather than pronouncements from a position of authority, but that often there will be a redactional addition to the logion, based on either his authority or his significance. E.g.: “I have come to call not the righteous but sinners” (2:17b); and likewise:

---

74 Re parables and בֶּבֶן, see Chapter Two, §3.3.2.
76 Loader cites as further examples of the pattern: Mark 2:1–12; 2:18–22; 2:23–28; and 3:1–6.
77 Ibid. 132.
“Thus he declared all foods clean” (7:19c).78 Further, it is not uncommon for anecdotes to be elaborated with scriptural quotations, such as the Isaiah passage in Mark 7:6–7.79 Another important point is that some sayings, such as Mark 2:9, are inseparable from their contexts.80 However, this is not the case with Mark 7:15, and there is no certainty that the question which originally prompted the saying was what we now have in Mark 7:5.81

4.1.2.4. The meaning of the parable in its literary context:

To interpret the expanded anecdote, we need to see it in its wider context of imagery pertaining to bread and leaven, and their use as metaphors for the teaching of Jesus and the Pharisees, respectively. As a fermenting agent, leaven was regarded by the Hebrews as unclean, and so came to symbolise the evil within humankind.82 Although in the parable about yeast (Matt 13:33; Luke 13:20–21) leaven appears to have a positive sense as a vital force,83 it has a negative meaning in Mark 8:15 and elsewhere in the NT.84 Thus the teaching of the Pharisees is represented by leaven, i.e. as unclean and corrupt, and as coming from within their hearts. Jesus’ teaching, on the other hand, is characterised as bread that is good, nourishing, and God-given, as in the feeding miracles.85 External impurities, which according to cultic beliefs have

78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
82 Re the authenticity or otherwise of the question, and the Sitz im Leben of the logion, see §4.1.5.2.
84 See ibid.; but cf. Scott, “Jesus as Sage,” 414.
85 E.g. 1 Cor 5:6–8; Gal 5:9 (Porter, “leaven,” 597).
86 It is possibly implied in Mark 7:2 that the disciples are eating food remaining from the feeding miracle recounted in 6:30–44 (Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 214; Marcus, Mark 1–8, 440, 447). The parable about yeast seems to be the only NT case where leaven itself has a positive sense, but note that in Mark 6:17–8:21 it is leavened bread that is contrasted with the leaven of the Pharisees. Normally, lack of leaven is equated to holiness (Funk, Five Gospels, 195). There may be a connection between this positive interpretation of leaven in the parable of the Yeast, the leavened bread in Mark 6:17–8:21, and the (apparently leavened) loaves (πρωτον not πρωτον) that Sarah prepares for the heavenly messengers in Gen 18:6 (cf. unleavened bread in Gen 19:3). Funk perceives a link between the yeast
the potential (via unwashed hands) to contaminate food and the one who ingests it, are contrasted with the internal impurities that make a person truly unclean. Thus from Mark’s perspective there are several dichotomies at play: Pharisees vs. Jesus; leaven vs. bread; external (cultic) vs. internal (moral) impurity; tradition of the elders vs. the commandment of God. We will endeavour now to ascertain the meaning of the original saying.

4.1.2.5. The original meaning vs. Mark’s interpretation of the logion:

While it is evident from 7:19c that Mark understood the parable as an exclusive antithesis, it is much more probable that Jesus intended it inclusively, i.e. that it had a sense of: not so much this, but rather that. Understood thus, Mark 7:15 could be rendered: “It is not so much anything outside a person that by going in can defile, but rather, the things that come out are what defile.” Such an interpretation is easily justified on the grounds of similar OT phrases such as Hos 6:6; Ps 51:16–17, and particularly οὐ(δέν) . . . ἀλλὰ constructions elsewhere in Mark (e.g. 9:37; 13:11).

If we accept that the background to the original logion was what we have in vv. 2 and 5, or something similar, then it is clear that besides interpreting the parable as an exclusive antithesis, Mark has shifted the focus from contaminated food to prohibited food. The anecdote implies merely that impurities on unwashed hands could contaminate food, yet Mark employs the logion to provide dominical authority for ignoring Jewish dietary restrictions, and eating food that according to Torah, was “unclean” per se.

parable and Gen 18:6 in view of the equal (and v. large) quantity of flour used in each, and the fact that both are connected with an epiphany (ibid.).

88 For discussion on arguments relevant to this point see ibid. 368–71. Gundry expresses the shift as being from “how to eat (with defiled hands or not)” to “what to eat (impure food or not)” [ibid. 368].
There are two sound reasons for believing that when Jesus actually uttered the logion preserved in Mark 7:15, he intended it inclusively, and was not abrogating portions of the Torah. Firstly, since issues relating to food laws and table fellowship were fiercely debated in the early church, it is clear that Jesus could not have made any unambiguous pronouncement concerning these matters. Secondly, both Matthew and Luke have shown by their treatments of the (hand)washing incident, that they did not share Mark’s radical interpretation of the saying. We will consider each of their versions in turn.

4.1.3. The handwashing dispute according to Matthew:

Matt 15:1–20:

1 Τότε προσέρχονταί τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων Φαρισαίοι καὶ γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν,
2 Διὰ τῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου παραβάνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν προφυτέων; οὐ γὰρ
νῦνται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἀρτὸν ἐσθίωσιν. 3 ὃ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
Διὰ τὸ καὶ ἤμεισε παραβαινεῖ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἑαυτῶν; 4 ὃ γὰρ
θεὸς εἶπεν, Τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ, Ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα
θανάσιμος τελευτάτω. 5 ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγετε, ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί, Δώρου δὲ ἐὰν
ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὥθησεν, 6 οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠκυρώσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ
θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἑαυτῶν. 7 ὅπως τιμηθῆναι, καλῶς ἔπροφτευσαν περὶ ἵματος Ἰσραήλ
λέγων, 8 ὅ λαβον αὐτοῦ τοὺς χεῖλες με τιμή, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’
ἡμῶν. 9 μάτηρ δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντέλειματα ἀνθρώπων. 10 Καὶ
προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε. 11 οὐ τὸ
eισαχρόντων εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔκφρωσαι εἰς καὶ τὸ
στόματος τοῦτο κοινοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 12 Τότε προσκλάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν
αὐτῷ, Οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούομεν; 13 ὃ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Πάσα φυτεῖα ἣν ὁὐκ ἔφυτενος ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ὑπάρχων ἐκριζωθηκαί. 14 ἄφητε αὐτοῖς τυφλοὶ εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ τυφλῶν· τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλῶν ἠν

90 Ibid. 146–48.
Then Pharisees and scribes came to Jesus from Jerusalem and said, 2 "Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders? For they do not wash their hands before they eat." 3 He answered them, "And why do you break the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition? 4 For God said, 'Honor your father and your mother,' and, 'Whoever speaks evil of father or mother must surely die.' 5 But you say that whoever tells father or mother, 'Whatever support you might have had from me is given to God,' then that person need not honor the father. 6 So, for the sake of your tradition, you make void the word of God. 7 You hypocrites! Isaiah prophesied rightly about you when he said: 8 'This people honors me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; 9 in vain do they worship me, teaching human precepts as doctrines.' " 10 Then he called the crowd to him and said to them, "Listen and understand: 11 it is not what goes into the mouth that defiles a person, but it is what comes out of the mouth that defiles." 12 Then the disciples approached and said to him, "Do you know that the Pharisees took offense when they heard what you said?" 13 He answered, "Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted. 14 Let them alone; they are blind guides of the blind. And if one blind person guides another, both will fall into a pit." 15 But Peter said to him, "Explain this parable to us." 16 Then he said, "Are you also still without understanding? 17 Do you not see that whatever goes into the mouth enters the stomach, and goes out into the sewer? 18 But what comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart, and this is what defiles. 19 For out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. 20 These are what defile a person, but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile."
Matthew follows Marcan order exactly in this section, so that the handwashing conflict is again positioned centrally within material concerning food and dining,91 commencing in 14:3 with the death of John,92 and ending at 16:12 after the warning about the yeast of the Pharisees (and Sadducees). Likewise, the Pharisees' question about the breach of tradition by the disciples is put to Jesus (15:2), though here it is generalised, rather than being applicable to a particular occasion.93 While Mark has utilised cognates of both νίπτω (7:2, 3) and βαπτίζω (7:4, twice) in reference to washing, or failure to wash, Matthew uses only the former verb (15:2, 20), and also omits the Marcan expression κοιναίς χερσάν (7:2, 5).

Matthew has rearranged the material from Mark 7:6–13, and also omitted the concluding charge: "And you do many things like this."94 More importantly, in 15:11 he has reworded the logion of Mark 7:15 so that it applies more clearly to food, adding two separate references to the mouth so that "what comes out" (τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον) cannot be misconstrued as faeces.95 He has Jesus compare the Pharisees with blind guides (vv. 12–14)96 before explaining the meaning of the saying to the disciples (vv. 16–18).97 The list of vices allegedly coming from the heart is shorter than Mark's, and is largely derived from the decalogue.98 The concluding words attributed to Jesus in v. 20b ("to eat with unwashed hands does not

91 Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 213. Note that (as in the corresponding verses in Mark 7:2, 5), Matt 15:2 in the Greek text refers to eating bread, although this is not repeated when eating is mentioned again in v. 20.
92 Though the Pharisees in Matthew are not involved with Herod and the Herodians as in Mark 3:6; 8:15.
93 See n. 85 above.
95 Ibid.
97 Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 214. There are two further references to the mouth (vv. 17, 18). On this point and the possible relationship with Acts 11:8, see Gundry, *Mark*, 364.
98 Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 215. Neyrey has shown that "most of the vices listed in Mark 7:21–22 are closely connected with the Ten Commandments ["The Idea of Purity in Mark's Gospel,"
defile”), indicate that Matthew, like Mark, assumes the Pharisees believe food is defiled by contact with unclean hands, and that the food may in turn defile the eater.\textsuperscript{99} This final phrase makes the section a closed unit by referring back to the question asked in v. 2.\textsuperscript{100}

The overall meaning of the pericope is best understood, like Mark 7:15, as an inclusive antithesis of internal and external purity, with Jesus proclaiming that the Pharisees should give priority to ethical values over against matters relating to ritual cleanliness.\textsuperscript{101} However, the modifications to Mark’s account make a substantial difference. Firstly, by omitting the judgment that all foods are clean, Matthew has shifted the focus away from the Gentile mission, and clean/unclean food, and has removed any suggestion that portions of Torah are invalid. Instead, Matthew’s Jesus merely calls for Torah to be given priority over the tradition of the elders.\textsuperscript{102} Secondly, two factors indicate that Matthew’s community supports at least some aspects of Pharisaic tradition. By omitting Mark’s disparaging comment “And you do many things like this” (7:13b), and by transposing the Isaiah quotation and the reference to corban, Matthew ensures that Jesus’ attack is not against the tradition of the elders as a whole, but mentions only one transgression of the commandments.\textsuperscript{103} Again, Matthew’s addition of the comment that the Pharisees found Jesus’ words offensive (v. 12) suggests that although his community upholds the priority of Torah provisions over against non-biblical traditions, some Pharisaic concerns about ritual

\textit{Semeia} 35 (1986): 120]. However, the relationship to the decalogue is much clearer in Matthew’s account.

\textsuperscript{99} Loader, \textit{Attitude towards the Law}, 215.
\textsuperscript{100} Stendahl, “Matthew,” §686f, 787.
\textsuperscript{101} Loader, \textit{Attitude towards the Law}, 215–16.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. 214.
purity remain significant, and are the subject of controversy. We will examine this issue below, but turn now to Luke’s account of the dispute.

4.1.4. Luke’s version of the conflict:

Luke 11:37–52:

37 Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι ἔρωτα αὐτῶν Φαρισαίος ὡς ἀριστήθη παρ’ αὐτῶν εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀνέπεα. 38 ὁ δὲ Φαρισαίος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐξαπτύθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀριστοῦ. 39 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἕν ἤμεις οἱ Φαρισαίοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποιημοῦ καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἐξωθεὶς ἴμων γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. 40 ἄφροις, οὐχ ὁ ποιημός τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἐξωθεὶς ἐποίησαν; 41 πλὴν τὰ ἑνότα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἴδοι πάντα καθαρά ἴμων ἔστιν. 42 ἀλλὰ οὐαὶ ἴμων τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὃτι ἀποδεκατοῦσι τὸ ἡδύσμων καὶ τὸ πήγανος καὶ πᾶν λάχανον καὶ παρέρχεσθαι τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ· ταῦτα δὲ δέ εἶδε ποιήσατε κάκεινα μὴ παρεῖναι. 43 οὐαὶ ἴμων τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὃτι ἀγαπάτε τὴν πρωτοκαθαρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄσπασμοι ἐν ταῖς ἁγοραῖς. 44 οὐαὶ ἴμων, ὃτι ἐστὲ ως τὰ μυθεῖα τὰ δόλια, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἦσιν περιπτυόμενες ἐπάνω οὐκ ὦδασιν. 45 Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ τὶς τῶν νομικῶν λέγει αὐτῷ, Λειδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγω καὶ ἡμᾶς ἱδρίζεις. 46 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Καὶ ἴμων τοῖς νομικῶσι οὐαὶ, ὃτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἄνθρωπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τοῖς δακτύλοις ἴμων οὐ προσημαίνετε τοὺς φορτίους. 47 οὐαὶ ἴμων, ὃτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μυθεῖα τῶν προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες ἴμων ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. 48 ἴππα μάρτυρες ἔστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοὺς ἐργοὺς τῶν πατέρων ἴμων, ὃτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς ὡς ἴμεις δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε. 49 διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλέην, Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώκουσιν, 50 ἵνα ἐκκητήρη τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένου ἀπὸ καταβολής κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. 51 ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἄβελ ἐκατομαίρει τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολαμβάνου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστήριον καὶ τοῦ οίκου· καὶ λέγω ἴμων, ἐκκητήρησεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. 52 οὐαὶ ἴμων τοῖς νομικῶσι, ὃτι ἔκαστε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκκλίνατε.

37 While he was speaking, a Pharisee invited him to dine with him; so he went in and took his place at the table. 38 The Pharisee was amazed to see that he did not first
wash before dinner. 39 Then the Lord said to him, “Now you Pharisees clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of greed and wickedness. 40 You fools! Did not the one who made the outside make the inside also? 41 So give for alms those things that are within; and see, everything will be clean for you. 42 “But woe to you Pharisees! For you tithe mint and rue and herbs of all kinds, and neglect justice and the love of God; it is these you ought to have practiced, without neglecting the others. 43 Woe to you Pharisees! For you love to have the seat of honor in the synagogues and to be greeted with respect in the marketplaces. 44 Woe to you! For you are like unmarked graves, and people walk over them without realizing it.” 45 One of the lawyers answered him, “Teacher, when you say these things, you insult us too.” 46 And he said, “Woe also to you lawyers! For you load people with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not lift a finger to ease them. 47 Woe to you! For you build the tombs of the prophets whom your ancestors killed. 48 So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of your ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs. 49 Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, ‘I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute,’ 50 so that this generation may be charged with the blood of all the prophets shed since the foundation of the world, 51 from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you, it will be charged against this generation. 52 Woe to you lawyers! For you have taken away the key of knowledge; you did not enter yourselves, and you hindered those who were entering.”

Luke’s version of the (hand)washing dispute differs markedly from the other two, and some scholars consider it independent of Mark 7:1–23.\textsuperscript{104} However, for reasons I will now explain, I do not share this view. In comparing the three passages, it is important to bear in mind that since Mark 7:15 is to be understood as an inclusive antithesis, the fundamental issue is not clean/unclean food, but concern

over the ritual purity of diners. Luke’s account of the dispute is substantially abridged and modified, omitting significant components of Mark’s version, notably the logion of v. 15. Nevertheless, the central issues remain basically the same, viz. the opposition of inside/outside, and Jesus’ insistence on the priority of inner purity. It seems to me that since the focus in all three Synoptics is ultimately on the distinction between external and internal purity, they probably derive from a single tradition about a dispute. While it most likely occurred during Jesus’ lifetime, the issues remained relevant in the early church, and hence could be raised in reference either to Jesus, as in Luke’s account, or to his disciples, as in Mark and Matthew. Thus, one of the major differences is that according to Luke it is Jesus who does not wash before eating, rather than the disciples. The verb used here is βαπτίζω, which is properly understood as *immersing the whole body* in a *mikveh*, and does not refer merely to handwashing. The Pharisee, Jesus’ host, does not overtly voice any criticism or ask a question, and is merely “amazed.” However, an utterance could perhaps be assumed from what appears to be a counterattack from Jesus, focused initially on the Pharisees’ preoccupation with external purity.

Although it is plausible that Jesus actually did dine with a Pharisee, as indicated in Luke 11:37, the evangelist has possibly constructed the occasion to provide a more realistic setting than the artificial circumstances of Mark 7:1–2. The meal setting allows Luke to treat the controversy in terms of hospitality mores, as well as with reference to ritual purity. The timing and manner of washing before

---

105 See n. 88 above.
106 As I will explain below in §4.1.5, the crux of the dispute is Pharisaic concern over boundaries.
107 Cf. Mark 7:2, 5; Matt 15:2. In fact, the disciples do not feature at all in Luke’s account of the incident.
109 Ibid. 23.
the meal evidently serve as boundary markers for the group,\textsuperscript{111} who may perhaps be regarded as *haberim*. Jesus' failure to proceed in the customary manner (v. 38) shows him up as an outsider, but also emphasises the exclusive nature of the group.\textsuperscript{112} In v. 39, Luke employs a metaphor derived from Q (par. Matt 23:25), by which Jesus criticises the Pharisees for their preoccupation with cleansing the *outside* rather than the *inside* of cups and dishes.\textsuperscript{113} However, he alters the metaphor so that it contrasts the Pharisees' concentration on the purity of the outside of the vessels, with their failure to deal with their own inner impurity.\textsuperscript{114} Thus he arrives at a conclusion similar to that of Mark 7:21–23, but by a different means. V. 40 is unique to Luke, and apparently refers to the desire of God, as creator, for the internal as well as external purity of the human subject.\textsuperscript{115} V. 41 is obscure, but should perhaps be understood as referring back to the vessels as symbols. It can then be interpreted to mean that the Pharisees will be cleansed by giving the *contents* of the dish and cup to the poor.\textsuperscript{116} This sense coheres well with our findings with regard to the redemptive value of hospitality to the poor,\textsuperscript{117} and the concept that children of God demonstrate

\textsuperscript{110} Nolland, *Luke*, 663. However, a possible indication that Luke has drawn on a pre-existing tradition is the uncharacteristic use of the historic present tense (ἐρωτάω) for the Pharisee's invitation (ibid.).


\textsuperscript{112} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{114} Ibid. 664; Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 416–17.


\textsuperscript{116} G. W. H. Lampe, "Luke," *PCB* §728h, 834; Funk, *Five Gospels*, 334. However, there is some doubt as to the accuracy of the text. The Aramaic equivalent of ἐλέηω (from which ἐλεηοῦνη is derived) may either mean *to have mercy or pity*, or *to purify*. If the latter meaning were applied, Luke 11:41 would have the sense of *purify that which is inside* . . . as against the NRSV translation "give for alms those things that are within . . . .". This rendition of the verse makes it comparable with its Matthewan parallel (23:26). See "ἐλέηω," BAGD 249; Zerwick and Grosvenor, *Grammatical Analysis*, 226.

\textsuperscript{117} For the Pharisees to share their own food with the needy would be in striking contrast to their normal practice. *M. Demai* 3:1 allows for the poor, or passing guests, to be given *Demai*-produce, which the Pharisees themselves could not consume unless they first tithed it. See Danby, *The Mishnah*, 22 n. 6. Note, however, that for the Pharisees to *give away* even some of their own food as *alms* would be inadequate, since true hospitality implies commensality. Hence ἐλεηοῦνη might be better understood here as *kind deed* [as against *alms* (*ἐλεηοῦνη*, BAGD 249)], so that a *shared meal* could be envisaged. Re commensality, see Chapter Seven, §3.2.2.
the divine qualities of compassion and generosity.\textsuperscript{118} It is also consistent with the fact that in the remainder of the pericope, Luke’s Jesus criticises the Pharisees (and lawyers, who are also present at the meal) for their ungodly practices.

Three woes against the Pharisees are followed by a further three against the lawyers (11:42–52).\textsuperscript{119} Although v. 44 is directed against the Pharisees it does not identify them, and so anticipates the commencement of an attack on the lawyers.\textsuperscript{120} Luke often depicts the groups of Pharisees and lawyers as partners, both in their interest in Torah, and in their opposition to Jesus,\textsuperscript{121} and there is a strong link between them in this passage.\textsuperscript{122} The woe oracle against the lawyers in v. 52b is especially noteworthy: “You have taken away the key of knowledge; you did not enter yourselves, and you hindered those who were entering.”\textsuperscript{123} Like the third woe against the Pharisees, Jesus’ statement implies that these legal experts too have achieved the opposite of what was required of them.\textsuperscript{124} As teachers of the Law they had been given the key to knowledge of God, particularly as preserved in Torah, but have failed to use it responsibly—thus hindering rather than providing access to knowledge.\textsuperscript{125}

Hence once again, our attention is focused on boundaries, with an emphasis now not only on the opposition of external/internal categories, but of people being kept outside through the actions of the lawyers. Since the contraposition of inside

\textsuperscript{118} See Chapter Five, §4.2.3 re the call to love enemies.
\textsuperscript{120} Green, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 475.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{122} Note that in the par. Matt 23:1–36 both scribes and Pharisees together are criticised throughout.
\textsuperscript{123} The par. Matt 23:13 probably preserves the original sense of the woe; it refers to people being locked out of the \textit{kingdom} rather than away from knowledge (Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 669).
\textsuperscript{124} Green, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 475.
\textsuperscript{125} Loader, \textit{Attitude towards the Law}, 332.
and outside has been a predominant theme in the three accounts of the dispute over washing, it is timely to consider what might be the underlying reasons for such concern about boundaries on the part of the Pharisees.

4.1.5. Issues pertaining to boundaries:

4.1.5.1. Insights from social anthropology:

In biblical studies, and in particular with regard to the (hand)washing conflict, the key for understanding the preoccupation with boundaries comes from social anthropology, specifically from two concepts posited by Mary Douglas. The first is the dichotomy between clean/unclean, or purity/pollution, and the insight that “dirt” is something out of its proper place. The notion may be extended so that it explains OT perceptions regarding the classification of animals as clean or unclean: a creature is unclean if it does not fit perfectly into the categories set down in the creation myth, i.e. if it is outside the proper boundaries. The second important concept is the perception of the human body as analogous to the social order in a particular culture:

> The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious... We cannot possibly interpret rituals concerning excreta, breast milk, saliva, and the rest unless we are prepared to see in the body a symbol of society, and to see the powers and dangers credited to social structure reproduced in small on the human body.

(Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 115)

On the basis of this analogy, Douglas demonstrates that a society or group in which there are strong beliefs about purity will maintain rigorous control over boundaries.

---

and demarcation lines. In the last two decades, several scholars, notably Malina and Neyrey, have applied these insights to Jesus research and the study of early Christianity. Neyrey’s work on the notion of purity in Mark’s gospel is especially valuable, although only a fraction of it is relevant here, viz. issues concerning the boundaries of Jewish society, and the beliefs in Judaism about the boundaries of the human body.

The most obvious external boundaries that defined the Jews as a nation were dietary restrictions, Sabbath observance, and circumcision, but to these we might add Torah observance and endogamy. Within Jewish society, certain people (e.g. lepers, eunuchs, the blind, and the lame) were marginalised, and deemed unclean, because they did not conform to the ideal of bodily wholeness, and so did not belong in a proper category. Those from beyond the bounds of society, e.g. strangers and sojourners, who could not be categorised, were a threat for this very reason, as we saw in Chapter Three. Such fears about the margins of society were replicated in concerns about the surfaces of the human body, and the orifices that allowed substances properly belonging inside to escape outside, e.g. faeces, urine, blood, semen, etc. Similarly, it appears that groups like the Pharisees were concerned to

---

131 Neyrey provides “maps” of places, persons, things, and times, showing how the social system of Judaism classified them according to their proper places (“Idea of Purity,” 94–99).
132 Ibid. 100.
133 Re endogamy, see Chapter Three, §2.1; and also Malina, New Testament World, 119, 121, 131–33.
135 §2.3.
136 Concern about damaged boundaries extended not only to human skin, but also to clothes and walls. See Crossan, “Mediterranean Jewish Peasant,” 1197; and Lev 13:1–46; 13:47–59; and 14:33–53, re “leprous” conditions of skin, clothing and walls, respectively.
protect bodily orifices, especially the mouth, from the threat of substances that properly belonged outside the body, and might invade it.\textsuperscript{138}

The status of clothing is somewhat ambiguous, and therefore requires additional explanation. It acted as a boundary for the body, and was necessary for purity, since nudity was equated with uncleanness and separation from God.\textsuperscript{139} However, clothing was subject to midras impurity,\textsuperscript{140} and it appears from \textit{m. Demai} 2:3 and \textit{Hag} 2:7 that haberim and Pharisees always presumed the garments of Amme Ha'arets were impure.\textsuperscript{141} For this reason, a haber could not receive an ordinary person as a guest in the clothing he was wearing, but would have to provide him with a clean garment. The caution exercised in these circumstances is redolent of the purification rites traditionally used before banquets, and particularly for removing the impurities carried by strangers; the procedure could include washing/bathing, anointing, and/or the gift of a new garment.\textsuperscript{142} Thus the purity concerns of Jews, and more specifically of the Pharisees, need to be perceived against the broader background of the threat posed by anyone or anything crossing established boundaries.

Obviously, these insights on the purity concepts of Judaism will be helpful as we undertake further examination of the handwashing dispute. From Mark's account, an attempt will be made to ascertain: firstly, a plausible scenario for Jesus' pronouncement about what defiles (7:15); secondly, the sorts of circumstances in which the original anecdote could have been constructed in pre-Marcan tradition; and

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid. 102–103.
\textsuperscript{139} Ibid. 103.
\textsuperscript{140} See Leviticus 15; and n. 136 above.
\textsuperscript{141} See Sanders, \textit{Practice and Belief}, 229, 434, 440, 521 n. 28.
\textsuperscript{142} See Chapter Three, §2.4; and below, §4.1.5.3.
thirdly, Mark’s perspective within his Gentile community.143 On the basis of those findings, we will then evaluate the differences between Mark’s account, and the other two versions of the dispute.

4.1.5.2. Mark 7:1–23 and boundary concerns:

4.1.5.2.1. The historical Jesus and the Pharisees:

There are firm grounds for assuming some facets of Jesus’ lifestyle that would have been offensive to Pharisees. Firstly, we can be reasonably sure that in the execution of his healing ministry, Jesus crossed boundaries: he touched a leper (1:41), and a corpse (5:41), and was touched by a haemorrhaging woman (5:24–28); he used spittle for healing (7:33; 8:23); he was frequently in contact with “unclean” people, including Gentiles (7:24–30), and those who were demon-possessed (1:23–28; 9:20–27), blind (8:22–25; 10:46–52), and deaf-mute (7:32–35).144 Secondly, his mission involved him with people who were allegedly not Torah observant, and whom Pharisees would therefore have despised—notably toll collectors and sinners (2:14–17), and again, Gentiles (4:35–41; 7:24, 31).145 Thirdly, there are significant issues relating to the itinerancy of Jesus and his followers. E.g. in the accounts of the feeding miracles (6:31–44; 8:1–9), Jesus is depicted as eating not only outdoors, but in desert regions, which were beyond the bounds of civilisation, and regarded as

143 Some scholars assume that Mark was composed in Galilee or Syria, cf. the traditional site of Rome [David Rhoads, “Social Criticism: Crossing Boundaries,” in Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies (ed. Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D. Moore; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 144, n. 16]. See also n. 66 above.


145 Ibid. 108.
dangerous and disorderly.\textsuperscript{146} Although the feeding stories may be largely fictional, it seems inevitable that as itinerants, Jesus and his disciples would in reality have eaten outdoors at times, as the setting of Mark 7:1–23 suggests.\textsuperscript{147} In such circumstances, water for handwashing would surely be unavailable. If Pharisees practised a purificatory ritual before their own meals, one can readily imagine their abhorrence concerning the situation of Jesus and his disciples. From their perspective, Jesus in particular would be at risk of ingesting contaminants acquired as a direct result of his ministry, and especially through frequent contact with ostensibly “unclean” people.

Providing the logion in v. 15 is understood as an inclusive antithesis, it means that Jesus did not deny the possibly contaminating effect of ingesting impurities as a result of his ministry and itinerancy, but declared this to be less defiling than what breeds within and subsequently emerges.\textsuperscript{148} Further, it is plausible that having vindicated himself by asserting the priority of God’s commandments over Pharisaic interpretations of Levitical laws, Jesus also referred to the adverse consequences of overemphasising the latter. In addition, it is quite possible that he cited the Pharisees’ abuse of corban, and perhaps mentioned other instances in which giving priority to traditions led to neglect of Torah.\textsuperscript{149}

In attempting to determine the Sitz im Leben of Mark 7:15, we need to remember that we are dealing with the evangelist’s narrative worldview, rather than

\textsuperscript{146} Baly and Achtemeier, “wilderness,” 1212–13. Walls, as boundaries of homes or cities, normally provided protection against the dangerous elements outside. See n. 136 above.

\textsuperscript{147} Note vv. 2, 14–17.

\textsuperscript{148} This perception stems from my belief that the Medical Explanation in Mark 7:18b, 19ab derives from pre-Marcan tradition, not from Jesus. See Booth, Laws of Purity, 71–73, 83, 215–218, 220, 223; Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 128–29. Although the saying itself does not specifically mention what it is that comes out of the body, the context indicates that it comprises the “leaven” of the Pharisees, and all that this encompasses. See §4.1.2.1 above. Re the (unlikely) possibility that “the things that come out” in v. 15 refers to faeces, see Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 143, n. 49.

\textsuperscript{149} Some possible cases are examined in §4.2.
with the historical Jesus,\textsuperscript{150} and to acknowledge that the scenario depicted in vv. 1–2 is decidedly unrealistic. The exact circumstances are irretrievable, but it seems more likely that the original criticism was of Jesus, rather than of his disciples. As we saw above, the question or criticism may have been based on Jesus’ (and perhaps some disciples’) failure to perform a supererogatory purity rite, but probably focused, as well, on lifestyle issues. It is also likely that the saying was connected with at least some reference to Pharisaic tradition, as in the existing v. 5.\textsuperscript{151}

The exchange could conceivably have arisen in the setting of an outdoor meal, as the Marcan pericope and its context suggest. However, while the background can be understood in terms of purity issues, and the practices of Jesus over against Pharisaic traditions, the idea of an outdoor meal does not really ring true as the \textit{Sitz im Leben} of v. 15. It is not only the manifestly artificial setting depicted in vv. 1–2\textsuperscript{152} that provokes this opinion. It is the fact that Pharisees surely would not, in reality, have taken such an intense interest in the dining customs of Jesus and his followers, unless personally affected by them. An obvious alternative setting for the debate would be a meal at which Pharisees themselves were present, e.g. at a normal indoor meal (as in Luke 11:37–41), with Jesus as a guest. In view of the generally tense relationship between the parties, this also seems an unlikely setting, but could

\textsuperscript{150} Rhoads, \textit{Mark and Method}, 158.

\textsuperscript{151} The rationale for these opinions is that the broad scenario highlights the polarity between Jesus’ and the Pharisees’ interpretations of obedience to God’s will. In order to carry out his mission and ministry, Jesus appears to have made conscious (though perhaps reluctant) decisions to cross boundaries [William Loader, “Challenged at the Boundaries: A Conservative Jesus in Mark’s Tradition,” \textit{JSNT} 63 (1996): 45–61]. Hence we must assume that he also accepted the inevitability of being ritually impure most of the time as a consequence of his calling. In contrast, the Pharisees’ concept of piety included a concern to exercise strict control over body surfaces and orifices. This would presumably cause them to feel utter repugnance for the types of activity and contact that were intrinsic to Jesus’ ministry. From the Pharisees’ viewpoint, if Jesus were to follow their tradition, the most significant element would surely be the avoidance of extreme impurity by staying within boundaries, not merely the observance of practices such as handwashing. Note, however, that the implied link between clean hands and a pure heart in Jas 4:8 could indicate that handwashing was highly significant for some pious Jews in the NT era. See also n. 66.

\textsuperscript{152} See e.g. Sanders, \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, 265.
well have been the actual situation if Jesus (and one or more disciples) arrived uninvited. The Pharisees would feel genuinely threatened by the presence of an outsider who did not observe the purificatory ritual prescribed for members of the group. The suggestion is entirely speculative, but it does provide a more likely setting for the encounter that prompted the saying in Mark 7:15. It also raises the possibility that, as perhaps with the story behind Zacchaeus’ hospitality to Jesus, Luke may have had access to some historical data that were not available to the other evangelists.

4.1.5.2.2. Pre-Marcan tradition:

One of the reasons for assigning Mark 7:2 and at least part of v. 5, to the early church, rather than to the historical Jesus, is the reference to the disciples. They feature in similar circumstances in two other controversy stories where Jesus is questioned about their conduct, and he defends their behaviour. In Mark 7:2, 5, the situation ostensibly relates to failure to handwash before eating hullin, while the other concerns are that the disciples do not fast (2:23–27), and that they pluck grain on the Sabbath (2:18–20). In each of the three cases it seems probable that they represent “disciples” in the early church, and that the anecdotes were developed when its members were under attack from Pharisees for diverging from traditional practices. The controversies are indicative of some early tensions between Judaism and nascent Christianity. It is likely that in the case of the handwashing incident, the nucleus of the anecdote (vv. 2, 5, 15, and possibly other portions) was formulated at this stage of the oral tradition, in the Palestinian church.

---

154 Cf. Mark 2:15–17, in which the disciples are asked to explain Jesus’ behaviour.
155 So Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 48. See also Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 136–38, 137 n. 27.
4.1.5.2.3. Marcan redaction:

The great disparity between Pharisees and early Christians about issues concerning boundaries and lines could be predicted on the grounds of social anthropology. We saw above that the Pharisees’ exclusionism, and preoccupation with guarding boundaries in a social context, was replicated in a concern for strict control over the surfaces and orifices of the human body. Conversely, the tendencies of the early church would have been towards the inclusion of Gentiles and other marginalised people, and for its members to have little concern over cultic purity. By the late 60s, when Mark was composing his gospel, the tensions between Christians and conservative Jews must have been considerable. In particular, issues over open commensality and Jewish dietary laws would have caused difficulties.

As we have seen, the sense of the logion (v. 15) underwent major change by being interpreted as an exclusive antithesis. The shaping of the handwashing pericope, especially the addition of 7:19c, had the effect of obtaining authorisation from the historical Jesus to ignore Torah restrictions on non-kosher food, and of asserting that they never had validity. It is interesting that for Mark, this pronouncement is evidently sufficient to authenticate the inclusion of Gentiles in the faith community, and to endorse their current practices. There is no mention of baptism or any other rite of initiation.\(^{156}\)

4.1.5.3. Matt 15:1–20 and boundary concerns:

It has already been suggested that Matthew’s modifications to the handwashing incident supported the notions of an anti-Gentile stance held at an earlier stage in the life of his community, and of continuing respect for some aspects of Pharisaic

\(^{156}\)The reference to baptism in Mark 16:16 is part of the longer ending of the gospel, generally considered inauthentic. See Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 388–90.
traditions. The idea of a strongly pro-Jewish element in Matthew’s community is affirmed by his removal of Mark’s disparaging remarks about cultic practices (7:3–4), and his rearrangement of the section about neglect of the commandments (7:6–13) so that the account becomes less derogatory towards Pharisees.

The transition from Judaism to Christianity may be expressed in socio-anthropological terms as requiring redefinition of boundaries and redrawing of lines. Tension was bound to be high during this process, especially over the admission of Gentiles to full table fellowship, and dietary issues. In contrast to Mark’s community, the Matthaean church apparently found it necessary to establish an initiation rite in order to differentiate insiders from outsiders: Matthew’s Jesus instructs the disciples that converts are to be baptised (28:19). Despite this move, residual tension over boundaries is evident in the parable of the Banquet (22:1–14): although all are invited to the celebration, one guest who is not wearing a proper garment is deemed to be an outsider (vv. 11–14). This incident, together with the requirement for baptism of converts, calls to mind the purificatory rituals traditionally required before the admission of an outsider to a formal meal, and involving one or more of three elements: washing, anointing, and the gift of a new garment. The significance of such rituals will be further discussed in Chapter Eight, but meanwhile we turn again to Luke’s version of the conflict over failure to wash before eating.

4.1.5.4. Luke 11:37–52 and boundary concerns:

Luke’s account of the (hand)washing dispute, combining material from both Mark and Q, serves as independent attestation that ritual purity, especially at table, is a crucial element in the conflict with Pharisees. The fact that Luke depicts Jesus, rather than the disciples, as under attack, adds weight to the notion that tensions over ritual

157 See above §4.1.3, and Chapter Five §3.4.2.
purity occurred during Jesus’ lifetime. As previously observed, it is possible that Luke’s account preserves some aspects of an historical event, and that Jesus actually did dine with Pharisees on at least one occasion. Yet in addition, the incident may reflect tensions in the early church, between conservative Jews and/or Jewish Christians, and those who would formerly have been perceived as “sinners.” The setting of the conflict within a meal, and the emphasis on both washing, and the opposition of outside/inside, affirm that the issues involve boundaries pertaining to purity standards and table fellowship.

Since the story is set in a Pharisee’s home, the social group concerned here is presumably an exclusive circle of friends and relatives, perhaps of ἱαβερίμ. Jesus is portrayed as an outsider, who is expected to adhere to the usual protocol, viz. to immerse (himself) [βαπτίζω], in order to attain proper status as a guest. In socio-anthropological terms, the situation is replicated on a larger scale in the early church: converts seeking admission to the Christian community are required to undergo the purificatory ritual of baptism (βάπτισμα, cognate of βαπτίζω), as in Acts 2:38. However, in this instance, the meal for which they must be ritually pure is the eschatological banquet. Such a background behind Luke’s account would explain why the Pharisee does not overtly criticise Jesus for failing to immerse. The reader would understand, of course, that while Jesus did not need to undergo immersion to attain purity or demonstrate repentance, it was deemed an essential ritual for converts to Christianity, whether Jewish or Gentile.

---

158 See §3.2 above, esp. nn. 45–46.
159 Cf. Matt 28:19. The situation is much more complex in Luke-Acts than in Matthew. The rite of baptism is linked with the need for repentance, and with the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38), and Jesus is depicted as promising the Spirit (Acts 1:5), rather than as instructing the apostles to make, and baptize, disciples.
160 Cf. the situation described in Matthew’s version of the banquet parable, where the guest who has not completed the prescribed rite is ejected.
Since Luke has omitted most of the material from Mark 7:1–23 as to what defiles a person, he has no need to address the topics of dietary laws and table fellowship at this point. However, he deals extensively with both issues in Acts, and there is also a significant passage in Luke 10:7–8. In Chapter Seven, these texts will be examined together with Gos. Thom. 14:4–5, a passage which juxtaposes parallels to Luke 10:8 and Mark 7:15. The matter of baptismal rites will be discussed further in Chapter Eight.

4.1.6. Concluding remarks:

The three versions of the (hand)washing dispute provide illuminating material for understanding the conflict which apparently occurred between Jesus and the Pharisees, and the way that tensions continued to affect relationships in the early Christian communities. Although the accounts differ markedly, each of them draws a comparison between external (ritual) and internal (ethical) purity, and depicts Jesus as asserting the priority of the latter. In addition, all three passages emphasise the precedence of God's commandments over Pharisaic traditions.

In Mark's version of the handwashing incident, Jesus cites the Pharisees' use of corban for avoiding obligations to their parents, as exemplifying the way the elders' tradition is utilised to nullify the Law (7:9–13). He indicates that this is only one of many instances (v. 13b). The comment brings to mind two other scenarios, both relevant to our topic, in which the Pharisees may have used their traditions to circumvent the Law. Although the Gospels make no explicit reference to these matters, either or both could plausibly have created discord between the Pharisees and the historical Jesus, and we will examine them in the next section.
4.2. Areas of potential conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees:

4.2.1. ‘Erubin:

The Mishnaic tractate ‘Erubin is a supplement to Sabbath, and defines regulations that permit a broader interpretation of the Torah in relation to Sabbath observance.\footnote{Danby, The Mishnah, 121 n. 11.} It deals with two separate spheres: firstly, the area in which a burden may legitimately be carried on the Sabbath; and secondly, situations when the normal restrictions on Sabbath travel may be applied less rigidly.\footnote{Ibid.} Both of these matters may be dealt with by means of an Erub,\footnote{Derived from בריס, to mix, confuse (‘בריס,’ Jastrow 1109-10). See also בריס, ‘eração,’ Jastrow 1075-76. Hereafter, Danby’s anglicised form of the term is used for convenience.} i.e. literally mixture, amalgamation or combination; in the tractate ‘Erubin, the term refers to the commingling or fusing of Sabbath limits.\footnote{Danby, The Mishnah, 793, 124 n. 1.} In the case of various occupants living in an alley, an Erub consists of a prescribed quantity of food, such as bread, that is placed in a known location in the courtyard, and declared to belong to all of the inhabitants. All the participants are then permitted to carry burdens between any of the dwellings on the Sabbath, as if all were under the one roof.\footnote{Ibid. 793, 131, re m. ‘Erub. 7:6–10; Neusner, “Two Pictures,” 537 n. 12. Another term used for this type of arrangement is Shittuf, i.e. literally association or partnership, between the various occupants in the alley (Danby, The Mishnah, 796, 131 nn. 2–3). See also בריס, Jastrow 1570; m. ‘Erub. 7:6–10.} Another means of “fusing” separate dwellings along an alley into a single domain is to construct a symbolic doorway between the public road and the private courtyards. The occupants of all the dwellings may then move freely anywhere within the enclosed area as if it were a single abode.\footnote{Ibid.} When an Erub is for the purpose of extending the limits of Sabbath travel, it must be sufficient for two meals per person, and it is placed, on the eve of the Sabbath, up to 2,000 cubits from the town’s boundaries, at what then counts as a temporary dwelling. The person to
whom it belongs is thus allowed a Sabbath limit of a further 2,000 cubits from that site.\textsuperscript{167} There are further complex rulings that effect an extension of Sabbath limits, such as those fusing separate townships into one.\textsuperscript{168}

Biblical requirements for Sabbath observance were prescribed in Exod 20:8–11 and Deut 5:12–15, and were subsequently elaborated in Jer 17:19–27 and Neh 13:15–22. Deliberate violation of Sabbath law was punishable by death (Num 15:32–36), and a sin offering was required for inadvertent transgressions (Lev 4:27–31).\textsuperscript{169} Clearly, observance of the Sabbath was a very serious matter for Jews,\textsuperscript{170} and it stood out as the most striking aspect of their faith.\textsuperscript{171} The \textit{Erubin} traditions developed by the Pharisees for circumventing the restrictions on Sabbath activity represented a considerable relaxation of the biblical commands,\textsuperscript{172} and it is not surprising that other Jews, notably the Sadducees, opposed the concepts.\textsuperscript{173} Likewise, if the practices were current in Jesus' lifetime, he may well have considered the Pharisees were "rejecting the commandment of God" in favour of their own Sabbath traditions, and could have included \textit{Erubin} in the category of "many things like this."\textsuperscript{174} Moreover, the fusion of dwellings would normally have allowed only an elite, pre-selected company to share the Sabbath meal, and in light of our previous findings concerning Luke 6:27–35 and 14:12–14, it is certainly possible that Jesus criticised the Pharisees for such exclusivist practices.\textsuperscript{175}

\begin{itemize}
\item[167] Ibid. 793, 132, re \textit{m. \textit{Erub}. 8:1–2. See also 4:3, 7; 5:7; and Neusner, "Two Pictures," 537 n. 12.
\item[168] E.g. see \textit{m. \textit{Erub}.} 5:1–3.
\item[169] Sanders, \textit{Practice and Belief}, 208.
\item[170] The Essenes, in particular, observed the Sabbath laws diligently (ibid. 425, citing CD XI, 7–9).
\item[171] Ibid. 209.
\item[172] Ibid. 466. The accent on leniency is noticeable in the tractate \textit{Erubin}. See e.g. 5:5, and note the emphasis is on leniency cf. stringency.
\item[174] Mark 7:9, 13.
\item[175] See Chapter Five, §4.2.3.
\end{itemize}
4.2.2. Evasion of taxes and tolls:

The terminology pertaining to tax and toll collection in the rabbinic literature is extremely complex, and since the following discussion cites several tractates, we need to clarify it at this point. As a general rule, רָבַי מַעַד and סְפָרִים denote, respectively, collectors of indirect and direct taxes,\textsuperscript{176} but the matter is complicated by several factors. The word סְפָרִים does not always refer to a tax farmer, but may also be used of his agent, or of a state official.\textsuperscript{177} Since a toll collector was unable to act unilaterally to confiscate taxpayers’ goods,\textsuperscript{178} it seems that the סְפָרִים mentioned in \textit{m. B. Qam.} 10:2 as seizing a man’s ass must be a government official,\textsuperscript{179} rather than a toll collector.\textsuperscript{180} This coheres with the observation that when the terms סְפָרִים and לֹא מַעַד occur in the same context in rabbinic literature, the former is a collector of \textit{direct}, not \textit{indirect} taxes.\textsuperscript{181} A further complication is that the interchangeable terms סְפָרִים and לֹא מַעַד, which both have connotations of oppression, are used to refer to Roman officials, especially tax collectors.\textsuperscript{182} Apparently, revenue collectors in general were regarded as oppressors, and considered to act unlawfully,\textsuperscript{183} and it is not always possible to differentiate between the various officials involved with tax and customs collection in the rabbinic

\textsuperscript{176} See Chapter Five, §3.1, and esp. n. 3.
\textsuperscript{177} Michel, "רָבַי מַעַד," 99 n. 115.
\textsuperscript{178} See Chapter Five, nn. 32, 53–54.
\textsuperscript{179} See "לֹא מַעַד," Jastrow 741.
\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Contra} Donahue, “Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 52.
\textsuperscript{181} Michel, “רָבַי מַעַד,” 99 n. 115. Yet the picture is far from clear. E.g. רָבַי מַעַד in \textit{m. B. Qam.} 10:1, (\textit{b. B. Qam.} 113a) where it occurs together with סְפָרִים, is translated as \textit{customs-collectors} in I. Epstein, ed., \textit{The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nezikin in Four Volumes} (London: Soncino, 1935), 1:662. Note also Michel's comment that רָבַי מַעַד did not often enter houses, since tolls were collected at specific locations ("רָבַי מַעַד," 101 n. 135). Cf. Donahue’s statement that only tax collectors, and \textit{not} toll collectors had occasion to enter houses ("Tax Collectors and Sinners," 50).
\textsuperscript{182} See "לֹא מַעַד," and "רָבַי מַעַד," Jastrow 807, 826, respectively. E.g. the "tyrants" (i.e. government officers) who confiscate property in \textit{m. B. Qam.} 10:5 are רָבַי מַעַד ("רָבַי מַעַד," Jastrow 807; Danby, \textit{The Mishnah}, 346), although in this instance they are not tax collectors.
\textsuperscript{183} E.g. Danby, \textit{The Mishnah}, 385, nn. 4–7 re \textit{m. Sanh.} 3:3 and the "oppressors" (i.e. tax collectors who exacted dues even in the Sabbatical Year). See also Epstein, \textit{Nezikin}, 3:142 n. 6, re the definition of “oppressors” as “government officials who spared no means of extorting heavy taxation from the people.”
literature.\textsuperscript{184} However, the differences between them are inconsequential for the present task, which is simply to seek evidence that the Pharisees endeavoured to evade taxes and/or tolls.\textsuperscript{185}

We have already seen above that according to Pharisaic tradition, it was deemed permissible to swear falsely to toll collectors in order to avoid paying dues.\textsuperscript{186} Another Mishnaic text indicating that the Pharisees deliberately evaded taxes is found in \textit{m. ‘Erub. 3:5}:

A man may make conditions about his \textit{Erub} and say, ‘If gentiles come from the east let my \textit{Erub} be to the east; if from the west, let my \textit{Erub} be to the east; if from both sides let me go to which side I will; if they come from neither side, let me be as the people of my town’. (Danby, \textit{The Mishnah}, 124)

The connection with revenue collection is made independently by Danby and Epstein, who both identify the Gentiles as tax collectors;\textsuperscript{187} this interpretation is confirmed in the Gemara to the text.\textsuperscript{188} The explanation provided in the notes to the English translation is that tax collectors are acknowledged as individuals from whom

\textsuperscript{184} In other words, Donahue’s identification of לוכדים as toll collectors, and מצרים as collectors of direct taxes (“Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 49), appears to be an oversimplification. Moreover, although it is virtually certain that the \\textit{דלאים} of the Synoptics are toll collectors (ibid. 54), the term \\textit{דלאים} is not such an exact equivalent of מצרים as Donahue supposes (ibid. 49). A \\textit{דלאים} can be a tax farmer who purchases the right to collect an indirect tax, or one of the employees or functionaries at the toll centre (ibid. 54), but (in contrast to מצרים) the term is not used to denote Roman officials who confiscate property.

\textsuperscript{185} Cf. Donahue’s attempt to evaluate and compare the moral standing of מצרים and לוכדים in the rabbinic literature (“Tax Collectors and Sinners,” 49–53).

\textsuperscript{186} See \textit{m. Ned. 3:4}; Chapter Five, §§3.3, 3.4.4.

\textsuperscript{187} Danby, \textit{The Mishnah}, 124 n. 18; L. Epstein, ed., \textit{The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Moad in Four Volumes} (London: Soncino, 1938), 2:250 n. 14, 251 n. 14. Danby attributes his interpretation to Tifereth Yisrael (Israel ben Gedaliah Lipschutz’ commentary to the Mishnah). I therefore consulted the commentary to determine why the identification of Gentiles and “taxgatherers” was made. However there is no relevant comment at the critical point of the text. According to Lipschutz’ version of ‘Erub. 3:5 [Tifereth Yisrael (Vilnius: Joseph Reuben Romm, 1854), 168], the Hebrew term translated as \\textit{גנטלים} is גנטים, i.e. literally \textit{slaves of the stars}. This epithet, which means \textit{idolaters}, is altered in some editions of the Hebrew text to \\textit{גנטים} and is then translated either as \\textit{Gentiles} (e.g. in Danby, \textit{The Mishnah}, 124), or as \textit{foreigners} (e.g. in Epstein, \textit{Moad}, 2:250). See also “גנטים,” Jastrow 1078.
people try to escape. Hence the rules concerning the placement of Erubin were evidently developed so as to allow the Pharisees the opportunity to distance themselves from someone they wished to avoid, e.g. an advancing tax collector. If the latter were approaching from one direction, the Erub could be sited where it would permit the person to travel up to 4,000 cubits in the opposite direction. In the same clause (m. ‘Erub. 3:5), a contrast is made between a tax collector (from whom one “must flee”), and a sage (whose discourses one would wish to hear). The Pharisaic tradition of blatantly encouraging tax avoidance is continued in the Babylonian Talmud, e.g. in B. Bat. 127b and Sanh. 25b–26a.

It is now clear that according to rabbinic tradition, several methods of tax evasion were condoned, including the swearing of false oaths, and the special provisions developed to circumvent the Sabbath laws. Owing to the late date of the relevant literature we cannot be certain that these practices were current in the early first century. However, they do provide some interesting background material and may have been a source of tension between Jesus and some Pharisees. In particular, given Jesus’ friendship with a number of reformed toll collectors, it is quite possible that he publicly supported their right to collect tolls, over against the Pharisees’ attempts to avoid paying them. It is in this light then, that we now consider the Lucan parable in which a toll collector is contrasted with a Pharisee.

188 Epstein, Mov ed, 2:251.
189 I.e. double the proper Sabbath limit.
191 Ibid. 251 n. 5.
192 See Michel, “τελωνής,” 102, n. 140, re evading the slave tax at a toll gate.
193 Here the local tax collector is the father of a rabbi; he acts in support of the townsfolk against the state official who comes occasionally to demand an extra impost over and above the poll tax. His ploy is to warn people to hide indoors, in order to give the official the impression that the town is not highly populated, and so avoid heavy taxation. See Epstein, Nezikin, 3:149.
5. **Pharisee vs. toll collector:**

Luke 18: 9–14:

9 Ἐξεπεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τινας τοὺς πεπουθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶν δίκαιοι καὶ ἔξουσιοις τοὺς λοιποὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· 10 "Ἀνθρώποι δύο ἄνθρωποι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν προσεβασάθησαν, ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος καὶ ὁ ἔτερος τελώνης. 11 ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταύτα προσηχόμεθα, ὁ θεός, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ὅσοι εἰμὶ ὑσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἄρτας, ἄλκης, μοιχαὶ, ἡ καὶ ὡς οὕτως ὁ τελώνης· 12 ἑτεροίῳ δὲ τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατώντα θαυμάζει· 13 ὁ δὲ τελώνης μακρόθεν ἐστιν οὐκ ἤθελεν οὕτω τοῖς ὑπάκουεις ἔπεσα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀλλ' ἐπιτυπνέ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ λέγων, ὁ θεός, ἔλαβόν μοι τῇ ἀμαρτωλῷ. 14 λέγω ὦμοι, καθεύθυνος ἐκείνος διδασκαλικούς εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐκείνων· ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὕψιν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.

9 [Jesus] also told this parable to some who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and regarded others with contempt: 10 “Two men went up to the temple to pray, one a **Pharisee** and the other a **toll collector**. 11 The **Pharisee**, standing by himself, was praying thus, ‘God, I thank you that I am not like other people: thieves, rogues, adulterers, or even like this **toll collector**. 12 I fast twice a week; I give a tenth of all my income.’ 13 But the **toll collector**, standing far off, would not even look up to heaven, but was beating his breast and saying, ‘God, be merciful to me, a **sinner**!’ 14 I tell you, this man went down to his home justified rather than the other; for all who **exalt** themselves will be **humbled**, but all who **humble** themselves will be **exalted**.”

In previous discussion of the parable it has been observed that its main import is the contrast between the inappropriateness of the Pharisee’s self-righteous attitude, and the appropriateness of the toll collector’s stance. In addition, Luke’s reference to the reversal motif in the conclusion of the story indicates that humility before God and others is essential for salvation.

---

194 Once again, the English translation of the passage is the NRSV with “toll” substituted for “tax.”
Our subsequent findings about Pharisaic traditions cast further light on the parable. We have seen that although the Pharisees’ chief goal was to interpret and apply the Law precisely, the traditions they had developed for their own expediency led to ultra-lenient interpretations, and even overt contraventions of the commandments. Examples of apparent malpractice are failure to honour their parents,\textsuperscript{196} manipulation of Sabbath laws to allow the proper limits on work and travel to be grossly exceeded,\textsuperscript{197} and lying and cheating with respect to taxes and tolls.\textsuperscript{198} Moreover, the exclusive nature of their table fellowship meant that they failed to observe the fundamental ethic of caring for the poor and needy.\textsuperscript{199} By way of contrast, toll collectors are characterised in the Synoptics as demonstrating penitence and true godliness by means of their hospitality to Jesus and his followers, i.e. to those who would be unable to return favours according to reciprocity conventions.\textsuperscript{200}

In the parable, Luke has accentuated the disparity between two paradigmatic figures.\textsuperscript{201} Although the depictions of the Pharisee and toll collector border on caricature,\textsuperscript{202} the character types are familiar from earlier portrayals,\textsuperscript{203} and the audience is encouraged to emulate the latter of the two.\textsuperscript{204} The toll collector’s humility and conscious dependence on God’s mercy are emphasised, and compared with the Pharisee’s arrogant belief that his salvation is not only assured by his supposed Torah observance, but that it is preordained. The irony of it is that when the

\textsuperscript{193} See Chapter Five, §4.2.2.
\textsuperscript{196} By improper application of the corban principle (Mark 7:10–13).
\textsuperscript{197} See §§3.2; 4.2.1 above.
\textsuperscript{198} See above, §4.2.2.
\textsuperscript{199} See above, §4.2.1.
\textsuperscript{200} See Chapter Five, §§4.2.2, 4.2.3.
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid. 876. It should be noted, however, that while the types may be overdrawn, hyperbole is a common feature of parables.
Pharisee’s words are considered in light of the above findings, it is clear that he, not the toll collector, is the guilty party. It is pertinent to recall here that in the OT worldview, sins against other persons, such as deceit and dishonesty, were the most likely to earn divine disapproval. Clearly, if the Pharisees practised tax evasion it would come into the category of such wrongs, and undoubtedly, Jesus would then have sided with the (reformed) toll collectors on this issue.

Whether or not the parable itself derives from the historical Jesus is unimportant, since its message is consistent with, and reminiscent of, material of accepted authenticity, e.g. Jesus’ pronouncement that the toll collectors (and prostitutes) will enter the kingdom ahead of the Pharisees (Matt 21:31b). Hence, although the sharp contrast between character types in Luke 18:9–14 is indubitably a narrative ploy, it may possibly reflect a historical situation in which Jesus could justifiably have criticised some of the Pharisees, but promised salvation to some toll collectors and sinners.

6. Summary:

When the background is taken into account, the conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees appear very likely to be historical, though the Synoptics probably exaggerate their seriousness. The major concerns of the Pharisees were the study and interpretation of the Torah. They also strove for a high level of purity, although they

---

203 It is true that the parable concerns a toll collector and a Pharisee and is not representative of all (ibid. 878; Green, Gospel of Luke, 646). Yet, as Green acknowledges, the reader/hearer is predisposed to view the Pharisee in a negative light, and to favour the toll collector (ibid. 647).
204 Ibid. 644–45.
205 See Chapter Five, §4.1, esp. n. 183.
206 For discussion on this matter see Nolland, Luke, 874.
207 See Chapter Five, §3.4.3.
208 On the subject of the Pharisees, and their conflicts with Jesus, my perspective differs markedly from that of Sanders. Though admitting that some would have been “priggish,” Sanders finds the Pharisees likeable (Practice and Belief, 494), and does not raise issues concerning their morality. However, I am in complete agreement with Sanders that the Pharisees were in no way responsible for Jesus’ death. See Chapter One, §3.1.1, nn. 122–24.
did not attempt to live like priests. It is probable that some of the Pharisees were *haberim*, who typically gathered for Sabbath meals. This practice was facilitated by the Pharisaic *Erubin* traditions, which substantially reduced the restrictions that Sabbath laws imposed upon travel and work.

Each of the synoptic accounts about failure to wash before a meal serves as an indicator of conflict between the historical Jesus and Pharisees, but also between “disciples” and conservative Jews or Jewish Christians in the early church. Mark’s version (7:1–23) is probably based on an anecdote formulated in the Palestinian church, and containing an authentic saying about what defiles a person (v. 15), combined with material concerning the tradition of the elders. The pericope needs to be considered in its literary context in order to appreciate that the significant emphasis on food and eating relates to the contraposition of the leaven (corrupt teaching) of the Pharisees, and the bread (appropriate food) offered by Jesus.

It is almost certain that the original logion was intended as an inclusive antithesis. The statement in v. 19c declaring all foods clean indicates that Mark has understood the saying as an exclusive antithesis, and has also shifted the focus from *contaminated* food to *prohibited* food. He has then employed it to give dominical authority to his Gentile community’s practice of ignoring Torah prohibition of “unclean” food.

Matthew’s account of the dispute (15:1–20) is based largely on Mark’s but makes some substantial alterations, notably the omission of the declaration that all foods are clean. The modifications probably indicate a conservative Jewish element in Matthew’s community, and ongoing controversy about ritual purity. However, although some Pharisaic traditions are still respected in Matthew’s community, the priority of Torah provisions is not in doubt.
Luke’s version of the conflict (11:37–52) differs from the other two, combining a very abridged form of Mark’s account with material from Q and some from L. Here, in comparison with Mark and Matthew, it is Jesus who does not wash before the meal, rather than the disciples, and the neglected ritual is immersion, not handwashing. However, the outcome of the exchange between Jesus and the Pharisees is, like the other accounts, focused on the priority of internal (ethical) purity over external (cultic) purity. V. 41 probably should be interpreted as Jesus exhorting the Pharisees to provide hospitality to the poor, in order to attain inner purity.

In all three accounts there is a significant emphasis on the opposition of external/internal categories, suggesting the need to examine them in the light of socio-anthropological findings. Two applicable insights are that a thing, person, or creature is “unclean” if it is not in its proper place or cannot be categorised, and that in any particular culture, the boundaries and lines of the social order are reflected in perceptions about the human body. According to these principles, concerns about a thing or person crossing boundaries in a social context, are replicated in concerns about the body’s surfaces and orifices.

When the ministry, mission, and itinerancy of the historical Jesus are considered against that background, it is evident that he would have been ritually impure much of the time. It is therefore likely that Jesus, rather than his disciples, was the original target of criticism in the conflict reflected in Mark 7:1–23. His itinerant lifestyle, in particular, would have made him vulnerable to impurity, since he would frequently be outside the protective boundaries afforded by the walls of a home or city. While his impure condition would have been repugnant to Pharisees, we may presume on the basis of Mark 7:15 that Jesus himself considered it of less import than his internal purity. The Sitz im Leben of the saying about what defiles
may have been a situation such as an outdoor meal, where the Pharisees expressed
disgust or concern about Jesus’ lifestyle. However, a more likely setting is an indoor
meal at the home of a Pharisee, attended by Jesus, who could plausibly have been
present as an uninvited guest.

The pre-Marcan tradition that the disciples, as against Jesus, were the target
of the Pharisees’ criticism over failure to handwash, probably reflects controversy in
the early church over issues of ritual purity. Mark’s understanding of the saying
indicates the established practice in his community, especially with respect to table
fellowship and Jewish dietary laws. However, the categorical statement in 7:19c
could reflect tension about the latter, and a perceived need to have Jesus authenticate
the inclusion of Gentiles and the waiver of dietary restrictions. While there is no
reference to any rite of initiation in Mark, Matthew has Jesus instruct the disciples to
baptise converts, and also demonstrates purity concerns in his account of the banquet
parable. Luke, too, makes the baptismal rite essential for Christian initiation, but as a
demonstration of repentance, and purification in preparation for the eschatological
banquet.

It is quite possible that tension actually occurred between the Pharisees and
Jesus over his friendship with toll collectors. In the rabbinic literature, as in the NT,
revenue collectors are portrayed as dishonest, and this was the pretext for Pharisees
to evade taxes. However, as a vocation, tax collection was not intrinsically evil, and
the τελωνεία with whom Jesus associated were apparently reformed. Furthermore,
Jesus’ response to the question about paying tribute to Caesar probably indicates that
he believed the poll tax was lawful. It is therefore likely that on the issue of taxes he
would have sided with the toll collectors, against the Pharisees. It is apparent then,
given the ploys possibly used by Pharisees to avoid paying taxes, that the real sinner
in Luke 18:9–14 is the Pharisee, not the toll collector. Though the contrast between
character types in the parable is undoubtedly a rhetorical artifice, it reflects the
historical situation, in which Jesus might well have been critical of some Pharisees,
while he promised salvation to some toll collectors and sinners.
Chapter Seven

_AKAHTOI IN THE SYNOPTICS_

1. **Introduction:**

This chapter investigates in detail, the concepts that the historical Jesus had a reputation for attending banquets as an uninvited guest, and that this characteristic explains many aspects of the manner in which he is depicted in the Synoptic Gospels. The identification of Jesus and other Gospel characters as ἀκλητοί proves illuminating for the exegesis of several synoptic passages, and clarifies the means by which Jesus’ followers are invited to the eschatological banquet.

The explication of the idea commences in §2 with a reconstruction of the historical Jesus, in which insights from Chapters Five and Six are added to the basic outline reached in Chapter One. §3 examines issues pertaining to the reception of unexpected guests, particularly in relation to some NT passages, but also with reference to Homeric epic. The findings are utilised in §4 for an investigation of Luke 7:31–34 and par., and the likely background to Jesus’ designation as a “glutton and drunkard.”¹ §5 draws on Mark 9:33–37 and related texts, to elucidate the means by which Jesus’ followers gain access to the kingdom. The case for Jesus as ἀκλητος is examined in more depth in §6, with reference to Luke 16:1–8a, and the anointing accounts. The notion is then used in the following section to facilitate an innovative exegesis of Mark 10:13–16; 7:24–31 and Luke 16:19–26. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings.

¹ See Chapter Five, §4.2.4 for the preliminary outline of the idea.
2. **Reconstruction of the historical Jesus:**

Drawing on the insights gained in earlier chapters, we are now in a position to expand the portrait of the historical Jesus outlined in Chapter One. In sociological terms, Jesus was a Jewish eschatological prophet and sage; he was an itinerant teacher who characteristically used parables and aphorisms, and was regarded as a healer. While he appears to have been Torah-observant, three factors should be borne in mind. Firstly, his outlook may have been influenced by Cynic-Stoic elements. Secondly, he is depicted by Mark as declaring that the dietary restrictions set down in the Torah were invalid. Thirdly, we may surmise that both his ministry and his itinerant lifestyle would have had the effect of rendering him unwelcome as a guest of Pharisees.

Jesus called disciples, and announced that the kingdom of God was imminent. His followers, who may be presumed as reformed, were promised salvation, with Jesus stating that toll collectors and prostitutes would enter the kingdom before the Pharisees. Although there were possibly grounds for tensions between Jesus and Pharisees, his arrest and subsequent crucifixion probably resulted from his action against the temple, and the Pharisees were not implicated in his death.

The proposed reconstruction of Jesus depends particularly on the idea that he typically attended banquets without a formal invitation, and that at least once, he arrived ἀκλητος at the home of a toll collector. In addition, it is suggested that Jesus' associates (i.e. so-called "sinners") may have gained entry to meals by "following" him. In such a way, a woman known as a prostitute followed Jesus into a house, and anointed him.

---

2 Re Jesus as a healer, see Chapter One, §§3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.3.
The next section examines whether or not uninvited guests would generally have been welcome, and focuses in particular on the status of Jesus and his disciples when they were present as ἄκλπτοι.

3. Reception vs. rejection of strangers:

3.1. The missionary discourses:

3.1.1. The sources of the tradition:

Discussion of the texts recounting Jesus’ commissioning of his disciples is complex, since there are several versions, and a number of discrepancies in details. Each of the Synoptics records the sending out of the Twelve (Mark 6:6b–13; Matt 9:35; 10:1, 7–11, 14; Luke 9:1–6), but in addition, there is a description in Luke 10:1–16 of seventy³ disciples being commissioned. Most, but not all, of this last text is designated as Q material, Matthew having apparently conflated some portions of it with his Marcan source.⁴ It is necessary to cite the account of the second commissioning as well as Mark’s account of the missionary charge, as it includes some significant data.⁵

Mark 6:6b–13:

6b Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κύμας κύκλω διδάσκαλων. 7 καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἔδιδον αὐτοῖς ἔρωσιν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων, 8 καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδέν αἰροῦσιν εἰς ὄδυν εἰ μὴ ῥάβδου μόνου, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πίπαν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώην χαλκόν, 9 ἀλλὰ ὕποδειξιν σανδάλια, καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσῃς δῶ τιτώνας. 10 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ὃ ἔλεγεν εἰς ἰδίαν, ἓκα τὸ τόπος μὴ δέσθητε ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ τὸ ἦλθεν. 11 καὶ ἦσαν τόποι μὴ δέσθητο οὕτως

---

⁵ Luke’s version is probably closer than Matthew’s to the original passage in Q (ibid. 547). However, Matt 10:14 is more likely original than Luke 10:10–11 (ibid.). See also James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffman, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds, The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of
Luke 10:1-16:

1 Metà de taúta anédeixen o kýrios étérous ébodasmìkonta [bdo] kai ápéstelleis autòús aná dòo [bdo] prò prosoupolon autòú eis pásoan polìn kai topóon òu òmmíllois autòús érchebain. 2 Ëleugén de prós autòús, 'O mèn thèrismíkos polîs, òi òe érgestai òlînóis' deòstei oún toú kúriou tou thèrismíou òpis òrgíntas èkblài eis tou thèrismíou autòú. 3 òpágetei, idòo ápoptèllon ìmàs òs òrinas èn mésa òlîs. 4 Mh bàstasèste bálalántwvn, mh péran, mh òpolðìmata, kai mhédna kata tìn òdòn òspápòsthèse. 5 Eîc ìc θàn eisélèsthe oícìas, próstous lègete, Eîrhnì tò oìkòr tò òsw. 6 kai òan òcèi ò òlîs eîrhnìs, èpavnaptástei èp' autòú ò eîrhnì ìmòwv eîc òc mh gê, ef' ìmàs ènkaúkìmei. 7 èn autòù de tì oícìa mènète òsthîoncte kai pínouthete tà par' autòù' àzîos gár ò òrgíntas tou mousoi autòù. mh metabáite te eîc oícìas eîc oícìas. 8 kai eîc ìc òc òpòlw èi oûsèrhimhse kai déxhounta ìmò, èsthîte tà paratíðhìmeta ìmòv 9 kai thérwstote tous èn autòù èstheuèis kai lègete autòù. 'Hggikèn ef' ìmàs ò hbasileia tou òðou. 10 Eîc ìc θàn eîc òpòlw èi oûsèrhimhse kai mh déxhounta ìmò, èxélbhontes eîc tàs plèntias autòù èlîpate, 11 Kài tòn kàvòròtan tòn kolhènta ìmòn èk tòn pòléwv ìmòv eîc touç pòdas.

ἀποστολέω μεθα ὡς πλὴν τοῦτο γυνάκετε ὅτι ἠγισκέν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 12 λέγω ὡς ὅτι Σωδόμως ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ἦσται ἡ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. 13 Οδικοὶ οἱ Χαρακίν, οὐαί σοι, Βηθσαϊδᾶ! ὅτι εἶ ἐν Τύφω καὶ Σιδώνι ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι καὶ μετενόησαν.
14 πλὴν Τύφω καὶ Σιδώνι ἀνεκτότερον ἦσται ἡ τῇ κρίσει ἡ ὡς ἡ με. 15 καὶ σὺ,
Καφαρναοῦμ, μὴ ὡς οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθητι; ἡ ὁ ὑδος καταβήσῃ. 16 ὁ ἄκοινον ἡμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ἡμᾶς ἔμε ἀθετεῖ; ὁ δὲ ἔμε ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὴν ἀποστελλαντά μὲ.

1 After this the Lord appointed seventy others and sent them on ahead of him in pairs to every town and place where he himself intended to go. 2 He said to them, "The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few; therefore ask the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into his harvest. 3 Go on your way. See, I am sending you out like lambs into the midst of wolves. 4 Carry no purse, no bag, no sandals; and greet no one on the road. 5 Whatever house you enter, first say, 'Peace to this house!' 6 And if anyone is there who shares in peace, your peace will rest on that person; but if not, it will return to you. 7 Remain in the same house, eating and drinking whatever they provide, for the laborer deserves to be paid. Do not move about from house to house. 8 Whenever you enter a town and its people welcome you, eat what is set before you; 9 cure the sick who are there, and say to them, 'The kingdom of God has come near to you.' 10 But whenever you enter a town and they do not welcome you, go out into its streets and say, 11 'Even the dust of your town that clings to our feet, we wipe off in protest against you. Yet know this: the kingdom of God has come near.' 12 I tell you, on that day it will be more tolerable for Sodom than for that town. 13 "Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the deeds of power done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. 14 But at the judgment it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for you. 15 And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades. 16 "Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me."
3.1.2. Historicity:

Scholars are mostly agreed that Luke’s two accounts of commissioning probably derive from a single tradition, but they are divided as to whether that tradition relates to an event during Jesus’ ministry, or to the mission of the early church.\(^6\) One indication that the tradition is pre-Marcan, and possibly historical, is the position of the story in Mark’s Gospel, since it tends to contradict his depiction of the disciples as failing to understand the truth about Jesus at that stage.\(^7\) Furthermore, while the message of repentance is similar to John’s,\(^8\) and the disciples may be perceived as preparing the way for Jesus,\(^9\) their reported activities are similar to those of Jesus,\(^10\) and they apparently share in his ministry.\(^11\) A third factor that perhaps supports the historicity of a commissioning event is that the tradition is innately a story about Jesus, not a narrative created to frame a pronouncement.\(^12\) On the other hand, the reference to the use of oil in Mark 6:13 probably reflects the influence of practice in the early church.\(^13\) Moreover, the eschatological focus evoked by the harvest imagery in Luke 10:2\(^{14}\) is likely to derive from the nascent Christian community rather than from the historical Jesus.

Further discussion of the accounts below will only underline the impossibility of determining to what extent they are historical. Nevertheless, two basic facts are evident: that the first apostles were itinerants, and that in their dependence on hospitality, they would have been emulating Jesus’ own lifestyle, though not

\(^7\) Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 155.
\(^8\) E.g. as in Mark 1:4 (ibid. 157).
\(^9\) Ibid. The notion of preparing the way ahead of Jesus is also implicit in Luke 10:1.
\(^10\) See Mark 1:34 and 3:10.
\(^12\) I.e. it is not to be categorised as a pronouncement story (Nolland, *Luke*, 425). If it were, it would clearly be less likely to have a historical basis.
\(^13\) Ibid. The only other reference in the Gospels to the use of oil for healing is in Luke 10:34; cf. early church practice as in Jas 5:14 (Wilson, “Mark,” §702b, 805).
necessarily following his actual instructions. In other words, the missionary
discourses affirm that at least during the times when he was travelling extensively,
Jesus sought board and lodging as an ἀκλητος.\(^{15}\)

3.1.3. Commentary:

3.1.3.1. “Two by two”:

There is evidence from both Mark (6:7) and Luke (10:1) that the disciples travelled
in pairs, probably in order to be able to provide official testimony in accordance with
OT tradition.\(^{16}\) This would presumably leave Jesus to travel alone, as indicated in
Luke 10:1 and Mark 7:24, although Luke 8:1–3 suggests otherwise. The tradition of
travelling two by two was evidently maintained for the missionary journeys of the
early church.\(^ {17}\)

3.1.3.2. Dependence on hospitality:

The instructions as to what the disciples could carry, and the discrepancies in the
various accounts, have received considerable attention in recent studies, especially
with regard to comparison of the allowable provisions, and the items characteristic of
itinerant Cynics.\(^{18}\) However, with respect to an alleged similarity to Cynics, the fact
that the missionaries were not permitted a πιπα is alone sufficient to show the
distinct difference between them, and Cynic preachers or other travellers:\(^ {19}\) wherever

---

\(^{14}\) Re the use of harvest imagery in this context, see Nolland, *Luke*, 550–51.
\(^{15}\) This is in contrast to his practice while based in Capernaum, where he most likely stayed at Peter’s
home. See n. 236, Chapter Five.
\(^{17}\) See Acts 8:14; 13:1–2; 15:22, 39–40 (ibid.).
\(^{18}\) Re the disciples’ vs. Cynic garb, and esp. the prohibition of a πιπα in Mark 6:8 and Luke 9:3; 10:4,
see e.g. Eddy, “Diogenes?” 461–62; Tuckett, “Cynic Q?” 367–68.
\(^{19}\) The πιπα denoted the Cynic’s self-sufficiency, and was a symbolic element of his garb (Eddy,
“Diogenes?” 462). Re the bag and staff as typically carried by Hermes, the god of travellers, see
Pervo, “Petronius’ Satyricon,” 325, 325 n. 89.
they went, the missionaries were to be totally dependent on the hospitality offered by householders.\textsuperscript{20}

3.1.3.3. “Greet no one on the road”:

The stipulation in Luke 10:4b that the disciples were to “greet no one on the road” occurs only in the account of the sending of the seventy. It is usually understood as indicative of the essential urgency of the mission, since it is redolent of the speed and single-mindedness required of Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, in 2 Kgs 4:29.\textsuperscript{21}

Nevertheless, the verb ἀπαίζομαι can also have the sense of \textit{making a short visit},\textsuperscript{22} and the purpose of the instruction could be to prevent the disciples from taking the easy option of staying with acquaintances, from whom they could be certain of a welcome, rather than risking rejection by strangers. There are two important reasons for interpreting the instruction in this manner. Firstly, the practice of seeking hospitality from strangers was a characteristic of Jesus that his disciples would surely have wished to imitate, even if the missionary discourses have no factual basis.\textsuperscript{23} Secondly, approaching a stranger to seek board and lodging would function as a test of his/her eligibility for the kingdom, since the offer of hospitality to Jesus or one of his disciples assured the host’s salvation.\textsuperscript{24} It is therefore plausible to suggest that the intention would be to bring the challenge to new potential hosts in this way, before the advent of the eschaton. If that were the true meaning behind the


\textsuperscript{21} Ibid. 413; Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 552. The fact that carrying a staff is not prohibited in Luke 10:4 (cf. 9:2) supports the notion of influence from the 2 Kings 4 story, in which Elisha’s staff features prominently. However, permission to carry a staff may simply derive from the Marcan version of the mission (6:8).


\textsuperscript{23} The idea that the disciples would have imitated Jesus’ lifestyle is supported by Crossan’s discussion on \textit{Mimetics not Mnemonics} in “Itinerants and Householders,” 15–16, although the thrust of the present hypothesis is different.

\textsuperscript{24} This concept is explored further in §3.1.3.7 below. On the redemptive value of offering hospitality, see also Chapter Five, esp. §4.2.2.
instruction in Luke 10:4b, it would still underscore the sense of urgency concerning
the mission.

3.1.3.4. “Whatever house you enter”: There is some confusion in the accounts with regard to being received by a
*householder*, over against reception by the whole *town.* Matthew has perhaps
attempted to overcome this problem by having Jesus instruct the disciples to
determine “who in [the town or village] is worthy (ἐξιος)” [10:11]. The point here is
not that enquiries were to be made beforehand, but rather that *when* a householder
was approached, his *response* would demonstrate whether he was eligible for the
kingdom (i.e. ἐξιος).  

This raises the question as to *how* and *when* the meeting of the disciples and
the householder actually took place. According to ancient tradition, sojourners could
ascertain who was willing to act as host by sitting in the town square and waiting for
an offer of hospitality. However, this was evidently not the practice of the
missionaries (nor presumably of Jesus), since in all four accounts, the wording
indicates that the disciples actually *entered* a house before requesting hospitality. It
seems therefore as though the typical method of seeking hospitality involved a two-
stage process: first *entering* the house and *then* offering the greeting that determined
whether or not a “son of peace” were present. Given the accessibility typical of


26 As Stendahl has observed (“Matthew,” §683f, 783), ἐξιος functions as a keyword in Matthew 10
[yv. 10, 13 (twice), 37, 38], and has a similar meaning in Matt 22:8.

27 As in Judg 19:15.

material more accurately than Matt 10:11–13, where the motif of *worthiness* has been influential

552–53.
Palestinian houses in the NT era,\textsuperscript{30} it is clear that the encounter with the householder would not necessarily take place at the entrance to the house. The missionaries could well have reached the dining area before meeting the host, and this possibility has significant implications for investigating accounts concerning Jesus' table fellowship.

The greeting itself is highly significant, and comprises much more than a mundane salutation, or a wish for the absence of war.\textsuperscript{31} In fact, it presages the coming of the kingdom, and the accompanying blessings, including harmony, wholeness, and prosperity, as well as peace.\textsuperscript{32} The greeting constitutes the missionaries' initial proclamation of the gospel, and will be welcomed by "sons of peace," i.e. those who are ready for salvation.\textsuperscript{33} When it is rejected, the gift of divine peace will return to the apostles who bear it.\textsuperscript{34}

The injunction that disciples are to remain in the same household for their entire stay in a town occurs in all the missionary discourses (Mark 6:10; Matt 10:11; Luke 9:4; 10:7).\textsuperscript{35} It is generally interpreted as a prohibition on moving to a different household to obtain a higher standard of accommodation.\textsuperscript{36}

A more complex issue concerns the instructions to the disciples in Luke 10:7–8, to eat and drink "whatever they provide" and to "eat what is set before you." The latter, in particular, warrants further examination, owing to close parallels in 1 Cor 10:27 and Gos. Thom. 14:4.

\textsuperscript{30} See Chapter Four, §3.4.2.
\textsuperscript{31} Green, Gospel of Luke, 413–14.
\textsuperscript{32} See Chapter One, §2.7.3.2, esp. nn. 90–92, 102, re the expectation of an era of peace.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.; Nolland, Luke, 552–53.
\textsuperscript{35} But see n. 50 below for further discussion on Mark 6:10–11.
1 Cor 10:27:

ei tis kalei imas twv apistovn kai thelete porenestei, pav to paratithmenon imin
esblste imen anakrinontes dia tin suneidhian.

If an unbeliever invites you to a meal and you are disposed to go, eat whatever is set
before you without raising any question on the ground of conscience.

Despite the obvious similarity between Paul’s statement and the relevant phrase in
Luke 10:8, the lack of the word παν (signifying everything) in the latter instruction
makes it much less sweeping.\textsuperscript{37} It is unlikely that it was intended to apply to non-
kosher food, since the mission of the seventy appears to have been limited to Israel.\textsuperscript{38}
At most, it was probably meant to apply to situations in which according to strict
Pharisaic principles, food might have been untithed or improperly prepared.\textsuperscript{39}

Nevertheless, the very close parallel alerts us to some significant issues.
While Luke’s account of the mission of the seventy is confined to Israel, it
anticipates the subsequent expansion of the ministry to include Gentiles.\textsuperscript{40} Now,
owing to the itinerant missionaries’ dependence on hospitality, it follows that as soon
as the mission to the Gentiles eventuated, the question of Jewish dietary restrictions
would inevitably become a major issue for the early church. Apart from the inexplicit
instructions in 10:7–8, Luke omits the issue from his Gospel, choosing to deal with it
extensively, albeit unconvincingly, in Acts 10, 11, and 15.\textsuperscript{41} One could reasonably
expect that the story of Peter’s vision (Acts 10:1–11:18) would lead to a conclusion
similar to that of Mark 7:19c. However, Luke overlooks its significance with respect
to Jewish dietary laws, and applies it not to the issue of “clean” vs. “unclean” food,

\textsuperscript{37} Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 553.
\textsuperscript{39} Loader, \textit{Attitude towards the Law}, 326.
\textsuperscript{40} Green, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 410–11.
but only to the Gentiles and their purity status. An even more pertinent issue for our purposes relates to the historical Jesus, and whether, as an itinerant, he might ever have found it necessary to rely on hospitality in a non-Jewish environment. We will consider this question below in §7.1.

*Gos. Thom.* 14:(4–5):

> When you go into any land and walk about in the districts, if they receive you, eat what they will set before you, and heal the sick among them. For what goes into your mouth will not defile you, but that which issues from your mouth — it is that which will defile you.43

The statements assigned to Jesus in these verses can readily be applied to the dietary dilemmas confronting the itinerant missionaries, and if the logia were authentic, they would neatly resolve the issues concerning non-kosher food. The sayings are particularly pertinent to the situation of missionaries travelling in Gentile territory, and in combination, imply that Jewish food laws are no longer valid. However, the text may be set aside, since neither of the sayings should be assessed as independent of parallels in the canonical Gospels. The first of the logia almost certainly derives from Luke 10:8–9a, and the second from Matt 15:11. As we saw in the examination of the handwashing dispute, it is highly probable that the logion concerning what defiles would originally have been intended as an inclusive antithesis, as against

---

44 Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 496. Cf. Funk (*Five Gospels*, 481), who suggests that the passage involves a more general religious and social context, and is not relevant to mission instructions.
45 Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 496.
46 *Contra Crossan, Birth of Christianity*, 326–27.
Mark’s interpretation of it as an exclusive antithesis. Matthew’s account of the
dispute restores what appears to have been the original meaning of the saying, and
removes any suggestion that Jesus overturned the dietary code. Hence, the
juxtaposition of Gos. Thom. 14:4 with a parallel version of Matt 15:11 puts a slant on
the latter text that is completely foreign to its true meaning. Further, as we have
shown above, the admonition to “eat what is set before you” in Luke 10:8 is not
applicable to itinerants travelling in Gentile lands. Thus the saying cannot justifiably
be transposed into that context in Gos. Thom. 14:4.

3.1.3.5. The seriousness of inhospitality:

The ambiguity in the accounts as to whether a welcome was offered by a
householder or an entire town is pertinent as we consider the injunction to the
missionaries to “shake off the dust” if they are rejected. Mark 6:10 is particularly
obscure, and may represent an abbreviated form of a more detailed instruction like
the Q material. However, in both of the Lucan missionary discourses, it is clear that
rejection is considered a corporate matter; this is the case too in his reports on
inhospitable towns in 9:51–52 and Acts 13:50–51. Some scholars consider that
shaking dust off the feet is connected with the Jewish practice of removing dust
acquired in foreign territory, before returning to Israel. The instruction is then taken

---

47 This judgment is based on the utilisation of imagery pertaining to the mouth, which is conspicuous in Matthew’s account, but absent from Mark’s. See Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 496.
48 Chapter Six, §§4.1.2 and 4.1.3.
49 See §3.1.3.4 above.
50 Nolland, Luke, 553. It is unclear as to whether ὅρω τὰ πόρια with subjunctive in Mark 6:10 means whenever or wherever (Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 121), but it is better interpreted wherever as in the NRSV. For the translation of v. 10, it is then feasible to apply τόπος (place, from v. 11) to ἐκεῖ ἔσται, and to accept that ἐκεῖ refers to the house, and ἐκεῖθεν to the town. For an interpretation of “place” as town, see e.g. Hooker, According to St Mark, 157. Matthew (10:14) attempts to resolve the ambiguity of his Marcan source by having the disciples shake off the dust of any house or town that rejects them.
to imply that any towns guilty of rejecting the emissaries are cut off from the Jewish
nation. 54 Better explanations are that it will serve as a testimony against those towns
on the day of the Lord, 55 or that it is a dramatised prophetic act, warning of
judgment. 56 The interpretation that judgment falls upon a whole town, perhaps as a
result of a single household’s rejection of the disciples, shows how seriously
inhospitality was judged. 57 The relevant Q material (Luke 10:12; Matt 10:15), in
which Jesus infers that such towns will be judged more harshly than Sodom, 58
confirms that inhospitable conduct to the disciples is the reason for their punishment.
Although Sodom was often associated with sexual immorality in Jewish literature, it
was linked above all with the violation of hospitality mores. 59 The sins of Sodomites
included failure to help the poor and needy despite their ability to do so, 60 and hatred
of strangers. 61 Hence there is a clear correlation between the punishment of Sodom,
and the threat of judgment expressed in Luke 10:12, especially since both situations
involve God’s envoys.

3.1.3.6. The call for repentance:

Both of the cited passages are suggestive of correlation between offering hospitality,
and heeding the call for repentance. This may be deduced from Mark 6:11 in that the
reverse is true: those who will not welcome the missionaries will not listen to their

55 Ibid. The testimony would require at least two witnesses. See n. 16 above.
56 Green, Gospel of Luke, 415; and see ibid. n. 51, comparing the prophetic action in Acts 21:10–11.
57 Conversely, one hospitable household might be sufficient to save a town from destruction, in
accordance with the principle established in Gen 18:16–33. However, that is not the principle Yahweh
employs in Genesis 19 and Joshua 2 and 6, where hospitable households are rescued, while their cities
are destroyed.
58 Matthew cites Gomorrah as well.
60 Ibid. 416 n. 56.; Ezek 16:48–49.
61 See ibid. 416 n. 56; and Josephus, Ant. 1.194–195; Wis 19:13–15.
proclamation either. From Luke 10:13–15 the hospitality–repentance relationship may be assumed from the sudden shift of focus from the inhospitality of Sodom, to the failure of Galilean cities to repent. The correspondence may be expressed: those who welcome and heed the message to repent, also welcome those who bear it.

3.1.3.7. Welcoming vs. rejecting:

As well as highlighting the antithesis between welcoming and rejecting, Luke 10:16 makes two significant points: that rejecting the disciples is equivalent to rejecting Jesus, and that to reject Jesus, God’s envoy, is to reject God. It is interesting that the statement at the conclusion of the mission charge in Matthew (10:40) is similar, but is expressed in terms of welcoming, as against rejecting. Hence both Luke 10:16 and Matt 10:40 show that the disciples are placed on an equal footing with Jesus, in respect to the treatment they receive as ἐκλητοί: potential hosts who reject them will be punished, while those who welcome Jesus or his disciples will be richly rewarded. In the next section we will consider the possible influence of Jesus’ and the missionaries’ power to heal, on a host’s willingness to receive them.

---

64 The missionary discourses clearly exemplify the principle that there is no middle path between hospitality and hostility. See Chapter Three, esp. §2.2.
66 The latter verse bears a close resemblance to Mark 9:37, which we will examine below in §5.2.
3.2. The power to heal:

3.2.1. Synoptic texts:

Together with proclamation of the kingdom, healing⁶⁸ is depicted in the missionary discourses as an integral part of the disciples’ ministry.⁶⁹ Yet it is apparent from Luke 10:8–9 that healing was only available to those who welcomed the disciples and their message; i.e. only those who heeded the call to repentance would be eligible. To pursue this question further, we will examine Mark’s account of Jesus’ rejection at Nazareth.

Mark 6:1–6:

1 Καὶ ἔξηλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. 2 καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἦραντο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, καὶ πολλοὶ ἄκουσαντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες, Πάθεν τούτῳ ταύτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τουλάχιστον διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γινόμεναι; 3 οὕτω αὐτός ἔστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφου καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; καὶ οὐκ εἶστιν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὅσα πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἑκατερολίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. 4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐκ ἑγεμόνευσαν αὐτόν καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. 5 καὶ οὐκ ἐδώκατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οἰκισμὸν δώματος, εἰ μὴ ὄλιγος ἀρρώστης ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν. 6 καὶ ἔθαυμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπίστιαν αὐτῶν. Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κόμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

1 He left that place and came to his hometown, and his disciples followed him. 2 On the sabbath he began to teach in the synagogue, and many who heard him were astounded.

They said, “Where did this man get all this? What is this wisdom that has been given to him? What deeds of power are being done by his hands! 3 Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?” And they took offense at him. 4 Then Jesus said to them, “Prophets are

---

not without honor, except in their hometown, and among their own kin, and in their own house.” 5 And he could do no deed of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them. 6 And he was amazed at their unbelief. Then he went about among the villages teaching.

This description of Jesus’ rejection in his hometown immediately precedes the pericope about the sending of the Twelve. Hooker has observed that the report in v. 6b, of Jesus teaching in villages other than Nazareth, is perhaps intended to highlight their willingness to hear, in comparison with inhabitants of his hometown.70 Likewise, a contrast is made between the few who were healed in Nazareth (6:5), and the many who were cured through the disciples’ ministry, in villages where they and their message were welcome (6:13). There seems to be a discrepancy between vv. 2d and 5, as to whether Jesus could perform “deeds of power” (δωρεάνεις) in Nazareth.71 Nevertheless, there is still a clear relationship overall, between the failure of Nazarenes to accept Jesus and his teaching, and their failure to receive healing.

Thus both Mark and Q indicate that healing is offered only after acceptance of Jesus or his disciples has occurred, and that it should not be seen as a potential means of attaining a hospitable reception. However, Crossan perceives the healing power of the itinerant disciples as crucially significant in their relationship with the householders, and in light of his conviction we turn now to consider the notion of an eating/healing dyad.

70 According to St Mark, 155.
71 Although this is explicable in that word could have spread about Jesus’ previous deeds, such as the raising of Jairus’ daughter (Mark 5:21–43). Re lack of faith in prophets and healers on their home territory, see Wilson, “Mark,” §702a, 805, referring to an Oxyrhynchus legion cited in Montague Rhodes James, ed. and trans., The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 27.
3.2.2. Crossan’s hypothesis:

3.2.2.1. Synopsis:

In the review of Crossan’s work, reference was made to his theory that the means by which a brokerless, egalitarian society was being achieved was what he terms a “dyad” of eating and healing. His hypothesis is based on the idea that the Christian missionaries had a reciprocal arrangement with the householders who provided hospitality to them: the missionaries offered healing to the host and his household, in return for receiving a shared meal. Crossan emphasises the connection between the two strands of Jesus’ command to the missionaries: they were to cure the sick in the towns where they were welcomed, and eat the meals that were provided. Although this idea is appealing, it has many inherent problems. We will consider in turn, its weaknesses and strengths.

3.2.2.2. Weaknesses:

Problems associated with the hypothesis are as follows:

- The notion cannot be sustained on grounds of Crossan’s key texts (Gos. Thom. 14:4; Luke 10:4–15; Mark 6:7–13), since the first of these is almost certainly inauthentic.

- Crossan believes that the in-breaking of the kingdom should be construed only as a phenomenon in the present, and not as a future reality as well. This perspective fails to recognise the historical Jesus as an eschatological prophet.

---

72 See Chapter One, §§3.2.1.2 and 3.2.2.4.
73 Crossan’s hypothesis is summarised well in “Itinerants and Householders,” 9–12, 24. See also Chapter One, n. 177.
74 See §3.1.3.4 above.
75 Crossan, Jewish Peasant, 304.
76 See Chapter One, §§2.7.3.1; 2.7.4; and also 2.8 re Jesus as an eschatological prophet; and §3.2.2.2 re Crossan’s understanding of eschatology.
• The concept places too little weight on the content of the proclamation and the necessity for repentance,\textsuperscript{77} and overemphasises the disciples’ power to heal. As we have seen, healing is available only after acceptance and repentance have occurred, and is properly viewed as one of the blessings conferred with the advent of the kingdom, and not as an end in itself.

• The notion of board and lodging in return for healing is feasible in terms of a labourer’s worthiness to receive a reward. However, the proverbial saying quoted in Luke 10:7a (and par. Matt 10:10b), is better seen as relevant to the ripeness of the harvest and need for labourers (Luke 10:2; Matt 9:37–38),\textsuperscript{78} and the “work” involves the mission in its entirety, not just healing.

• The reason Crossan posits for the rejection of the missionaries is unconvincing, and does not take account of the hospitality/hostility dichotomy. In both households and towns, the missionaries would either be received or rejected—there was no intermediate position.\textsuperscript{79}

• True hospitality is not about reciprocity at all, but is provided \textit{without anticipation of any reward}.\textsuperscript{80}

3.2.2.3. Strengths:

Despite the number of problems associated with Crossan’s theory, I am in complete agreement with one of its central aspects, viz. that in the missionary discourses, “we are not just dealing with almsgiving but with a shared table, with commensality.”\textsuperscript{81} In

\textsuperscript{77} Crossan considers that the requirement for \textit{μετάνοια} in Mark 6:12 is merely redactional (\textit{Birth of Christianity}, 329–30), and fails to perceive that an emphasis on repentance is discernible in Luke 10:12–15. See §3.1.3.6 above.

\textsuperscript{78} Green, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 414. See ibid. 414 n. 47 for other citations of the proverb.

\textsuperscript{79} The idea of an escalating rejection as the social programme spreads from rural to urban areas seems to read far too much into the house vs. town ambiguity in the texts. See Crossan, \textit{Birth of Christianity}, 331–32. In any case, the notion should be dismissed owing to its dependence on \textit{Gos Thom.} 14:4.

\textsuperscript{80} See Chapter Five, §4.2.3.

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Jewish Peasant}, 341.
addition, I fully endorse the distinction Crossan makes between commensality and almsgiving. Reception of the uninvited guests implied commensality, i.e. the host and members of his household shared their table with the missionaries. On the other hand, if the missionaries were only offered alms, it would be tantamount to rejection.

Even so, I would argue that Crossan's hypothesis is based on a misinterpretation of the evidence. The principles involved here are not specific to the in-breaking of the kingdom, and they are by no means new. Moreover, the real focus is not reciprocity, but ἀκλητοι, and the manner in which they are treated. That issue, and the disparity between commensality and almsgiving, are both well illustrated in *Odyssey*, and the following discussion will demonstrate the dichotomies of hospitality/hostility, and reception/rejection, in relation to unexpected arrivals.

3.3. *Commensality vs. almsgiving:*

Eumaeus, the loyal swineherd on Odysseus' estate, is a fine example of a compassionate, beneficent host. When Odysseus arrives uninvited, and disguised as a destitute tramp, Eumaeus provides generous hospitality over a three-day period, treating the supposed stranger as a commensal, and indeed, as if he were royalty. Eumaeus is shown as dividing and apportioning the meat so that his guest and all the members of the household receive equal amounts, with Odysseus receiving the portion of honour.

When Odysseus, still disguised as a πτωχός, arrives at the banqueting hall in his own palace, the situation is very different. During the long absences of Odysseus

---

82 Od. 17.515–516.
83 Od. 14; 15.301–495. (esp. 335–336); 16.
86 Πτωχός is conventionally rendered beggar in the passages concerning Odysseus' disguise, but a more accurate translation is dependent on others for support, or simply poor. See "πτωχός," "πένης,"
and his son Telemachus, the numerous suitors of Odysseus’ wife, Penelope, have wreaked havoc in the household, and held daily banquets. Although Telemachus is now present, and is nominally master of the house in the supposed absence of his father, the feast is largely dominated by the suitors. Eumaeus has brought Odysseus into the assembly, and encouraged him to go around the hall, begging.87 Most of the suitors give the “beggar” a small amount from their portions, but Antinous, the most malevolent of them, refuses.88

Thus the reception/rejection dichotomy is readily discerned in relation to the two meal situations. At Eumaeus’ table, the ἐκλήτως Odysseus enjoys commensality, and receives the portion of honour. In contrast, the suitors give him only scraps of food, and treat him as a beggar. The polarity between the generous hospitality shown to Odysseus by Eumaeus, and the conspicuous inhospitality of the suitors, is a prominent theme at this stage in the epic. There are frequent references to the forthcoming retribution.89 Even though the suitors, with the exception of Antinous,

BAGD 728, 642, respectively. Odysseus is understood here to be a poor stranger from abroad, and certainly has a different status from a local, familiar beggar. See Chapter Three, n. 34.

87 During this scene (17.324–491), Antinous chides Eumaeus for inviting the so-called “beggar.” In responding, Eumaeus denies having invited the man, pointing out that no one would seek out and invite a beggar from afar, unless he were “a prophet, or a healer of ills, or a builder, or perhaps a divine minstrel . . .” (μάλτιν ἦ ἤπειρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτων δώρων, ἢ καλ. θεσίων άουδον) [Murray, rev. Dimock, LCL]. The passage (17.382–384) is enticing in that it involves strangers and feasting, and because three of the four guest types seem applicable to Jesus, as depicted in Mark 6:3–6. However, analysis indicates the similarity of the texts is probably superficial, and irrelevant to the present discussion. Most likely, the only useful information is that according to Od. 17.384 a τέκτων had a fairly high status, at least in the Homeric era. This could perhaps apply to Jesus, but the situation was not necessarily the same in the NT milieu, nor is it certain that the term applies to exactly the same craft in the Homeric and Marcian texts. Although in Mark 6:3 τέκτων is usually rendered carpenter, the term can also mean builder, as in the version of Od. 17.384 cited above, despite the fact that it there refers specifically to a wood craftsman. See also Chapter One, n. 57. Re prophets and healers, note the possibility of a tradition that those who were strangers were held in high regard, in contrast with those on their home territory. Cf. Mark 6:4–6, and see n. 71 above. On the Marcian tradition that Jesus was a τέκτων see also Chapter Eight, §5.

88 Od. 17.411–412.

89 E.g. Od. 17.465 (Odysseus planning revenge after Antinous has hurled a stool and struck him); 17.492–494 (Penelope’s prayer that Antinous will be struck dead, in return for striking Odysseus); 17.539–540 (Penelope’s remark that if Odysseus returned, he and Telemachus would take vengeance on the men for their violent deeds); 17.546–547 (Penelope affirming that all the suitors will die, after Telemachus sneezes following the previous pronouncement); 17.597 (Eumaeus’ prayer that Zeus will
give food to Odysseus, their almsgiving is equivalent to rejection. In any case, all of
the suitors are already guilty of violating the mores of hospitality, and consequently,
all will perish.

The punishment ultimately meted out to the suitors and the disloyal members
of Odysseus’ household is extremely harsh, but in fact, no more so than the divine
retribution which is prophesied for inhospitable towns in the missionary discourses.90
Similarly severe is the depiction of God’s judgment in Matt 25:31–46, upon those
who have not demonstrated a hospitable attitude or cared for the sick and needy.
Failure to provide for the hungry and thirsty, and/or to welcome the stranger (ξένος),
are specifically mentioned, and needy persons in these categories are placed ahead of
the naked,91 the sick, and the imprisoned.92 Ultimately, the judgment of individuals as
righteous and blessed, or wicked and accursed, is made in accordance with the
treatment they have given to the least of Jesus’ disciples.93 Initially, however, it is
shown to be based on whether or not they have cared for Jesus himself, when he was
hungry, thirsty, a stranger, etc. It will be salutary now to see what light is shed on
various NT passages when Jesus, and some others, are viewed as ἀκλητοὶ.

utterly destroy the evil men). The references continue in the following books until all prophecies of
vengeance are fulfilled.
90 See Luke 10:10–15; Matt 10:14–15; and §3.1.3.5 above.
91 It is apparent from Odyssey that provision of clothing, as well as food and drink, is a normal
component of hospitable conduct. See e.g. Od. 14.510–522 re Eumaeus’ provision of a cloak for the
“stranger.”
92 Matt 25:42–43.
93 i.e. ἐκ τῶν τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἔλαχιστον (Matt 25:40). Since Jesus is referred to as “the
Son of Man” (ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) in v. 31 of the passage concerning the judgment of the nations
(Matt 25:31–46), οἱ ἀδελφοί could plausibly be understood as encompassing all human beings, not
just his disciples. This would apply also in Matt 25:45. However, in view of the identification of
Jesus’ family [mother, brothers (and sisters)] as those who do the will of God (Mark 3:35 and parr.
Matt 12:50; Luke 8:21), it is possible that “brothers” of Jesus means his disciples. See also the
discussion on the meaning of “in the name of Jesus” in §5 below.
4. Luke 7:31–34:

4.1. *The παιδία in the marketplace:*

In Chapter Five, §4.2.4, it was suggested that the reason Jesus was called a “glutton and drunkard” (Luke 7:34) was his reputation for arriving at meals ἄκλητος. We will now investigate the issue further by examining Luke 7:31–34 in light of the idea that the παιδία in the marketplace are young slaves or servants, rather than children.94

4.2. *Text and translation:*

31 Τίνι αὖν ὁμοιόως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ τίνι εἰσίν ὁμοίοι; 32 ὁμοιοὶ εἰσίν παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἁγορῇ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλους ἢ λέγει, Ἡγιάζωμεν ἢ μὲν καὶ οὐκ ἀφράσατε, ἐθηρήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλεισατε. 33 ἔλθωσαν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μὴ ἐσθίων ἀρτον μήτε πίνων οίνου, καὶ λέγετε, Ἰωάννην ἔχει. 34 ἔλθωσαν ὁ νόμος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἰδοὺ ἀνθρώπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπόθης, φίλος τελωνίων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν.

31 “To what then will I compare the people of this generation, and what are they like?

32 They are like servants sitting in the marketplace and calling to one another, ‘We played the flute for you, and you did not dance; we wailed, and you did not weep.’ 33 For John the Baptist has come eating no bread and drinking no wine, and you say, ‘He has a demon’; 34 the Son of Man has come eating and drinking, and you say, ‘Look, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!’ “

The term παιδίον has several different meanings, the most relevant in the present context being a young slave, male or female.95 Others meanings are: very young

---

94 See Chapter One, §§3.4.1 and 3.4.3. On the few differences between Luke 7:31–34 and its par.
child, infant (either a boy or a girl, and often a newborn child),\textsuperscript{96} child, as distinct from an adult;\textsuperscript{97} child, from the perspective of God, or of some other father figure.\textsuperscript{98} Undoubtedly, it is used much more often in reference to a young child, and this factor has probably been influential for interpretation of some NT passages, such as Luke 7:31–34; Mark 9:36–37; 10:13–15 and parr.\textsuperscript{99} However, a point that should not be overlooked is that in Mark 5:35–43, παιδίον is used three times (vv. 39, 40, 41) of Jairus' daughter, whose age is given as twelve years (v. 42).\textsuperscript{100} This is significant, as it shows that the girl had attained her majority,\textsuperscript{101} and that it is not essential to regard other NT occurrences of παιδίον as referring to very young children.

A further reason for substituting "servants" for "children" in the marketplace, is that an understanding here of παιδίον as, say, young slave-lad or little servant-girl is justifiable on the grounds that it is a diminutive of παιζέ,\textsuperscript{102} and is appropriate with regard to the vulnerability of young slaves to sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{103}

4.3. Interpretation:

The identification of the παιδία as servants or slaves allows for a much more plausible situation than that of children playing a game in the marketplace.\textsuperscript{104} The sympotic elements in the passage (music, dance, excessive eating and drinking),

\textsuperscript{96} See "παιδίον, ου, τό," 1, BAGD 604. E.g. in the LXX, Gen 17:12; in the NT, Matt 2:8 etc.; Luke 1:59 etc.

\textsuperscript{97} See "παιδίον, ου, τό," 2. a, BAGD 604; in the LXX, Isa 3:5; 4 Macc 4:9; in the NT, 1 Cor 14:20. In the OT, the plural παιδία is used frequently in reference to the progeny in a household, and translated in the NRSV as little ones; e.g. Gen 45:19. Likewise, in the NT, Luke 11:7.

\textsuperscript{98} See "παιδίον, ου, τό," 2. b, BAGD 604; in the LXX, Tob 4:4; in the NT, John 21:5; 1 John 2:18.

\textsuperscript{99} The stories recounted in Mark 9:33–37 and 10:13–16 are discussed below in §§5.2 and 7.1 respectively.

\textsuperscript{100} In Mark 5:42, the term κοράσιον is used instead. Matthew (9:24, 25) also refers to the girl as a κοράσιον, while Luke (8:51, 54) uses the term παιζέ. While Matthew's version lacks any reference to the age of the lass, Luke (8:42) states that the girl was about twelve.

\textsuperscript{101} A minor was defined as a male under the age of thirteen, or a female under twelve (Epstein, Nezikin 4:147 n. 11).

\textsuperscript{102} See "παιζέ, παιδός, ὁ ἢ ἢ," BAGD 604–605 re alternative meanings: boy, youth, girl, servant, slave, son. See also n. 270 below.

\textsuperscript{103} Corley, Private Women, 25–28, 48–49.
suggest a dining context, and the παιδία may readily be imagined as young flautists waiting to be hired out, either as entertainers for a celebratory banquet, or to play dirges at a funeral feast.\textsuperscript{105} The term “this generation” refers to Israelites who have refused John’s baptism, and who are now failing to respond to Jesus’ proclamation;\textsuperscript{106} vv. 29–30 indicate that it is being applied specifically to the Pharisees and lawyers.\textsuperscript{107} It is sometimes suggested that the parable is not identifying “this generation” with the παιδία, but rather that it should be understood as referring to a situation in which the latter are behaving thus.\textsuperscript{108} However, I would argue that the unbelieving Israelites are being compared directly with two hypothetical groups of slaves/servants, one of entertainers, and the other of mourners. Members of the former group have the expectation that banqueters will dance to their tune, while the latter expect their dirges to evoke tears. The “entertainers,” who believe that it is a time for celebration, are irritated because the “mourners” fail to respond by dancing. Conversely, the “mourners,” who propose that it is a time for lamentation, are annoyed because the “entertainers” refuse to weep.

When the analogy is applied to the groups’ reactions to John and Jesus (vv. 33–34), the first group fails to respond to John’s call to repentance, claiming that it is a time for merrymaking. The second group, on the other hand, refuses to respond to Jesus’ offer of the kingdom (i.e. his invitation to participate in the eschatological banquet), asserting that the feasting he anticipates is inappropriate.

\textsuperscript{104} The passage is notoriously difficult for exegetes. See e.g. Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 343–44.
\textsuperscript{106} See Meier, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 145. The terminology is rooted in OT references to Israel, as e.g. a \textit{perverse} and/or \textit{crooked} generation in Deut 32:5, 20. Its use by Jesus is well documented in both Mark and Q, and may well be authentic (Meier, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 209 n. 134).
Two matters mentioned in Chapter Four, §3.4.1 are of relevance here. Firstly, we saw that God’s wrath would be upon those who attended exclusive, luxurious feasts, ignoring his deeds and purpose, and neglecting the poor. Secondly, it was observed that feasting was not appropriate at times of national mourning, and that this principle found support in rabbinic literature. On both counts, the Pharisees’ and lawyers’ criticism would be justified, if they perceived Jesus as a prodigal partygoer who failed to uphold the Hebrew ethic of caring for the needy, and ignored a prophetic call for national lamentation. Yet obviously, this image was not applicable to Jesus. Rather, he is depicted as bringing in a new era, which, in stark contrast to the asceticism characterising John’s ministry, will culminate in the eschatological banquet. It is clear, too, that the Pharisees had neither heeded John’s warning, nor treated the period of his ministry as a time of national mourning. The point of the parable is that neither group of πατήρ has the authority to be “calling the tune” as to whether it is a time for rejoicing or mourning—as Israelites they should see themselves merely as God’s servants. It is God’s prerogative to decide on the appropriate season for the people of Israel, and it is for his envoys, first John, and then Jesus, to announce it, i.e. to “call the tune.”

Although the parable itself involves a purely hypothetical situation, the slurs against John and Jesus are almost certainly grounded in actual opposition slander. We will look now at the criticism of Jesus cited in Luke 7:34.

4.4. Jesus: “glutton and drunkard”:

The application of the description “a glutton and a drunkard” (ἀνθρώπος φάγως καὶ οἰνοπότης)\(^{109}\) to Jesus strongly implies that he had a reputation for turning up to meals uninvited, i.e. as an ἀκλητος or παράσιτος.\(^{110}\) The term οἰνοπότης means literally wine-drinker, rather than the usual translation drunkard,\(^{111}\) but the inference here that Jesus drank to excess is immediately redolent of the characteristic drunkenness of ἀκλητος.\(^{112}\) The consequent probability that Jesus was branded as an ἀκλητος is strengthened when we consider the term φάγως,\(^{113}\) since there is irrefutable evidence for the identification of parasites and gluttons. Odysseus, when disguised as a destitute stranger, is automatically regarded as a “filthy glutton,” and as having a “bottomless belly,”\(^{114}\) and the term παράσιτος is found in comedy as a euphemism for

---

\(^{109}\) The terms glutton and drunkard appear together in five texts in the NRSV: Deut 21:20, Prov 23:21, Matt 11:19, Luke 7:34 and 4 Macc 2:7. Matt 11:19 and Luke 7:34 (and only these, in the literature cited in LSJ), use the identical Greek terms φάγως and οἰνοπότης. Prov 23:21 should be excluded since glutton is not an accurate translation of πορνοκόμος, which means one who has commerce with prostitutes, fornicator, (“πορνοκόμος,” LSJ 1450). Deut 21:20 is not directly comparable since both terms used are different from those of the Q passage, and συμβολοκοπωῖ translates as given to feasting rather than glutton (“συμβολοκοπωῖ,” LSJ 1676). Prov 23:21 and Deut 21:20 are comparable in the original Hebrew in that the same verbs מִזְרְח and כָּאָשֶׁר are used in each, though their order is reversed in Prov 23:21. However, מִזְרְח actually means be frivolous (“1 מִזְרְח: qal,” Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 89), and thus the participle מִזְרְח is evidently translated as glutton(s) in Prov 23:21 (NIV) only because of the context of excessive eating of meat and drinking of wine. In Deut 21:20 (NIV) מִזְרְח is translated as profligate. (Hence the difference in the terminology used in the LXX for the two verses.) I do not concur with the opinion of N. T. Wright, who follows Jeremias’ claim of an association between Deut 21:20 and Q 7:34 [Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (3d ed.; London: SCM, 1972), 160]. Despite having acknowledged the discrepancies in the Greek terms used, Wright states on the basis of Deut 21:20 that “it is quite likely that Jesus was ... regarded as a ‘rebellious son’ ” (Victory of God, 440). Contra Jeremias see also Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:681. Nevertheless, Meier points out that whether or not an allusion to the LXX passage was intentional in Q, we cannot determine if the original accusation had that intent, since Jesus may have cited it in Aramaic (Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 212 n. 155). 4 Macc 2:7 uses Greek terms which are yet again different from the Q passage, γαστρομαργος καὶ μέθυσις, “gluttonous or even a drunkard” (“γαστρομαργος, oι,” LSJ 339; NRSV), and is not considered relevant.

\(^{110}\) Re parasites see Chapter Four, §4, esp. n. 290.

\(^{111}\) See “οἰνοπότης,” LSJ 562.

\(^{112}\) See Chapter Four, §4.

\(^{113}\) I.e. glutton. See “φάγως,” LSJ 1911.

\(^{114}\) Od. 17.219, 228.
a gluttonous person (περί πολυθάγος τύνωος). However, much more frequently the epithets used for stereotypical ἄκλητοι (i.e. parasites and flatterers) are overtly offensive and/or sarcastic descriptions pertaining to their reputation; e.g. γάστρις (glutton);116 γάστρων (pot-belly);117 κνυσοικός (fat-licker);118 ἐπίστοις (victual-seeker); σιτόκοιρος (bread-shearer);119 and λαρυγγικὸν (throat specialist).120 In light of this evidence for the traditional association of gluttony with uninvited guests, it is clear that the most likely reason for the epithet “glutton and drunkard” to be applied to Jesus is that he had acquired a reputation as an ἄκλητος. We will therefore proceed now to test the validity of the hypothesis by applying it to various NT passages.

5. In the name of Jesus:

5.1. Hospitality to ἄκλητοι:

Before commencing the exegesis of relevant NT texts, it is necessary to draw together some of our previous findings. In Chapter Five, it was found that the toll collectors of the Synoptics represent ideal hosts, who demonstrate their repentance, and eligibility for the kingdom, by offering hospitality to Jesus and his disciples.121 Again, we saw above in §3.3, that in both Homeric epic and the NT, divine judgment of potential hosts depends on whether or not hospitality has been offered to the needy and/or strangers. The arrival of a divine envoy such as Odysseus or Jesus in the guise of an

115 Athenaeus, Deipn. 421d.
116 See “γάστρις, οὐς ορ εὐς, δ, ἦ,” 2, LSJ 339; Aristophanes, Av. 1604.
117 See “γάστρων, ωυς, δ, = γάστρις,” LSJ 339; Aristophanes, Ran. 200.
118 Athenaeus, Deipn. 125e.
119 Ibid. 247e.
120 Ibid. 246f. Other examples include οἰκοσυνος (living on his own means), οἰκοσύνος (bringing his own food), κακόστοις (off his food, i.e. fastidious), δληγόστος (little-feeder) [Athenaeus, Deipn. 247e]; and ψωμικόλις (crumb-flatterer, i.e. one who flatters to get a morsel of bread) [Athenaeus, Deipn. 261f]. It should be noted that absolutely no suggestion is being made here that the historical Jesus resembled in his behaviour or morals the stock character παράσιτος/κόλας as depicted in comedy. The hypothesis simply is that by seeking hospitality as a wayfarer/stranger, he had gained a reputation for arriving at meals without a formal invitation, i.e. ἄκλητος.
121 See §4.2.2.
≺κλητος functions as a test of an individual’s or group’s willingness to provide hospitality when there is no expectation of reciprocity or reward. The ultimate fate of the potential host is determined by the response offered to the stranger: hospitable individuals or groups will be richly rewarded, while those who are inhospitable will be harshly punished. In Odyssey, it is clear from Eumaeus’ conduct and words that any wayfarer would have been given similar hospitality and kindness.\footnote{See e.g. Od. 14.48–58, esp. 56–58: “Stranger, it is not right for me to slight a stranger, even though one of less account than you were to come: for all strangers and beggars are from Zeus,” (Murray, rev. Dimock, LCL).}

Nevertheless, the suitors and the household staff are tested solely on whether or not they demonstrate hospitality and loyalty to Odysseus. In the NT, by way of contrast, the worthiness of individuals is gauged not only on their response to Jesus, but on whether they care appropriately for any disciple of Jesus, however lowly.\footnote{See §3.3 above re Matt 25:40, 45; and also §§3.1.3.5 and 3.1.3.7.}

Another finding, from Chapter Five, §4.2.2, is that disciples of Jesus who attend a banquet as his associates may be regarded as present “in his name.” Jesus is in solidarity with his disciples, acting as their guarantor, and enabling them to gain entry. We will see from the examination of relevant texts in §5.3, that this concept is also applicable to the eschatological banquet, with Jesus acting as a mediator for his followers.

5.2. \textit{The need for humility:}

5.2.1. The key texts:

The most significant passage to be examined in this section is Mark 9:33–37, but Mark 10:15 and 35–45 are included as well, for comparative purposes.\footnote{The complete pericope Mark 10:13–16 is examined in §7.1 below.}
Mark 9:33–37:

33 Καὶ ἠλθόν εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος ἐπηρώτα αὐτοῖς, Ἡ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διηλεγόμεθα; 34 οὐ δὲ ἐσωπόων· πρὸς ἄλληλους γὰρ διελέγησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τίς μείζων. 35 καὶ καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐὰν τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἦστη πάντων ἐσχάτος καὶ πάντων διάκονος. 36 καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον ἐστησεν αὐτό ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐναγκαλιάσμενος αὐτὸ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 37 ὃς ἂν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις παιδίων δέχηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπόματί μου, ἡμέ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχηται, ὁ πάντα ὑποστείλεται ἡμῖν.

33 Then they came to Capernaum; and when he was in the house he asked them, “What were you arguing about on the way?” 34 But they were silent, for on the way they had argued with one another who was the greatest. 35 He sat down, called the twelve, and said to them, “Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all.” 36 Then he took a servant-boy and had him stand in front of them; and he put his arm around him, and he said to them, 37 “Whoever welcomes one such boy in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes not so much me but the one who sent me.”

Mark 10:15:

ἀμὴν λέγω ἡμῖν, ὃς ἂν μὴ δέχῃται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ως παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν.

“Truly I tell you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a young servant will never enter it.”

Mark 10:35–45:

35 Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, θέλεμεν ὅτι ἐὰν αἰτήσωμεν σε ποιήσῃ ἡμῖν. 36 ὃ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί θέλετε [με] ποιήσῃ ἡμῖν; 37 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δῶς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἰς σοῦ ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀριστερῶν καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου. 38 δὲ ἦραν αἰτήσει αὐτοῖς. Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθαι, δύνασθαι πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὁ ἐγώ πίνω ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ ἐγώ βαπτίζωμαι βαπτισθῆται; 39 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δυνάμεθα. ὃ δὲ ἦραν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τὸ ποτήριον
ο ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζωμαι βαπτισθήσεσθε. 40 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐκ εὐωνύμων οὐκ ἔστων ἐμῶν δοῦναι, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἴστι θησαυροί. 41 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δὲ ἠρέσαντο ἁγανακτίσαντες περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. 42 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτούς ἐκ Νσσιάς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἁκούσαντες ἀρχεῖα τῶν ἑθῶν κατακριβέσασιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάσασιν αὐτῶν. 43 οὐχ οὗτος δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ἱμάτιοι, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ἱμάτιοι, ἔσται ἱμάτιον διάκονος. 44 καὶ ὡς ἐν θέλῃ ἐν ἱμάτιοι εἴναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος. 45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὑιὸς τοῦ διὸ θεοῦ ἦλθεν διακοσμηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακοσμήσει καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρου ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

35 James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came forward to him and said to him,

“Teacher, we want you to do for us whatever we ask of you.” 36 And he said to them,

“What is it you want me to do for you?” 37 And they said to him, “Grant us to sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your glory.” 38 But Jesus said to them,

“You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” 39 They replied, “We are able.” Then Jesus said to them, “The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptized, you will be baptized; 40 but to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared.” 41 When the ten heard this, they began to be angry with James and John. 42 So Jesus called them and said to them, “You know that among the Gentiles those whom they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. 43 But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant, 44 and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. 45 For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.”

As in Luke 7:31–34, παιδίον is best understood in Mark 9:36–37 and 10:15 as a young servant or slave, particularly in view of the occurrence of the term διάκονος in 9:35. Although the neuter word παιδίον could refer to either a boy or a girl, I have
opted for the former in 9:37, with "boy" having a sense similar to the French garçon, i.e. implying either lowly status or youthfulness, or both. The expression ἐν μέσῳ means literally in the middle, but frequently has the meaning in front of, which fits the context better in this passage. The verb ἐναγκάζεσθαι is usually understood in 9:36 as to take in one's arms, on the grounds that the subject is an infant. However, assuming the παιδίον is a youngster of, say, twelve or thirteen years, standing in front of the group, a better image is of Jesus simply putting his arm(s) around the boy. The slight change from the wording of the NRSV for 9:37 is an acknowledgement of the inclusive antithesis denoted by the οἶκος...ἀλλά clause.

5.2.2. Exegetical issues:

Mark 9:33–37 presents several exegetical problems. Firstly, although Jesus was apparently in Capernaum frequently (Mark 1:21; 2:1; 9:33), there is insufficient detail to determine precisely where he was based. Considering his itinerant status, it is likely that he stayed at Peter's home, as Mark 1:29–36 suggests. Secondly, Jesus' calling of the Twelve to hear the logion of v. 35 is distinctly artificial, and evidently a Marcan redaction. It probably indicates the importance of the teaching, as is likely too in Mark 10:41–42, where Jesus draws the other ten disciples to hear what he says to James and John. Thirdly, vv. 36–37 do not appear relevant to 35b; indeed, it has been suggested that these two verses, and Mark 10:15, may have been

---

125 Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 138.
126 See e.g. Funk, Five Gospels, 84.
127 As e.g. in Hooker, According to St Mark, 227. Note that Funk (Five Gospels, 84) has understood the παιδίον to be a young girl.
129 Note that translating ἐν οἴκῳ (2:1) as at home does not necessarily imply it was Jesus' house.
130 Hooker, According to St Mark, 227.
transposed. Nevertheless, we cannot assume that this was the case, and the received text is comprehensible when considered in relation to the other two cited passages.

5.2.3. Interpretation:

The passages Mark 9:33–37; 10:15, 35–45 contain several themes that are common either to all, or to at least two of the three. They include humility; servitude; the reversal motif; the kingdom, as both a present and future reality; and hospitality as the overarching theme. Each of the texts is focused on hospitality: in the first two, this is indicated by the occurrence of the verb δέχομαι, while in the third, the question posed by James and John in 10:37 concerns seating arrangements at the eschatological banquet. Again, all three texts depict Jesus teaching his disciples about the need for humility. They must possess the attitude of a servant if they wish to enter the kingdom. In the context of hospitality, it is clear that anyone with the status of a slave or servant would be categorised as an ἀκλητος, and this factor has important implications with respect to Jesus and his disciples.

The reversal motif is a prominent feature in the first and third texts (9:35; 10:44) occurring as a dichotomy between first and last (least), and highlighting the fact that the kingdom has both present and future aspects. For those who aspire to an exalted place in the kingdom in the future, it is necessary to behave in the present as would a humble servant. The point is confirmed in Mark 10:15, viz.: eligibility to enter the kingdom in the future, and to participate in the eschatological banquet,

131 Ibid. 228; Wilson, “Mark,” §705e, 810. The parallel versions in Matthew (18:1–5; 19:13–15) are smoother, with the equivalent of Mark 10:15 placed at Matt 18:3–4, in the story concerning the dispute over greatness. See Hooker, According to St Mark, 228.
132 Further evidence of banqueting imagery in the first and third texts is found in the references to cups and drinking. See the passage immediately following 9:33–37, esp. v. 41; and 10:38–39. The perception that all three texts pertain to banqueting is therefore to be preferred over against the
depends on one’s ability in the present, to accept the kingdom with the humility of a young slave or servant.\textsuperscript{134}

In the next section we will consider the implications of Jesus’ and the disciples’ status in the context of receiving hospitality, both in the present, and in the future, i.e. at the eschaton.

5.3. The invitation to commensality:

5.3.1. The significance of Jesus’ name:

This section investigates what it means to welcome a παιδίον “in the name” of Jesus, as in Mark 9:37. In order to comprehend the terminology involved, we need to examine several verses that follow the key passage from Mark 9, with v. 37 repeated here for convenience.

Mark 9:37–42:

37 “Ος ἂν ἐν τοῖς τουοίτων παιδίων δέχηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὁ ἂν ἐμὲ δέχεται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστελεῖλατά με. 38 Εὐχὴ αὐτῶ, ὁ Ἰωάννης, Διδάσκαλε, ἑδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλύμεν αὐτῶν, ὥστε οὐκ ἴχθυον ἤμεν. 39 ὃ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Μὴ κωλύσετε αὐτῶν. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔστιν ὃς ποιήσῃ δίκαιον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου καὶ δυσφήσεται ταχὺ κακολογήσῃ με· 40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ἴματιν, ὅπερ ἴματιν ἔστιν. 41 “Ος γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ἰμᾶς ποτήριον ἰδίατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὃτι Χριστὸς ἔστι, ἀμήν λέγω ἢμιν ὃτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. 42 Καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἑνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστεύσαντων [εἰς ἐμὲ], καλὸν ἔστιν αὐτῷ μέλλον εἰ περικείεται μίλος ὄντις περὶ τὸν τρέχοντα αὐτῶ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.

37 “Whoever welcomes one such boy in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes not me but the one who sent me.” 38 John said to him,
“Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, and we tried to stop him, because he was not following us.” 39 But Jesus said, “Do not stop him; for no one who does a deed of power in my name will be able soon afterward to speak evil of me. 40 Whoever is not against us is for us. 41 For truly I tell you, whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you bear the name of Christ will by no means lose the reward. 42 “If any of you put a stumbling block before one of these little ones who believe in me, it would be better for you if a great millstone were hung around your neck and you were thrown into the sea.

While it is possible that Mark has drawn together the sayings in this passage on the strength of the keyword ὄνομα, the interwoven themes of hospitality, humility, and solidarity provide a unifying influence. The focus on hospitality in v. 37 is resumed in v. 41, together with reference to the promise of a reward for offering even the most meagre hospitality to a disciple of Jesus. The reward for welcoming a disciple in v. 41, contrasted with the threat of dire punishment for causing harm to one of them in the following verse, is redolent of the previously discussed dichotomy between hospitality and hostility. Emphasis on humility is carried over from the employment of the παιδίον as a prime example in vv. 36–37, to the reference to disciples as μικροί in v. 42. The solidarity of Jesus and his disciples is demonstrated in several ways. Firstly, in the episode concerning the “outsider” exorcist, there is the use of the plural “us” in vv. 38, 40. Although this may indicate that the story derives from the early church, it is important because it gives a sense of Jesus and his disciples acting as a cohesive group, even when they are physically separated. The idea of solidarity among those siding with Jesus also gains support

135 Hooker, According to St Mark, 229; Wilson, “Mark,” §705e, 810.
136 See §3.1.3.7 above, esp. n. 64, and Chapter Three §2.2.
137 Note that Matthew appears to identify παιδίον and μικροί (18:4–6; cf. Mark 9:37, 42). See Hooker, According to St Mark, 231.
from the approximate parallels to Mark 9:40 found in Matt 12:30 and Luke 11:23, despite the fact that the saying and its variations were probably proverbial.\textsuperscript{139}

Secondly, the outsider’s use of Jesus’ name in his practice of exorcism suggests that the missionaries employed it in a similar way in their own ministry, both during Jesus’ lifetime,\textsuperscript{140} and after his resurrection.\textsuperscript{141} The disciples are therefore seen to be dependent on Jesus and on his name, before and after his death. Their relationship may be understood as one of solidarity, i.e. of “faith,” as expressed by the use of the verb πιστεύω in v. 42. Thirdly, it is evident from Jesus’ supportive and protective stance toward his disciples in v. 42 that he is in solidarity with them.

Now, although the incident recounted in vv. 38–40 supports the concept of solidarity among Jesus and his disciples, the use of his name here differs from the connotations it has in vv. 37 and 41. In ancient thought, a person’s name had intrinsic power, and the use of Jesus’ name for healing or exorcism would be expected to effect a cure as if he himself were performing the act.\textsuperscript{142} In v. 37, on the other hand, where ὄνομα occurs in the phrase ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματί, it represents Jesus himself,\textsuperscript{143} and the ἐπὶ followed by the dative indicates the basis for an action.\textsuperscript{144} The welcome given to the παῖδιον in v. 37 is best understood then, as being on the grounds of the host’s devotion to Jesus.\textsuperscript{145} Thus although the word order in the verse tends to put emphasis primarily on the relationship between the host and the παῖδιον, and only then refers to the identity of Jesus and the boy, it is clear that the host must first have been in

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid. 229.
\textsuperscript{139} See Hooker, According to St Mark, 230, citing Cicero, Lig. 11.
\textsuperscript{140} See Mark 6:7, 13.
\textsuperscript{141} The use of Jesus’ name for teaching, healing, and exorcism, is evident in Acts, e.g. 5:28; 9:34; 19:13–17.
\textsuperscript{142} Hooker, According to St Mark, 229.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid. 228; Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 138. See Dana M. Pike, “names,” HBD 734, re representatives acting “in the name” of a higher authority, e.g. in 1 Sam 25:5; Esth 3:12.
\textsuperscript{144} Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 138; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §126, p. 42.
relationship with Jesus. Understanding the reception of the παιδίον in this way allows us to perceive him as a typical ἀκλήτος, a slave or servant who would gain entry to a banquet only by accompanying his master as a "shadow." This means of accessing hospitality brings to mind the discussion of Mark 2:15 in Chapter Five, and the possibility that the "sinners" attending Levi’s banquet did so by “following” Jesus into the house. We turn now to the matter of access to the kingdom and the eschatological banquet.

5.3.2. Gaining entry to the eschatological banquet:

It is already clear that salvation, and a place at the eschatological banquet, are attained by those who provide hospitality to Jesus and/or his disciples. We need to look more closely now at the means by which disciples other than hosts are assured of a place.

Given the connection discerned between Mark 9:37 and 10:15, and their counterparts in Matt 18:2–3, it is apparent that attending an earthly banquet by virtue of one’s association with Jesus, is analogous to gaining access to the eschatological banquet. Eligibility to enter the kingdom, and to be a commensal of Jesus at the eschatological banquet, is achieved simply by being his disciple, and by maintaining the humble attitude of a παιδίον. In accordance with the reversal motif, Jesus’ situation alters dramatically following his death and resurrection: the risen and glorified Jesus is envisaged as the chief guest at the eschatological banquet. The exalted Jesus will then act in a mediating role between his disciples, and God, the gracious host.

145 Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 138.
146 See Chapter Four, §4, esp. nn. 320–21.
147 §4.2.2.
148 And perhaps some toll collectors.
149 This topic is discussed further in Chapter Eight.
The situation of the emissaries (the Twelve and the seventy), requires specific explanation, since the discussion in §3.1 focused on whether the householders welcomed or rejected the missionaries, rather than on the disciples’ relationship with Jesus. It is apparent now, in light of our findings, that humility, and a personal relationship with Jesus, are both crucial for eligibility to participate in the eschatological banquet. The apostles’ solidarity with Jesus is not in doubt, as it would obviously have been a prerequisite for their commissioning. However, the teaching found in Mark 9:33–37, 10:15, and 35–45 suggests that Jesus had to provide several reminders about the concomitant requirement for humility and servitude.

5.3.3. The importance of commensality with Jesus:

Eligibility to participate in the eschatological banquet is usually considered in relation to the central tenets of the Christian faith, i.e. Jesus’ death and resurrection as the means of atonement and salvation. In other words, the focus is on the Passion Tradition, rather than the Commensality Tradition.150 The finding that being a table companion of the historical Jesus is analogous to being a commensal of the exalted Jesus, suggests a need to examine other meal situations within the Commensality Tradition in this light. Two outstanding examples of commensality with Jesus are, of course, the feeding stories and the Last Supper. Although the present study is focused most specifically upon Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners, both of these meal traditions are important, and will be explored in Chapter Eight. It is worth noting here that the Passion Tradition is not found in Q, and that it does not allow a clear link to be made between salvation from sin, and entrée to the eschatological banquet. By way of contrast, the significance of the Commensality Tradition is indicated by the likelihood that the historical Jesus adopted the role of a
lowly ἐκλήτος, and the evidence that faith in Jesus, and an attitude of humble servitude, allow access to the eschatological banquet. This is not to play down in any way the centrality of the passion story. Rather, it is to suggest that Jesus’ table fellowship, and its innate connection with the eschatological banquet, deserve to be given greater prominence in the faith tradition. We will return to this issue below, in §7.2.2.4.

6. Jesus, and a woman, as ἐκλήτος:

6.1. Luke 16:1–8a:

6.1.1. The text:

1 Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς, Ἀνθρωπῶς τις ἦν πλοῦσιος δὲ εἶχεν οἰκονόμων, καὶ οὗτος διεμβάλῃ αὐτῷ ὡς διακορπιζόν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. 2 καὶ φωνῆσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τί τούτο ἀκοῦσθαι περὶ σοῦ; ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου, οὐ γὰρ ἀλήθη ἔτι οἰκονομοῖ. 3 εἶπεν δὲ ἐν ταὐτῷ ὁ οἰκονόμος, Τί ποιήσω, ὅτι ὁ κύριός μου ἀφαιρεῖται τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ; ὁμέρεις ὁ λόγος, ἐπαιτεῖς αἰτείον. 4 ἐγνώκα τι ποιήσω, ἵνα ὅταν μετασταθῶ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας δεῖξαι με εἰς τοὺς οἰκονομοὺς αὐτῶν. 5 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἔκακος τῶν χρυσοφιλετῶν τοῦ κυρίου ταυτὸς ἔλεγεν τῷ πρῶτῳ, Πώσου ὀψιλίας τῷ κυρίῳ μου; 6 δὲ εἶπεν, Ἑκατὸν βάτους ἐλαίου, ὅ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Δέξαι σου τὰ γράμματα καὶ καθήκας ταχέως γράφου πεντήκοντα. 7 ἐστάτα ἐτέρῳ εἶπεν, Σὺ δὲ πόσου ὀψιλίας; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἑκατὸν κύριος σίτου. λέγει αὐτῷ, Δέξαι σου τὰ γράμματα καὶ γράφον ὑγιῆκοντα. 8 καὶ ἐπήρεσαν ὁ κύριος τῶν οἰκονόμων τῆς ἀδικίας ὅτι φωνῆσας ἐποίησεν ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρουριωτέρου ὑπὲρ τοις υἱοῖς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενέαν τὴν ταυτῶν εἰσιν. 9 Καὶ ἐγὼ ἤμιξεν λέγω, λατρεύετε ποιήσατε φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλήτη δεῖξαι ἵμας εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους οἰκνάς.

1 Then Jesus said to the disciples, “There was a rich man who had a manager, and charges were brought to him that this man was squandering his property. 2 So he

150 Re the Commensality and Passion Traditions, see Chapter One, §§3.2.1.3 and 3.2.3.
summoned him and said to him, 'What is this that I hear about you? Give me an accounting of your management, because you cannot be my manager any longer.'

Then the manager said to himself, 'What will I do, now that my master is taking the position away from me? I am not strong enough to dig, and I am ashamed to beg. 4 I have decided what to do so that, when I am dismissed as manager, I may be welcomed into their homes.' 5 So, summoning his master's debtors one by one, he asked the first, 'How much do you owe my master?' 6 He answered, 'A hundred jugs of olive oil.' He said to him, 'Take your bill, sit down quickly, and make it fifty.' 7 Then he asked another, 'And how much do you owe?' He replied, 'A hundred containers of wheat.' He said to him, 'Take your bill and make it eighty.' 8 And his master commended the dishonest manager because he had acted shrewdly; for the children of this age are more shrewd in dealing with their own generation than are the children of light. 9 And I tell you, make friends for yourselves by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, you may be welcomed into the eternal homes.'

The parable of the Unjust Steward, unique to Luke, is one of the Gospel stories most likely to derive from the historical Jesus. Yet it is also one of the most difficult passages for exegesis, and traditional interpretations fail to explain why the ostensibly dishonest conduct of the manager would earn the approval of his master. My contention is that when the parable is interpreted appropriately, it affirms the hypothesis that the historical Jesus had a reputation for receiving hospitality as an uninvited guest.

It is virtually certain that the original parable ended at v. 8a, and that vv. 8b–9 have been added by Luke in an attempt to make sense of it without knowing its Sitz

---

151 The translation follows the NRSV, other than for vv. 4 and 9. On these see below, §6.1.3, and nn. 170–72.
152 Nolland, *Luke*, 796; Funk, *Five Gospels*, 357–58. The parable is one of only three accepted by the Jesus Seminar as authentic, the other two being Luke 10:30–35; Matt 20:1–15 (ibid. 549).
The redactional portions are included in the citation because they are an important indicator of Luke’s perceptions about the parable.

6.1.2. The context:

It is surely no accident that the previous chapter commences with the grumbling of the Pharisees and scribes over Jesus’ association with toll collectors and sinners (Luke 15:1–2), nor that its remainder consists of three parables concerning forgiven sinners. The introductory comment ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς in 16:1 should probably be understood to mean that the audience has been extended to include the disciples, as well as the Pharisees and scribes mentioned in 15:2, since the latter two groups are still present in 16:14.

An emphasis on hospitality, already apparent in Luke 14:1–24 and 15:11–32, is maintained in this passage by the manager’s statement in v. 4. The theme is accentuated by the fact that the verb δέχομαι is used not only in v. 4 with the meaning to welcome, but also in vv. 6 and 7, perhaps as a wordplay, with the sense to receive. Although v. 9 is not part of the parable, the further occurrence of δέχομαι here indicates the importance of the hospitality motif for Luke.

6.1.3. Interpretation:

The parable may be understood as Jesus’ satirical response to an accusation that he claims divine authority to forgive sins. It is reminiscent of Luke 7:31–34, since in both instances, Jesus tells a parable in response to criticism of his ministry, openly

---

157 Reading the καὶ as also (Nolland, Luke, 796–97, 802).
159 Ibid. 591.
160 See Loader, “Jesus and the Rogue,” 530.
repeating or acknowledging the negative views of his opponents.\textsuperscript{161} When the story is viewed in this light, it is evident that Jesus himself is the rogue, i.e. the shrewd manager, while God is cast in the role of the master,\textsuperscript{162} as suggested by the title ὁ κύριος in v. 8. As elsewhere in the Gospels,\textsuperscript{163} debts and debtors represent sins and sinners respectively.\textsuperscript{164}

Once the characters are appropriately identified, the meaning behind the story is clear. An anonymous complaint is brought to God about the conduct of his envoy, Jesus. God summons Jesus, fires him, and orders him to turn in the accounting books. Jesus considers his position, and his future needs, and proceeds to ingrate himself among God’s clients by writing off a sizable proportion of their debts (i.e. sins). The story concludes with God commending Jesus for his action.

The parable is a typical βουλεύσαται—it is clever and witty, and relates to a scenario that would be familiar to Jesus’ hearers.\textsuperscript{165} Its authenticity is affirmed by several characteristics,\textsuperscript{166} including exaggeration,\textsuperscript{167} and a surprise ending which jolts the audience, and goes against religious and social norms.\textsuperscript{168} Despite Jesus’ portrayal of himself as a dishonest rogue, he concludes by claiming God’s vindication of his conduct.

The two sides in the bipartisan audience, had they understood the parable, would have responded to it very differently. The Pharisees and scribes would probably identify themselves as those who reported the manager’s misdemeanours,

\textsuperscript{161} See also the discussion on Luke 16:16 in Chapter Eight, §2.1.2.
\textsuperscript{162} Loader, “Jesus and the Rogue,” 529–30.
\textsuperscript{163} E.g. Luke 7:41–43; Matt 18:23–35.
\textsuperscript{164} Loader, “Jesus and the Rogue,” 530.
\textsuperscript{165} See Chapter Two, §3.3.2, esp. nn. 111–21. On the possible reasons for the debts, see Nolland, Luke, 798–800, 803. The two examples given coincide with quantities of oil and wheat cited in Ezra 7:22 (ibid.), thus underlining that the story is fictitious, i.e. a parable, not an actual occurrence as Jeremias suggests (Parables of Jesus, 182).
\textsuperscript{166} Funk, Five Gospels, 30–32.
\textsuperscript{167} The debts and reductions are extremely large. See Nolland, Luke, 799.
and would be furious about Jesus’ assertion, in symbolic terms, that God endorsed his practice of forgiving sins. By way of contrast, the disciples would see the ludicrousness of the story. In particular, the toll collectors (theoretically still present from 15:1), might be amused at the ironic notion that Jesus had forgiven their sins with the sole purpose of securing offers of hospitality, as v. 4 suggests.

Indeed, the idea that Jesus would forgive sins for this reason seems so bizarre that an alternative possibility suggests itself: that it may have stemmed from opposition slander. Although there is no firm evidence, the similarity of Luke 16:4 and 7:34 makes the notion plausible. Jesus’ reputation as an ἀκλητος could spawn the slanderous concept that his ministry revolved around obtaining offers of hospitality, just as it could lead to his being labeled a “glutton and drunkard,” and “friend of toll collectors and sinners.”

Any attempts to comprehend v. 8b will be counterproductive, since Luke does not appear to have identified Jesus as the manager in the parable. However, examination of v. 9 is of value, as it perhaps demonstrates Luke’s recognition of a connection between offering hospitality in this life, and receiving it in the next. In vv. 4 and 9 the verb form δεξιονται is a third person plural aorist subjunctive, with no specified subject. It has the sense of a passive construction: may be welcomed. In the case of v. 4, it is obvious from vv. 5–7 that the debtors constitute the anticipated hosts. However, in v. 9 the context is eternity, and it is clear that the passive phrase “that you may be received” refers to reception by God. Thus Luke’s Jesus is urging his listeners to use their worldly wealth for hospitable ends, so ensuring their

---

169 See Chapter Five, §4.2.4, esp. n. 273.
salvation. However, the point here is neither reciprocity nor reward. As we see previously, the toll collectors’ hospitality to Jesus and his disciples is not offered in an attempt to obtain redemption. Rather, it demonstrates their repentance, and eligibility for the kingdom. Similarly, as we will see from the examination of Luke 7:36–50, the action of the “sinful woman” demonstrates her gratitude, following her repentance and forgiveness.

6.2. *The anointing story according to Luke:*

6.2.1. Overview of the anointing accounts:

Each of the canonical Gospels contains an account of a woman who anoints Jesus during a meal (Mark 14:3–9; Matthew 26:6–13; Luke 7:36–50; John 12:1–8). While Matthew’s version follows Mark’s quite closely, Luke’s is remarkably different, and John’s is also unique, evidently containing elements from both Mark’s and Luke’s accounts. One of the conspicuous variables in the stories is that according to Mark and Matthew, the woman anoints Jesus’ head, while in Luke and John, his feet are anointed. Regardless of the various disparities, it is likely that all four versions derive from one basic story, in which a woman anoints Jesus, and he defends her when objections are raised about the impropriety of her actions. Each evangelist then, would have used the fundamentals of the story for his particular theological purpose. Since John’s account is derived from Mark and Luke to some extent, we can safely regard it as redactional; its characters Mary, Martha, and Lazarus (11:1–2; 172


174 See Chapter Five, §§4.2.2, 4.2.3, and n. 259.


12:1–3) are obviously Johannine. Hence, given that Matthew depends on Mark, we need to focus only on Mark’s and Luke’s accounts. Important points of agreement between the latter two versions are that the episode occurs during a formal meal, where the guests are reclining, and that the woman arrives uninvited. The remainder of this section investigates Luke 7:36–50, while Mark 14:3–9 is considered in Chapter Eight.

6.2.2. Text and translation:

Luke 7:36–50:

36 Ἡρώτα δὲ τις αὐτῶν τῶν Φαρισαίων ἵνα φάγῃ μετ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν σίκον τοῦ Φαρισαίου κατεκλίθη. 37 καὶ ἴδον γυνὴν ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀμαρτωλός, καὶ ἐπιγνώσας ὅτι κατάκειται ἐν τῇ οίκῳ τοῦ Φαρισαίου, κομίσασα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου 38 καὶ στάσα ὑπὸ σοῦ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἤρετο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς θρεῖν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασσεν καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειψεν τῷ μύρῳ. 39 ἴδον δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγον, ὁ δὲ δὲν ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνοικεν ἐν τῆς καὶ ποταπῇ ἡ γυνὴ ἥτις ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἀμαρτωλός ἦστιν. 40 καὶ ἀποκρίθηκεν ὁ Ἰσραήλ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Σίμων, ἵνα σοὶ τι εἰσέχει. ὁ δὲ, Διδάσκαλε, εἴπε, φησίν. 41 δύο χρυσάφεια ἦσαν δανυστὶ τινι· ὁ εἷς ὀφέλεσεν δημόρια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ ἐτερος πεινήκεια. 42 μὴ ἐγκύωσιν αὐτῶν ἀποδοθαίμαι ἀματήτους ἐχαρίσατο. τίς οὖν αὐτῶν πλείου ἀγαπόησε αὐτῶν; 43 ἀποκρίθηκεν τῷ Σίμων εἶπεν, Ὑπολαμβάνω ὅτι ὃ τὸ πλείου ἐχαρίσατο. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὅρθως ἔκρυμας. 44 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὸν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμων ἔφη, Βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; εἰσῆλθον σου εἰς τὸν οίκον, ἱδοὺ μοι ἐπὶ πόδας ὦκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοὺς δάκρυσιν ἤφη οὗ τὸς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θρέειν αὐτῆς ἐξάμειζεν. 45 φίλημα μοι ὡκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ ἐφ’ ἣς εἰσῆλθον οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσα μοι τοὺς πόδας. 46 ἔλατη τὴν κεφαλήν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας· αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας.

178 See Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 806; Funk, Five Gospels, 115, 440.
179 This is not to say that the meal should be regarded as a symposium (contra Funk, Five Gospels, 115). Rather, it is a formal Jewish meal. Re Jewish feasts in the Roman period, see Chapter Four, §3.4.2.
μου. 47 οὖν χάριν λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαί, ὡς ἡ γάπη ταῦτα πολύς ὃς ἐλάγγειλέν ἀφίηται, ἄλλο γάγαμοι. 48 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῇ, Ἀφέωνται σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. 49 καὶ ἡγέσαι οἱ συνανακέλτησαν λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ἦς οὗτος ἵστατο ὁ ἁμαρτίας ἀφίησαι; 50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε πορεύσαι εἰς εἰρήνην.

36 One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee's house and reclined at table. 37 And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster flask of ointment. 38 She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. 39 Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, “If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him — that she is a sinner.” 40 Jesus spoke up and said to him, “Simon, I have something to say to you.” “Teacher,” he replied, “Speak.” 41 “A certain creditor had two debtors; one owed five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. 42 When they could not pay, he canceled the debts for both of them. Now which of them will show him more gratitude?” 43 Simon answered, “I suppose the one for whom he canceled the greater debt.” And Jesus said to him, “You have judged rightly.” 44 Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, “Do you see this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair. 45 You gave me no kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet. 46 You did not anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment. 47 Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she shows much gratitude. But the one to whom little is forgiven, shows little gratitude.” 48 Then he said to her, “Your sins are forgiven.” 49 But his companions began to say among themselves, “Who is this who even forgives sins?” 50 And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.”
6.2.2.1. The woman and the anointing:

The description of the woman in v. 37 suggests that she is known as a prostitute, and her subsequent behaviour, and Simon’s reference to her reputation, both support this impression.\textsuperscript{180} The alabaster flask she brings,\textsuperscript{181} and its contents,\textsuperscript{182} add further weight to the notion that she is a harlot.\textsuperscript{183}

6.2.2.2. The woman’s forgiveness and gratitude:

The perfect passive ἀφέωντας in v. 47 indicates that the woman’s sins have already been forgiven by God, and a previous encounter with Jesus may be assumed.\textsuperscript{184} The ὅτι clause, which as Bailey observes was mistranslated for centuries,\textsuperscript{185} is properly understood as resultative: the woman, having received much forgiveness, shows much gratitude.\textsuperscript{186} Thus ὅτι here means hence, or therefore.\textsuperscript{187} The meaning of the verb ἀγαπάω is sometimes be grateful, as in Ps 114:1 in the LXX (116:1 in the NRSV), and that sense fits well in v. 47.\textsuperscript{188} Further, since it is a stative verb, the Semitic


\textsuperscript{181} The term ἀλαβάστρον refers to a long-necked flask that is carved from alabaster, and used as a container for perfumes and ointments (“ἀλαβάστρον, υἱ, ὁ and ἤ,” BAGD 34), particularly spikenard (Herodotus, Hist. 3.20). According to Pliny the Elder, Nat. 13.3.19, alabaster aids in the preservation of the unguentum. The neck of the vessel has to be broken off before use (BAGD 34).

\textsuperscript{182} Re the μύρον used for the anointing, see “μύρον, οὗ, τῆς,” BAGD 529; LXX Ps 132:2; Cant 1:3. In the NT, the term occurs in all four anointing accounts; in Luke 23:56 for the ointment intended for embalming Jesus’ body; and in Rev 18:13 (translated myrrh in the last-mentioned).

\textsuperscript{183} See Chapter Four, §4, esp. nn. 305–306. An ἀλαβάστρον may be considered as equivalent to a ληπτομένος, i.e. a vessel of ointment characteristically used by courtesans.

\textsuperscript{184} Ravens, “Luke’s Account of the Anointing,” 284; Green, Gospel of Luke, 308, 313. Re the use of the passive to avoid direct reference to God, see Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 17.

\textsuperscript{185} Through Peasant Eyes, 18.

\textsuperscript{186} Ibid.; Green, Gospel of Luke, 313 n. 103.

\textsuperscript{187} Not because, or for, as e.g. in the RSV.

\textsuperscript{188} See “ἐγεῖπο,” 1. a. α, BAGD 4; Corley, Private Women, 126 n. 99.
perfect is best rendered as a present tense;\textsuperscript{189} thus the translation: \textit{hence she shows much gratitude}.

6.2.3. The context:

6.2.3.1. Literary:

There is a tendency to overemphasise the connection between Luke 7:36–50 and \textit{symposia}.\textsuperscript{190} Although Luke’s account may contain elements that are reminiscent of devices used in the symposia literature,\textsuperscript{191} the woman’s attendance at the banquet should not be equated with the \textit{stereotypical} arrival of a \textit{σκιά}.\textsuperscript{192} Her arrival as an uninvited guest, and the meal setting itself,\textsuperscript{193} are intrinsic to the anointing story, and not indicative of Lucan redaction. Further, while sympotic imagery such as Jesus’ rhetorical skill may be discerned in Luke 7:36–50,\textsuperscript{194} it is salutary to remember that the setting is a Jewish meal, not a \textit{συμπόσιον}.\textsuperscript{195} In any case, the supposedly sympotic elements in the passage are of less significance than its other contextual features.

6.2.3.2. Geographical and temporal:

The Lucan account of the anointing differs from the other three, in that it occurs relatively early in Jesus’ ministry, and evidently at Nain.\textsuperscript{196} In all of the other versions the episode is placed shortly before the Last Supper, and in Bethany.\textsuperscript{197}

\textsuperscript{189} Zerwick and Grosvenor, \textit{Grammatical Analysis}, 203.
\textsuperscript{190} See e.g. Corley, \textit{Private Women}, 123, esp. n. 82.
\textsuperscript{191} See Aune, “Septem sapientum convivium,” 69–70. Re the symposium as a literary genre, see Chapter Four, §3.2 and nn. 155–58.
\textsuperscript{192} As Aune seems to imply. He posits that a dinner is “used” in Luke 7:36–50 as “a literary device,” and “as the context for a pronouncement story” (ibid. 70), although he acknowledges that the passage contains “reminiscences of Jesus’ meals with disciples and acquaintances,” (ibid. 69–70).
\textsuperscript{193} Corley, \textit{Private Women}, 123, n. 81.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid. 123.
\textsuperscript{195} See Chapter Four, §3.4.3.
\textsuperscript{197} Matt 26:6; Mark 14:3; John 12:1.
6.2.3.3. Thematic:

Luke 7:36–50 contains several motifs, correlating with themes in the material that frames the passage. Firstly, in vv. 40 it is implied that Jesus is a prophet, because he “hears” and responds to Simon’s thoughts (v. 39). This motif corresponds with the theme that commences in 7:16 with the acknowledgment of Jesus as a great prophet, and continues in 7:26–28a with reference to John’s prophetic role. Secondly, the pericope reflects the acceptance/rejection dichotomy found in vv. 29–30, but whereas the focus in the latter is on response to John, it is now transferred to the woman’s vs. the Pharisee’s response to Jesus. That motif is closely linked with the third, in which the sinful woman exemplifies the ἀμαρτωλοί of v. 34, who are friends of Jesus, and who are presumed to have table fellowship with him. The first motif returns in vv. 47–50, when the focus on Jesus’ authority as a prophet is resumed and is continued in 8:1–3 when he is depicted as proclaiming the good news of the kingdom. Vv. 1b–3 make it clear that Jesus is accompanied and supported by many women, as well as the Twelve. The fact that Jesus bids the woman who anointed him to “Go in peace” (7:50) indicates that she is not among them, but the group does include women who have evidently been saved from similarly dire circumstances.

199 McMahon, “Meals as Type-Scenes,” 171.
200 Re the connection with a prophet’s authority to proclaim the forgiveness of sins, see Ravens, “Luke’s Account of the Anointing,” 284.
201 On the link with vv. 29–30, see Green, Gospel of Luke, 306; Johnson, Literary Function, 102; Nolland, Luke, 351. It is tempting to assume (as does Kilgallen, “Sinful Woman, and the Pharisee,” 677–78), that the sinful woman is among those who accepted John’s baptism (v. 29), and to contrast her with the Pharisee, who did not (v. 30). However, there is no evidence to support the notion (Ravens, “Luke’s Account of the Anointing,” 284). Nevertheless, it is certainly legitimate to compare the polarisation that occurs around John in vv. 29–30, with that around Jesus in the anointing account (Corley, Private Women, 126 n. 104).
203 See §6.2.4.4 below.
6.2.4. Commentary:

6.2.4.1. The woman and her behaviour:

The ability of an uninvited person to enter the Pharisee’s dining area is readily explained by the relative accessibility of Palestinian homes in the NT era.\textsuperscript{205} Likewise, the woman’s position behind Jesus, and at his feet, is easily understood from the typical layout of dining rooms, and the fact that commensals reclined with their legs pointing outwards, away from the table.\textsuperscript{206} It is clear from v. 45 that the woman has been present at least since Jesus arrived.\textsuperscript{207}

The erotic nature of the woman’s behaviour is obvious,\textsuperscript{208} particularly the letting down of her hair, an act which is normally performed only in private.\textsuperscript{209} The verb καταφιλέω may be translated kiss affectionately, with the imperfect having the meaning covered with kisses.\textsuperscript{210} This behaviour would scandalise onlookers;\textsuperscript{211} so too would the fondling and anointing of Jesus’ feet, since such acts were associated with prostitutes or slaves.\textsuperscript{212} While anointing of the feet, rather than the head, is unusual, there are other examples of this besides the incidents recorded in Luke 7:38, 46; and John 12:3. A situation described in Cena Trimalchionis is particularly relevant:

---

\textsuperscript{202} Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 4–5, 7; McMahan, “Meals as Type-Sennes,” 169 n. 26. See also Chapter Four, §3.4.2, esp. nn. 270–78.

\textsuperscript{206} Green, Gospel of Luke, 310; Nolland, Luke, 354; Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 5. For an impression of the layout, see Dunbabin, Plates/Triclinium and Stibadium, Fig. 5.

\textsuperscript{207} Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 7; Green, Gospel of Luke, 309.

\textsuperscript{208} Corley, Private Women, 125; Green, Gospel of Luke, 310.

\textsuperscript{209} Ibid.; Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 9.

\textsuperscript{210} Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 202–203. See also Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 9; idem, Poet and Peasant (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1976), 183.

\textsuperscript{211} Green, Gospel of Luke, 310. A similar example of a woman showing immense gratitude is found in Jos. Asen. 15:11 (Nolland, Luke, 354), although it is not stated that the feet are kissed, as Nolland implies.

\textsuperscript{212} Corley, Private Women, 125, n. 94; Green, Gospel of Luke, 310.
I am ashamed to tell you what followed: in defiance of all convention, some long-haired boys brought ointment in a silver basin, and anointed our feet as we lay, after winding little garlands round our feet and ankles. (Petronius, Sat. 70)\(^{213}\)

The passage is illuminating because it indicates that anointing of the feet is not expected during a banquet; that the act is performed by slaves; and that it causes shame to the “victims.” By way of contrast, no surprise or criticism is expressed about anointing of the head.\(^{214}\)

A further indication of the eroticism associated with the woman’s behaviour is Simon’s use of the verb ἄπτομαι in v. 39 with respect to her “touching” Jesus.\(^{215}\)

The term is employed in Gen 20:6; Prov 6:29; 1 Cor 7:1; and Josephus, Ant. 1.163 in relation to sexual intercourse.\(^{216}\)

Ravens has observed that whereas Luke uses the verb χρίω (anoint) with reference to Jesus’ status or role, he employs the alternative term ἀλείφω in the anointing story (v. 38; twice in v. 46).\(^{217}\) In the LXX, χρίω usually has a more sacred meaning than ἀλείφω, the latter mostly being chosen for translating γαστεραίος in situations such as the beautification or preparation of the body.\(^{218}\) Hence Luke’s choice of ἀλείφω in his anointing account\(^{219}\) suggests that he perceived the act as secular in nature, and without messianic significance.\(^{220}\)

\(^{213}\) The speaker is the narrator, the Greek freedman Encolpius.

\(^{214}\) See Petronius, Sat. 65 re Habinnas arriving at Trimalchio’s after attending another banquet. He has several wreaths on, and ointment is running down his forehead. Another anointing during Cena Trimalchionis, presumably of the head, occurs in Sat. 78. For other examples of anointing the feet, see Athenaeus, Deipn. 553a–553e.

\(^{215}\) Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 11.

\(^{216}\) Ibid.; “ἄπτεσθαι,” Z. a. BAGD 102.


\(^{218}\) Ibid. Examples are found in Ruth 3:3 and 2 Sam 14:2 (ibid.).

\(^{219}\) Cf. μυρίζω in Mark’s version (ibid.).

\(^{220}\) Ibid.
6.2.4.2. The parable:

The Pharisee’s name is revealed for the first time in v. 40, when Jesus addresses him personally; it is possibly derived from Mark’s anointing account.\(^{221}\) The parable comprising vv. 41–42 is likely to be redactional, although the historic present, φησί, in v. 40 could indicate that it is from a pre-Lukan source.\(^{222}\) An interesting point is that the verb ὀφείλω (owe, be indebted),\(^{223}\) has connotations of either debt or sin, and that cognates of the Semitic root זור have that same double sense.\(^{224}\) Thus, whether the parable was originally in Aramaic or Greek, it would still make the point that Simon, like the woman, is a debtor/sinner, and demonstrate the contrast between their attitudes to Jesus.\(^{225}\) Another feature of interest is the use of the verb χαρίζω in v. 42 for the remission of debt.\(^{226}\) The term means to “confer, grant, freely and graciously as a mark of favour.”\(^{227}\) It is used in Luke 7:21 with reference to the granting of sight to the blind,\(^{228}\) and by Paul with the sense to offer grace.\(^{229}\) Hence, although the debtors in the parable owe different sums, they are equally in need of grace; the same is applicable to the woman and the Pharisee.\(^{230}\)

6.2.4.3. The comparison of the sinner and the Pharisee:

In vv. 44–47, the reason for the absence of detail in the introduction becomes clear: the narrator has until now deliberately avoided reference to the host’s failure to

---


\(^{223}\) See "ὀφείλω," BAGD 598.

\(^{224}\) Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 13; see "זור, (be guilty of) and "זר, (debt), Holladay, *Hebrew Lexicon*, 97.

\(^{225}\) See Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 13, on the possibility of additional wordplay.

\(^{226}\) Ibid. 12.


\(^{228}\) Ibid.

\(^{229}\) Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes*, 12.

\(^{230}\) Ibid. Examples of Pauline usage in this sense are Rom 8:32; Phil 2:9. See "χαρίζω," BAGD 876.
perform the traditional customs involved in welcoming a guest.\textsuperscript{231} Jesus proceeds to compare what the woman has done for him, with what the Pharisee has failed to do. While Nolland argues that the washing of feet, the kiss of greeting, and anointing the head are non-mandatory,\textsuperscript{232} all are customs that are appropriate and traditionally expected at a formal banquet. Footwashing would normally be carried out by a servant, but the host has a responsibility to ensure that water is \textit{provided}.\textsuperscript{233} For the greeting, the part of the body that is kissed depends on the relationship of host and guest; Simon’s use of the title \textit{Διδάσκαλος} suggests that he should have kissed Jesus’ hand.\textsuperscript{234} Anointing the head with oil, although not essential, is certainly commonplace at banquets, and is a traditional component of merrymaking.\textsuperscript{235}

The comparison between the woman and the Pharisee is poignant not only because she has performed, in his stead, what are properly the duties of the host. The contrast is extreme, owing to the humility and lavishness of the woman’s actions. Her lowliness is manifested in that she has bestowed all her attention on Jesus’ \textit{feet}, an offensive and unclean part of the body, according to Oriental tradition.\textsuperscript{236} The generosity of her conduct is shown in that she gives not just one kiss, but \textit{smothers} his feet with kisses,\textsuperscript{237} and that for the anointing she uses not ordinary olive oil, but expensive perfume.\textsuperscript{238}

\textsuperscript{232} \textit{Luke}, 357.
\textsuperscript{237} Bailey, \textit{Through Peasant Eyes}, 17.
While Simon’s initial response to the woman has been “proper” in terms of traditional Pharisaic attitudes concerning purity, 239 he has now been exposed as failing in his responsibilities as a host. In contrast, the “sinner” performs these functions, and through her hospitable conduct proves reminiscent of Rahab the harlot. 240

6.2.4.4. Forgiveness and faith:

In v. 47, Jesus concludes his address to Simon by announcing that the woman’s many sins have been forgiven, and presenting this as the reason for her immense gratitude. Then, speaking directly to the woman, he declares that she is forgiven (v. 48). The accent on forgiveness is maintained in v. 49, with Jesus’ commensals questioning his identity, and by implication, his authority. This can be seen as a literary device inviting the hearer/reader to affirm Jesus’ status as a prophet.

In v. 50, the focus shifts from Jesus’ authority to forgive, to the grounds on which the woman has received forgiveness, i.e. her faith (πίστευσε). 241 In typical manner as a disciple of Jesus, she has “followed” him into the Pharisee’s home, and attends the banquet as an uninvited guest, “in Jesus’ name.” As with the exemplary ἄκλητος in Mark 9:35–37; 10:15, her humble servitude, and solidarity with Jesus, show her to be among those who will enter the kingdom, and participate in the eschatological banquet. 242

6.2.4.5. Jesus as bearer of good news:

There is considerable emphasis on Jesus’ feet in Luke’s anointing account; Ravens observes that they are mentioned seven times in the passage. 243 The accent on

239 Ibid. 307.
humility is sufficient to explain this, but there may well be an additional reason. The recurring motif of Jesus’ prophetic role has been noted, and it seems likely that Luke is drawing on imagery from Isa 52:7:

Δώς σάρα ἔπι τῶν ὅρων ὃς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοήν εἰρήνης ὃς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἁγαθά ὅτι ἀκούσαν ποίησαν τὴν σωτηρίαν σου λέγων Σιων βασιλέασε σου ο θεός.

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger who announces peace, who brings good news, who announces salvation, who says to Zion, “Your God reigns.”

From the evangelist’s perspective, Jesus is readily identifiable as the bearer of good news in this passage, and it seems probable that Luke has used its imagery for crafting his account of the anointing. This would explain why he has the woman direct so much attention to Jesus’ feet, rather than simply anointing his head, as in Mark’s version. The connection with Isa 52:7 is affirmed by the fact that in 7:50–8:1, Luke utilises cognates of several of its key words.

7:50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, Ἡ πίστις σου σέλωκεν σε πορεύσαι εἰς εἰρήνην. 8:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς καὶ αὐτὸς διώδουν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κόμην Κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

7:50 And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.”
8:1 Soon afterwards he went on through cities and villages, proclaiming and bringing the good news of the kingdom of God.

---

242 See §§5.3.2, 5.3.3 above.
243 I.e. even more frequently than forgiveness, which occurs only six times (Ravens, “Luke’s Account of the Anointing,” 285).
244 See §§6.2.3.3, esp. nn. 198–200, 203–204.
246 Ibid. 285, 291 n. 18.
247 Ibid. 286.
6.2.5. Interpretation:
The above analysis is based on the belief that all of the anointing accounts are
derived from a single incident, and that Luke has adapted the story to suit his
authorial purpose. Major differences from Mark’s version are the shifting of the
episode to early in Jesus’ ministry, and that his feet are anointed, rather than his
head.

In light of the Pharisee’s failure to perform basic hospitality rituals, it is
tempting to think that Jesus might have been present as an ἕκλητος on this
occasion. This is especially so in that the verb used for the invitation is ἐρωτάω
(ask, ask a question, request), rather than the more conventional term καλέω. However,
that argument is somewhat weakened by the fact that Simon is referred to
as ὁ καλέως in 7:39, and it is much more likely that Luke has regarded the incident
as an opportunity to make a contrast, as in vv. 29–30, between Pharisees and toll
collectors. Thus vv. 36–50 feature a Pharisee who is typically inhospitable, while
Luke elsewhere portrays toll collectors as reformed and faithful, and as epitomising
those who are hospitable to Jesus and his disciples. Simon fails in his
responsibilities as a host not only to Jesus, but also to the woman. As an umbra of
Jesus, she should have been accorded the same courtesy as an invited guest,
regardless of her reputation, and her highly unconventional conduct.

The woman, as a character in Luke’s account, fits into several other roles. As
a reformed prostitute who has table fellowship with Jesus she falls into the category
of the “sinners” of 7:34. As a humble disciple who has put her faith in Jesus, she is

248 Re Jesus’ commensality with Pharisees, see also §1, Chapter Six.
249 See “καλέω,” 1 b, BAGD 398–99; and “ἐρωτάω,” BAGD 311–12. Note also similar usage of
eligible for the kingdom. By joining Jesus at table in the Pharisee’s house, she exemplifies those who come “in his name,” and for whom he will ensure a place at the eschatological banquet. In yet another way, the woman is assured of a place in the kingdom. Luke portrays her as fulfilling the role of the host, and although we cannot assume that the woman was baptised by John (7:29), her exemplary hospitality to Jesus means that she may legitimately be paired with the toll collectors. This surely puts her in the same category as the harlot Rahab, hailed as a heroine of the faith because of her hospitality to the Israelite spies.252 The pairing of a prostitute with toll collectors, and the contrast with a Pharisee, is also remarkably close to the import of Matt 21:31.253 However, in the Matthaean text the comparison of toll collectors and prostitutes with Pharisees pertains to John and his baptism (as in Luke 7:29–30), rather than to the provision of hospitality to Jesus and his disciples.

7. **Application of the hypothesis to specific Gospel texts:**

7.1. **Mark 10:13–16:**

7.1.1. Text and translation:

13 Καὶ προείθερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν άφηση αὐτῷ οἱ δὲ μαθηταί ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς. 14 Ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἡρώου ἡγούμενος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἄφητε τὰ παιδία ἐρχομένα πρὸς με, μὴ κολύσετε αὐτά, τάν γὰρ τοὺς τοιούτους ἤστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 15 ἂν ὁ λόγος ἄφην, ὥσπερ ὃς δέχεσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παιδεία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν. 16 καὶ ἔναγκαιολούμενος αὐτά κατευθύνει τιθέει τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά.

13 And **they were on the point of bringing young servants** to him in order that he might touch them; and the disciples spoke sternly to them. 14 But when Jesus saw this, he was indignant and said to them, "Let the **youngsters** come to me; do not stop them; for it is to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs. 15 Truly I tell you, whoever

---

252 See Chapter Five, §3.4.3, esp. nn. 123, 125.
253 See Chapter Five, §3.4.3.
does not receive the kingdom of God like a young servant will never enter it.” 16 And he put his arms around them, laid his hands on them, and blessed them.

The verb προσέφερον in v. 13 is best understood as a conative imperfect, reflecting an ineffective attempt at doing something;254 hence the translation “they were on the point of bringing young servants.” The subject is not specified, and can only be surmised from the context. As previously, in §§4.1 and 5.2 above, the term παιδία is understood here to refer to young servants or slaves,255 and ἐναγκάλιζομαι is taken to mean put one’s arms around, as in Mark 9:36.

7.1.2. Context:

Reference has already been made to Mark 10:15 in view of its relevance to the interpretation of Mark 9:33–37, especially in relation to the term παιδία.256 We need now to consider the geographical setting of the whole pericope Mark 10:13–16, and to view its content in light of the material in vv. 1–12.

In vv. 1–2, there is a clear break that marks the closure of the episode in Capernaum (9:33–49), and the introduction of a new location and topic. One is accustomed to treating the incident in vv. 13–16 as separate from the preceding material, but in fact, the next marker of a break in the story-line occurs in v. 17. Hence it is valid to interpret Jesus’ encounter with the παιδία as taking place inside a house (v. 10),257 either beyond the Jordan (i.e. in Perea),258 or in the region of Judea (v. 1). Although Mark’s location of the story at this point in his narrative may not be historically accurate, it is plausible to imagine that Jesus and his disciples would

---

254 Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, xx., 140.
255 The youngsters could be either boys or girls. See n. 264 below.
256 See above, §5.2.1.
257 I.e. ἐλέει τῷ άλλῳ. Re the use of ἐλέει instead of ἔν, see Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §99, p. 33.
258 Charles H. Miller, “Perea,” HBD 827.
travel through Peraea on the way to Judea. In the time of Jesus, the population of Peraea was predominantly Jewish, but we may assume that there were some Gentiles, and that they were more prevalent here than in Judea. Thus Gentile influence could have been significant, and if the actual incident occurred in a home where traditional Jewish morals were not observed, as I suggest, Peraea is a probable location.

In vv. 2–9, the topic of Jesus’ dialogue with the Pharisees is whether divorce is lawful. Subsequently, Jesus’ disciples question him further on the matter, and the topic becomes specifically focused on adultery:

11 He said to them, “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; 12 and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.”

Mark’s placement of the logion about the παροικία immediately after this may well indicate that the motif of illicit sexual relations extends into vv. 13–16.

7.1.3. Interpretation:

My proposal is that the itinerant group has accepted an offer of hospitality at a banquet where the ethos is Graeco-Roman, in contrast to the more conservative atmosphere of a Jewish meal. It is not necessary to imagine a completely Gentile milieu, although this would be a possibility in Peraea. Rather, the household could simply be more influenced by Graeco-Roman culture than we have supposed for typical Jewish establishments.

259 Apparently this route was used in order to bypass Samaria (ibid.).
260 Ibid.
261 See Chapter Four, §3.4.3.
262 Alternatively, Gentiles could have been present as ἔξοροι, like the Syrophoenician woman who features in the next subsection.
The conventional scenario of parents arriving suddenly and asking blessings for their infants is highly improbable in this environment. Rather, when the παιδία are understood as young slaves/servants in a Graeco-Roman syphotic environment, they may be envisaged as entertainers, such as acrobats, dancers, or musicians. Some unidentified people are about to bring the youngsters to Jesus for his amusement, the verb ἀπτομαί here having sexual connotations, as in Luke 7:39.\textsuperscript{263} In a Graeco-Roman setting such an event would not be unusual.\textsuperscript{264} Moreover, the proposed circumstances would explain the disciples' rebuke, which would otherwise seem excessive.

After Jesus' previous teaching about παιδία as exemplars of humility and servitude (9:33–37), his indignation towards the disciples is also understandable. He insists that the παιδία be brought to him, and emphasises that it is people like them who are eligible for the kingdom. They are typical ἀκλῆτοι, but his words in v. 15 indicate that by befriending them, he offers, and they accept, an invitation into the kingdom, and to the eschatological banquet. The description in v. 16 is problematical, since it implies that Jesus simultaneously performs the separate actions of embracing and blessing the youngsters (with both hands). However, we can suppose that he first puts his arm(s) around each of the youngsters before blessing them.

7.1.4. Commentary:

Admittedly, the suggested interpretation is entirely conjectural. Yet it is plausible, and although the inherent eroticism in the proposed exegesis puts it in sharp contrast

\textsuperscript{263} See §6.2.4.1 above, and "ἀπτομαί," 2. a, BAGD 102.

\textsuperscript{264} See Chapter Four, §3.2, esp. nn. 147–48; and 3.3; esp. 202–204.
with the conventional reading, the ultimate meaning of the passage is much the same. The slaves/servants are not infants, but they are still young, perhaps twelve or thirteen; they may be envisaged as vulnerable, as well as humble, like the lad in Mark 9:36. In addition, they are apparently deemed innocent, since Jesus pronounces them as eligible for the kingdom (v. 14) without mentioning any need for forgiveness. Significantly, if the παιδία are assumed to be boys, the passage could perhaps shed some light on Jesus’ attitude toward homosexuality.

7.2. "Ακλητοί as “dogs”:

7.2.1. Mark 7:24–31:

7.2.1.1. Introduction:

In §4, Chapter Four, it was mentioned that άκλητοι are often associated with canine imagery, implying their low status, and dependency. While such depictions are negative for the most part, there are some examples of stereotypical victims who are treated like dogs, but who ultimately undergo a reversal of fortune and become heroes. Both the present subsection and the next examine situations in which I believe canine imagery occurs in the latter sense.

7.2.1.2. Text and translation:

24 ἔκειθεν δὲ ἀναστάς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἄγαλμα Τύρου, καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν οὐδένα

ηθέλειν γυναί, καὶ οὐκ ἡσυχήσας λαθείν. 25 ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσας γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἢς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἡλιθίους προσέπεσεν πρὸς τούς πόδας αὐτοῦ. 26 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἤρξεν Ἑλπίσεις, Συροφοινίκιοισα τῷ γένει τινὰ τοιὸν υπερ ἡρμήνευσεν τὸ 

---

265 Esp. if compared with the parallels in Matt 19:13–15; Luke 18:15–17. Luke (v. 15) has βρέφη (infants) in lieu of παιδία. Matthew retains the term παιδία, but eliminates the verb ἐπήμαι, and the intention behind bringing them is for Jesus to “lay his hands on them and pray.”

266 See nn. 103, 264 above.

267 See §5.2.3 above.

268 It is noteworthy that Jesus’ reaction in Mark 10:13–16 is reminiscent of his attitude towards the woman caught in adultery (John 8:1–11). He does not condemn the woman for her previous behaviour, and evidently anticipates her reformation.

269 See Chapter Four, nn. 324–27.
the girl’s age. The term Ἐλληνίς (v. 26) literally means Greek, although it is usually translated Gentile in the NT.\textsuperscript{272} The title κύριε, used by the woman for Jesus, would be the conventional form of address in this situation.\textsuperscript{273} Hence, to avoid reading meaning into the text, the translation Sir, rather than Lord, is preferred;\textsuperscript{274} likewise, προσπίπτω (v. 25) is to be understood as fall at (one’s feet),\textsuperscript{275} rather than bow down as in the NRSV.

7.2.1.3. Context:

As with the immediately preceding passage (7:1–23), the pericope must be considered in relation to its context (6:17–8:21) to appreciate its significance.\textsuperscript{276} After the section located in Jewish territory, and featuring the feeding of the five thousand (Israelites) and the handwashing dispute, Jesus journeys into Gentile territory. Here, he performs two miracles: the exorcism of a Gentile girl; and the healing of a deaf-mute man in the predominantly Gentile region of the Decapolis.\textsuperscript{277} The focus on Jesus’ ministry to Gentiles\textsuperscript{278} culminates with the second feeding miracle (8:1–10), which takes place in a Gentile region. The motif of the “bread” offered by Jesus vs. the “leaven” of the Pharisees marks the conclusion of the section (8:14–21).

While the focus is more on Jesus’ vs. the Pharisees’ teaching in 7:1–23, the emphasis in vv. 24–31 is on “bread” and “feeding”; as in the feeding miracles, the bread symbolises Jesus’ whole ministry.\textsuperscript{279} It is significant that the verb χορτάζω (to satisfy with food), is employed in Mark 7:27, recalling its use in 6:42 in the first

---

\textsuperscript{272} See Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 129; Hooker, According to St Mark, 183.

\textsuperscript{273} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{274} Although Mark may have intended the latter sense (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{275} Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis 129; “προσπίπτω,” 1, BAGD 718.

\textsuperscript{276} For an outline of Mark 6:17–8:21, see §4.1.2.1, Chapter Six.

\textsuperscript{277} Hooker, According to St Mark, 185.

\textsuperscript{278} But note that the deaf-mute is not necessarily a Gentile (ibid.)

\textsuperscript{279} Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 70.
feeding story, and anticipating its employment in relation to the feeding of the Gentiles (8:4, 8).^{280}

7.2.1.4. Interpretation:

Although Mark has inserted the story within its broader context with considerable artifice, the fact that it shows Jesus in an uncomplimentary light favours the argument for the authenticity of the basic account.^{281} If the story does indeed go back to the historical Jesus, the abrupt phrase εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν readily suggests that he is present as an ἀκλήτος. It is clear that the woman, too, is uninvited. Despite the setting of the episode in the region of Tyre, and the woman’s ethnicity, the household is most likely Jewish.^{282} Since there is no indication that Jesus has been invited to share the household meal, he is probably to be envisaged at the periphery of the dining area,^{283} or in the vestibule,^{284} perhaps seated on the threshold.^{285} Clearly then, the comment that he does not want his presence to be known applies to those who would seek him out, not to household members from whom he desires hospitality.

The key to understanding the dialogue between Jesus and the woman seems to lie in the two different terms used for “children.” Jesus’ statement “Let the children be fed first,” employs the word τέκνα, and refers to the children of Israel, implying that his mission is primarily to them.^{286} His notorious remark that “it is not fair to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs” asserts that it is not right to take “food” intended for Israel and give it to Gentile “dogs.” The diminutive

---

^{280} Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 183, 190.
^{281} Ibid. 182. But see also Loader, “Challenged at the Boundaries,” 50–51.
^{282} Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 181; Loader, “Challenged at the Boundaries,” 50 n. 16.
^{283} See the discussion above on Luke 7:36–50, esp. §6.2.4.1.
^{284} See §7.2.2.1 below, esp. n. 291.
^{285} For an example of this posture as traditional for ἀκλήτος, see e.g. *Od*. 17.339–341.
^{286} Loader, *Attitude towards the Law*, 80.
κυνάριον is equivalent to κύων,287 and is no less derogatory—both terms were apparently used by Jews to refer to Gentiles.288 However, if, as proposed, Jesus is present as an ἔκλητος, the appellative is equally applicable to himself, and hence loses most, or all, of its sting. By applying the traditional imagery of ἔκλητος as “dogs,” it is possible to consider the vocabulary used in the story in a different light, and to exonerate Jesus for his deprecatory language. The difference in its effect is easily discerned if he is envisaged as sitting on the floor, with the woman beside him. As an uninvited guest herself, the woman must be aware that the canine imagery applies to her on two counts. In her reply, she uses an alternative word, παιδία, for “children,” and I believe that this is both intentional and significant. The fact that the term παιδίον, rather than τέκνον, is used for the girl in v. 30 indicates that a difference is being acknowledged between the status of the children of Israel and that of the Gentile child. The term παιδίον, even when not used specifically of servants or slaves, infers a sense of humility that is not conveyed by τέκνον. Thus the woman is perhaps recognising a descending social order of τέκνα, παιδία, and “dogs.” She demonstrates an attitude of humility by addressing Jesus as “Sir,” but is possibly making a claim for her daughter to be regarded as a παιδίον, rather than a “dog.” In any case, she is evidently applying the analogy to the real life situation, and the individuals involved. The housedogs do indeed receive the “crumbs” from the table, and she indicates that when a meal is shared, there is sufficient food for all—Israelites, Gentiles, and ἔκλητος.

287 See n. 270 above; Loader, “Challenged at the Boundaries,” 48.
288 Ibid.
7.2.1.5. Commentary:

We cannot be certain that the story recounted in Mark 7:24–31 is historical. If it is from Mark, or pre-Marcan tradition, it may be seen as a celebration of the inclusion of the Gentiles in God’s salvation plan, and of their eligibility to share in the feast of the kingdom. The story also portrays the woman as a Gentile heroine, demonstrating the capacity of her faith to secure Jesus’ compassion and aid. On the other hand, if the account preserves an actual event in the life of Jesus, it surely depicts him as an itinerant ἅγιος. In Chapter Eight we will consider the exaltation of Jesus, and see how in accordance with the reversal motif, he is transformed from a lowly figure, tainted with canine imagery, to exalted post-resurrection status.

7.2.2. Luke 16:19–26:

7.2.2.1. Text and translation:

19 Ἀνθρώποι δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἡμών, καὶ ἱδεῖν δύσκολον πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον εὔφρασιν οὕτως καὶ ὑπὲραν λαμπρός. 20 τουχός δὲ τες ἀνάμειν Λάζαρος ἔβλεπεν πρὸς τὸν πολὺν αὐτοῦ ἑλκομένον 21 καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦν χορτασθήσῃ αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τῶν πιττάνων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύρεις ἐφείλειν τὰ ἔλεγαν αὐτοῦ. 22 ἐγένετο δὲ ἂνθρωποι τοῦ πορπυροῦ καὶ ἀνενεχθήσαντα αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραὰμ· ἐπέθεκαν δὲ καὶ ὁ πλοῦσιος καὶ ἑτάφη. 23 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔδρατε ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων ἐν μοῖραις, ἤρθε Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν καὶ Λάζαρον ἐν τοῖς κόλποις αὐτοῦ. 24 καὶ αὐτὸς φωνῆσας εἶπεν, Πάτερ Ἀβραὰμ, ἐλέησόν με καὶ πέμψον Λάζαρον ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἴκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὄσατο καὶ καταφύξῃ τὴν γλώσσαν μου, ὅτι ὀδύναμι ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ. 25 εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ· Τέκνου, μην ἐστίν ἡ ἀπήλαση τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, καὶ Λάζαρος ἐμοίως τὰ κακά· καὶ ὁ δὲ ἀδεὶκεῖται, σὺ δὲ ὀδυνάσαι. 26 καὶ ἐν πάση τούτων μεταξὺ ἠμῶν καὶ ἠμῶν χάσαμεν μέγα ἐστήρικαται, ὡς οἱ θέλοντες διαβήναι ἐνθεύν πρὸς ἰμαίς μὴ δώσωται, μηδὲ ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν.

289 Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 81–82; idem, “Challenged at the Boundaries,” 50.
19 “There was a rich man who was dressed in purple and fine linen and who feasted sumptuously every day. 20 And at his portal lay a poor man named Lazarus, covered with sores. 21 Who longed to satisfy his hunger with what fell from the rich man’s table; not only so but the dogs would come and lick his sores. 22 The poor man died and was carried away by the angels to the bosom of Abraham. The rich man also died and he was buried. 23 In Hades, where he was being tormented, he looked up and saw Abraham far away with Lazarus by his side. 24 He called out, ‘Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am in agony in these flames.’ 25 But Abraham said, ‘Child, remember that during your lifetime you received your good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted here, and you are in agony. 26 Besides all this, between you and us a great chasm has been fixed, so that those who might want to pass from here to you cannot do so, and no one can cross from there to us.’”

The citation is limited to vv. 19–26, since this portion has some claim to authenticity, as well as being sufficient for our purposes. The term πυλών, usually rendered gate, is better understood as a portal or vestibule; hence Lazarus’ position means that his presence must be known to anyone coming to or from the house. He is often assumed to be a beggar, but the noun πτωχός is correctly translated poor man in the NRSV, and he is more accurately designated as an ἀκλήτος. His situation is a close parallel to that of Odysseus, disguised as a πτωχός, sitting on the threshold in the doorway of his palace, in anticipation of a meal. However, an important difference is that Lazarus is evidently not ambulant, the pluperfect passive ἔβηβλητο

---

294 Re the translation of πτωχός as beggar in Odyssey, see n. 86 above.
295 See Od. 17.336–341.
in v. 20 indicating that he has been put here and is unable to move.\textsuperscript{296} The precise significance of the dogs licking Lazarus’ sores is debated, though it undoubtedly emphasises his outcast position.\textsuperscript{297} In view of the frequent association of dogs with ἄκλητοι, I would view them as hounds treating him sympathetically as one of their own.\textsuperscript{298} His status is lower than theirs, however, since they presumably receive adequate sustenance from the table scraps, while he gets nothing.\textsuperscript{299} The name Lazarus, meaning God helps, is probably symbolic of the divine assistance that the destitute man obtains during the story.\textsuperscript{300}

7.2.2.2. \hspace{1cm} Context:

The description of the Pharisees in v. 14 as lovers of money (φιλάργυροι) signals that the emphasis on wealth is to continue. However, the specific focus is the appropriate use of wealth, viz. for hospitality to the needy.\textsuperscript{301} Thus the parable’s message goes beyond that of the parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:16–21).\textsuperscript{302} It is linked thematically with Luke 14:12–14 in that Lazarus would obviously be among those

\textsuperscript{296} See F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (ed. and trans. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §347, pp. 177–78. The verb πάλαιον has a weakened sense in this instance, i.e. put cf. throw (Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 247). Since it is intransitive and passive here, it gives the sense of lying ill, as also in Matt 8:6, 14 (Nolland, Luke, 828). Hence he is not to be envisaged as a beggar who comes to the same place day by day, and is familiar to passersby. Rather, we may surmise that some days previously, Lazarus has been placed here by persons unknown, in the expectation that he will receive help; however, he dies without obtaining aid of any kind.

\textsuperscript{297} E.g. Nolland (Luke, 828–29, 832) considers that they are hounds that “continue their meal with the juices that ooze from the afflicted man’s sores.” Green (Gospel of Luke, 606) sees them as roaming street dogs seeking refuse. Johnson (Literary Function, 142 n. 2) asserts that the dogs’ action signifies the man’s outcast condition. For the translation of ἄλλα καὶ in v. 21 as not only so, but, see Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 248.

\textsuperscript{298} Lazarus himself is reminiscent of Odysseus’ faithful dog Argos, which lies in dung by the palace door, neglected, and full of ticks. When his master, disguised as a πτωχός, approaches after his twenty year absence, Argos wags his tail and drops his ears, but does not have the strength to do more. He dies immediately after Odysseus has passed by. See Od. 17.290–327.

\textsuperscript{299} Note the similarity between the imagery in v. 21a, and Matt 15:27 (Nolland, Luke, 828).

\textsuperscript{300} Ibid. Re the name and its meaning see also Green, Gospel of Luke, 606, n. 337; Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 825–26, 868 n. 158.


\textsuperscript{302} See Nolland, Luke, 825. Re the carpe diem and memento mori themes in the Rich Fool parable, see Chapter Four, §5.
who, according to Luke 14:13, should be invited to meals. Moreover there are several points of comparison with the parable of the Loving Father (15:1–24) including: the occurrence in both, of the verbs χορτάζω (16:21; 15:16) and εὑραίω (16:19; 15:23, 24); the uncleanness of Lazarus and of the prodigal son (16:20; 15:15–16); and the rejection of Lazarus as against the reception of the prodigal. From the context then, it is apparent that the references to the Law and the prophets in 16:16–17, 29–31, relate to the rich man’s failure to fulfil his ethical responsibility toward Lazarus. Likewise, his blatant inhospitality is clearly the reason for his severe punishment.

7.2.2.3. Interpretation:

The depictions of the two men accentuate the disparity between them. The portrayal of Lazarus as poor and hungry recalls the first two Beatitudes, Luke 6:20–21), while the description of him as “covered with sores” contrasts starkly with that of the rich man in his fine clothing. In Deuteronomistic terms, his condition, and being left unburied after death, would both imply that Lazarus is receiving divine punishment, so it would come as a surprise to the audience that he is carried off by angels. This point may signify that Lazarus has been translated into heaven as were

303 See Chapter Five, §4.2.3, esp. n. 269.
304 Green, Gospel of Luke, 599.
306 Ibid. 828.
307 Green, Gospel of Luke, 603–604, 610; Nolland, Luke, 827; Johnson, Literary Function, 142. In accordance with hospitality traditions, the rich man, whether Jew or Gentile, should welcome Lazarus. Since he is clearly a Jew (Nolland, Luke, 830), his obligation to do so must be known to him through the Scriptures.
309 The extent of the rich man’s affluence is indicated by the opulence of his clothing (Green, Gospel of Luke, 605; Nolland, Luke, 827; Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 64–65), as well as by the daily banqueting (ibid. 65; Green, Gospel of Luke, 605–606, 606 n. 332). Note that the verb χορτάζω occurs in the second Beatitude (Luke 6:21), as well as in 16:21 (Johnson, Literary Function, 142 n. 2).
Enoch and Elijah, but that is by no means certain.\textsuperscript{312} The meaning of “the bosom of Abraham” (vv. 22, 23) is a matter of controversy, as the patriarch’s role here may either be paternal, or connected with his legendary hospitality.\textsuperscript{313} Nevertheless, given the emphasis on dining and food in the parable, it seems likely that Lazarus has been awarded the place of honour at the heavenly banquet.\textsuperscript{314} Owing to the hermeneutical difficulties, one cannot be too precise about interpreting the parable. However, two points are clear: firstly, that Lazarus’ elevation represents the fulfilment of the divine reversal prophesied in the Beatitudes\textsuperscript{315} and elsewhere;\textsuperscript{316} and secondly, that the judgment and punishment of the rich man are a consequence of his inhospitality.

7.2.2.4. Concluding remarks:

Lazarus exemplifies an ἀκλητος who in his earthly life is treated like a dog, but who upon his death undergoes a reversal of fortune, and becomes a highly honoured participant at the banquet of the blessed. When Jesus, as depicted in the Synoptics, is likewise regarded as an ἀκλητος, there is significant correspondence between the situations of the two figures in view of their reliance on hospitality, their suffering, and their exaltation after death.\textsuperscript{317} However, in light of the Deuteronomistic concept that misfortune in this life represents divine punishment for sin, the circumstances of Jesus’ death indicate that his situation was ostensibly much more serious than that of

\textsuperscript{311} Ibid. 605, 607.
\textsuperscript{314} Though perhaps not the eschatological banquet. On this issue see Koenig, “Hospitality,” 300; Green, Gospel of Luke, 829; Nolland, Luke, 829; Dentzer, Motif du banquet, 451, n. 265; and esp. Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 823, 868 n. 156. Meier observes that the idea of reward or retribution immediately following death is inconsistent with the concept that the eschatological banquet is to take place at the end time. However, he urges caution on the grounds that notions about the eschaton were still fluid in the NT period, and that the ideas reflected in the parable are not uniform, nor meant to convey formal doctrine about the afterlife (ibid. 868 n. 156).
\textsuperscript{315} Re the universal application of the reversal, see Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 826; cf. Nolland, Luke, 830, 832.
\textsuperscript{316} See above, §§5.2.3, 5.3.2, and 7.2.1.1; and Chapter Five, §3.4.4, esp. n. 152.
Lazarus. While Lazarus’ death resulted from his illness and the inhospitality of the rich man, Jesus was executed as a criminal, and according to the Scriptures, was placed under God’s curse because he was “hung on a tree.” His exaltation following his death therefore represents much more of a reversal than that of Lazarus. Yet it need not be perceived only in terms of the Passion Tradition. §5.3.3 mentioned the need for greater prominence to be given to Jesus’ table fellowship, and to the analogous relationship between attending banquets in the name of Jesus, in this world and the next. This approach will therefore be adopted in Chapter Eight, with the exaltation of Jesus being interpreted in terms of the Commensality Tradition, rather than the Passion Tradition. The immense significance of hospitality and feasting traditions has already been shown by our findings to date, and examination of additional NT texts will further demonstrate their importance for understanding the historical Jesus, and the evolution of the Christian faith.

8. **Summary:**

The chapter commences with a portrait of the historical Jesus that incorporates insights gained through investigating his table fellowship with toll collectors, sinners, and Pharisees. The reconstruction includes in particular that he had a reputation as an ἀκλητος; that at least once he arrived at the home of a toll collector without a formal invitation; that so-called “sinners” may have gained entry to meals by following him; and that a prostitute followed him into a house and anointed him during a meal.

The reception/rejection of ἀκλητος is discussed under three broad topics. Firstly, the missionary discourses are examined using Mark 6:6b–13 and Luke 10:1–16 as representative texts of what is understood to derive from a single

---

317 The perceived similarity is not based on any supposed significance in Lazarus’ name, as if he represented a figure for Jesus. On that concept see Nolland, Luke, 828.
tradition. It is determined that the disciples actually enter houses before requesting hospitality, and that the greeting of peace functions as a test of the householder, as to whether he will receive or reject them. The stipulation in Luke 10:7–8 that the disciples are to eat and drink what is set before them is investigated together with parallel statements in Gos. Thom. 14:4 and 1 Cor 10:27. Gos. Thom. 14:4–5 is considered to be inauthentic, and it is concluded that in Luke’s account the instruction does not apply to non-kosher food. Inhospitality towards the disciples is a serious matter, and will be harshly punished. In this sphere, the disciples are placed on the same footing as Jesus; hence rejecting them is equivalent to rejecting God. Another finding is the correlation between heeding the call to repent, and offering hospitality.

The second topic of the three concerns Jesus’ and the disciples’ healing power, and whether it has any bearing on a householder’s reception or rejection of them. It is concluded that healing is offered only after Jesus or his disciples have been received, so that it cannot have provided an incentive. Crossan’s concept of an eating/healing dyad is examined, and its weaknesses and strengths outlined. His views on two important points are endorsed. The first is that in the missionary discourses, the disciples are invited to share meals with the householders. The second concerns the distinction between almsgiving and commensality: to offer alms rather than a shared meal is equivalent to rejection. However, Crossan’s idea of an eating/healing dyad is dismissed on the grounds that true hospitality is provided without anticipation of reward, and is not connected with reciprocity. The third topic is the dichotomy between commensality and almsgiving. This is discussed in relation to two meal scenes in Odyssey, and the punishment meted out for inhospitality is compared with that described in Matt 25:31–46.
Luke 7:31–34 is examined from the viewpoint that the παρόια in the marketplace are young servants waiting to be hired as flautists for either a wedding or a funeral. On that basis, the appellative “this generation” would refer to two hypothetical groups of Israelites, with one group believing that it is time for celebration, and the other claiming it is a season for lamentation. Each group complains that the other refuses to respond properly. When the focus shifts to the ministries of John and Jesus in vv. 33–34, the first group fails to heed John’s call to repentance, while the second declines Jesus’ invitation to the eschatological banquet, asserting that feasting is inappropriate. The point of the parable is that neither group has the authority to “call the tune”—they are merely God’s servants. It is God’s prerogative to determine what is the appropriate season for Israel, and it is for his envoys, first John, and then Jesus, to announce it.

While the parable involves a hypothetical situation, the slurs against John and Jesus should probably be seen as opposition slander. The epithets “glutton” and “drunkard” imply that Jesus had gained a reputation for arriving at meals uninvited, i.e. ἄκλητος. Although similar terminology was used extensively in comedy, no suggestion whatever is being made that Jesus resembled the stock characters παρόιατος/κόλαξ. Rather, it is posited that as an itinerant, he sometimes sought hospitality as a wayfarer/stranger.

In §5 the examination of Mark 9:33–42 and 10:15, 35–45 produces some important findings. Firstly, eligibility to enter the kingdom and participate in the eschatological banquet requires acceptance of the kingdom with the humility of a young slave/servant. Secondly, παρόια are typical ἄκλητοι, and they gain entry to the eschatological banquet as umbrae of Jesus, attending “in his name.”
The case for Jesus as an ἐκλητός gains support from the exegesis of Luke 16:1–8a and 7:36–50. The parable of the Unjust Steward is interpreted as Jesus’ satirical response to an accusation that he claims divine authority to forgive sins. Jesus himself is the “rogue” of the story, God is the master, and debts and debtors represent sins and sinners respectively. The story asserts in symbolic terms, that God endorses Jesus’ practice of forgiving sins, a concept that would infuriate the Pharisees and scribes. It also contains the implication that Jesus forgave sins for the sole purpose of securing offers of hospitality, a notion so bizarre that it is likely to derive from opposition slander.

In Luke’s anointing account there seems to be no doubt that the woman who arrives uninvited is known as a prostitute. Her sins have already been forgiven in a presumed previous encounter with Jesus, and consequently she shows much gratitude. Anointing the feet rather than the head is unusual, but not without precedent. Luke has probably crafted the story and its content, and shifted the focus to Jesus’ feet, in order to identify him as the bearer of good news, in accordance with the imagery of Isa 52:7. The eroticism of the woman’s actions would scandalise onlookers. However, when Jesus draws attention to Simon’s failure to fulfil his responsibilities as a host, it becomes clear that the woman has performed those functions in his stead, and that her hospitable conduct renders her comparable with Rahab. As well as failing to welcome Jesus appropriately, Simon has neglected his responsibility towards the woman, who as an umbra of Jesus, should have been accorded the same courtesy as an invited guest.

In §7 the hypothesis is applied to three specific NT texts, Mark 10:13–16; 7:24–31; and Luke 16:19–26. The episode recounted in Mark 10:13–16 is interpreted as taking place in a Graeco-Roman sympotic environment, and the πατρία being
brought to Jesus are understood as young servants, who are present as entertainers. That the topic of illicit sexual relations is carried over from vv. 11–12 into this account is suggested by the use of the verb ἀποκαταστασία in v. 13. Jesus’ response indicates his solidarity with the youngsters, and that he regards them as innocent. He insists that they be brought to him, and embraces and blesses them.

The other two texts examined in this section both involve the use of canine imagery for ἄκλητοι, accentuating their low, dependent status. In each case, the ἄκλητοι portrayed are in the category of those who are treated like dogs, but who ultimately undergo a reversal of fortune and become heroes.

The context of Mark 7:24–31 is a significant factor for its exegesis. The pericope marks the beginning of Jesus’ journey into Gentile territory, and is placed between the two feeding stories, the first of which involves Israelites, while the second is for Gentiles. The symbolism of “bread” and “feeding” is important, with the bread here representing Jesus’ whole ministry. If the story goes back to the historical Jesus, as seems likely, the details are consistent with his arrival ἄκλητος, and it is clear that the woman is also uninvited. Both are envisaged in the lowly position that is typical of ἄκλητοι, sitting on the floor, probably in the vestibule of the house. Jesus’ statement that “it is not fair to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs” asserts that it is not right to take “food” intended primarily for Israel and give it to Gentile “dogs.” The term κύων is derogatory, but is rendered much less insulting by the fact that the canine imagery is also applicable to Jesus himself. The story probably turns on the woman’s substitution of the word παιδία for τέκνα. She is possibly claiming that her daughter should be regarded as a παιδίου rather than a “dog,” and indicating that when a meal is shared, there is sufficient for all—Israelites, Gentiles, and ἄκλητοι.
In Luke 16:19–26, the πτωχὸς Lazarus is to be understood as a destitute and chronically ill man who has been put in the vestibule of the rich man’s house in anticipation that he will receive aid and sustenance. The canine imagery here is significant, and Lazarus is a typical ἄκλητος, with a status even lower than that of the hounds. His elevation to a place of honour at the heavenly banquet represents the fulfilment of the divine reversal prophesied in the Beatitudes and elsewhere. The judgment and punishment of the rich man are a consequence of his inhospitality.

Lazarus and Jesus share several characteristics, notably their reliance on hospitality, their suffering, and their exaltation after death. In Deuteronomistic terms the misfortunes of both would have been seen as punishment for sin. However, in view of Jesus’ death by crucifixion, his subsequent exaltation represents a far greater reversal than that experienced by Lazarus. The traditional interpretation of Jesus’ death and resurrection on the basis of the atonement does not specifically explain the means by which followers of Jesus attain entrée to the eschatological banquet. By contrast, the analysis of the synoptic traditions concerning Jesus’ table fellowship points clearly to the means of gaining access to the kingdom as a commensal of Jesus. Moreover, examination of additional NT texts will further demonstrate the significance of hospitality and feasting traditions for understanding the historical Jesus, and the evolution of the Christian faith. On these grounds, Chapter Eight will investigate the exaltation of Jesus from the perspective of the Commensality Tradition.
Chapter Eight

JESUS AND THE BANQUETS

1. Introduction:

This chapter draws on our previous findings to explore several NT issues concerning Jesus and meals, approaching the topics with a view to exploring the relationship between the Commensality and Passion Traditions. §2 examines some NT passages that highlight elements pertaining to hospitality in both the earthly and the heavenly realms, as well as pre- and post-resurrection. In §3, we investigate the two meal scenes contained in the Passion Narrative, with a brief consideration of Mark’s anointing account, and a detailed examination of the Last Supper. §4 focuses on the eschatological banquet with reference to NT texts, especially Luke 13:28–30; 14:15–24 and parr., as well as to the baptismal rite of the early church, and the concept termed “the justice of the banquet.” In §5 we look at the relative merits of the Persecution–Vindication genre and the Ambiguous Guest motif for understanding the exaltation of Jesus. The chapter concludes with a summary.

2. Relevant pre- and post-resurrection texts:

2.1. “Threshold” imagery:

2.1.1. Preamble:

An interesting point of comparison between Lazarus and Jesus as ἔκλωτος is that both may be envisaged as waiting at or near entrances in the hope of receiving hospitality.¹ While there is no specific report of Jesus doing so in his lifetime, several NT passages contain imagery in which he, or others, are waiting or knocking at a door in the hope of gaining entry. Despite the fact that in the NT milieu outsiders

¹ See Chapter Seven, §7.2.1.4 re Mark 7:24–31, and the likelihood that Jesus is waiting to gain access to a meal.
were evidently able to enter with relative ease, the door still signifies that it is the householder’s prerogative to keep out unwanted visitors. The recurrence of the “threshold” theme suggests that imagery of Jesus seeking hospitality as an ἄκλητος corresponds analogically to individuals’ attempts to gain entry to the kingdom.

The concept is based on two of our previous findings. Firstly, it has been surmised that gaining entry by “following” Jesus into an earthly banquet correlates with eligibility to attend the heavenly banquet as one of his umbrae. Secondly, we saw that a host who welcomes Jesus or his disciples in this world will himself be welcomed into the kingdom. The following examples in which the motif occurs are categorised as relevant to the period either before or after the resurrection.

2.1.2. Pre-resurrection sayings:

In Luke 11:9–10, God is depicted as beneficent, opening the door to those who seek entry to the kingdom:

_9 καρπὸς ἕμεν ἀλήγω, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ἵμαν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε, κραύγετε καὶ ἀνοιχθήσεται ἵμαν._ 10 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κραύγοντι ἀνοιχθήσεται._

9 “So I say to you, Ask, and it will be given you; search, and you will find; knock, and [the door] will be opened for you. 10 For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who searches finds, and for everyone who knocks, [the door] will be opened.”

The fact that both the preceding and the following passages (vv. 5–8, 11–13) involve responses to requests for food indicates that the pericope concerns hospitality, while

---

2 Cf. Crossan’s description of the magnitude of “the step across the threshold of a peasant stranger’s home,” (Jewish Peasant, 341).
3 The par. Matt 7:7–8 is almost identical. Stendahl (“Matthew,” §681k, 780) points out that the door in vv. 7–8 is not connected with that mentioned in Matt 7:13–14, and indicates that the Lucan context for the saying is preferable. The knocking relates to an appropriate attitude of confidence in God’s mercy (ibid.).
4 The parable about the friend at midnight (11:5–8) is ostensibly recounted to illustrate how to pray. However, the humorous story also demonstrates how important it is to be able to provide
the context of the verb ἀνοίγω⁵ presumes the existence of a door on which to knock. The saying indicates that God will welcome those who seek admission to the heavenly banquet. However, the use of present imperatives (αίτεῖτε, ζητεῖτε, and κρούετε) perhaps implies a need to go on asking, seeking, and knocking,⁶ and hence that entrée is not automatic. This idea is underscored by the second example, Luke 13:24, which suggests that access to the kingdom is restricted, i.e. that God, the householder, may exercise his right to refuse entry.

'Αγωνίζεσθε εἰσέλθειν διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας, ὅτι πολλοὶ, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν εἰσέλθειν καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν.

24 Strive to enter through the narrow door; for many, I tell you, will try to enter and will not be able.⁷

The third example, Luke 16:16, depicts the entrance to the kingdom being stormed by violent people.

'Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι τὴν ίωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσαγελλέται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.

The law and the prophets were in effect until John came; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and ‘everyone forces a way into it.’

Exegesis of this text and par. Matt 11:12 is notoriously difficult,⁸ but the logion should probably be regarded as being based on Pharisees’ criticism of Jesus, as

---

5 Re the uncertainty regarding the tense of ἀνοίγω in v. 10 (future or present), see Nolland, Luke, 628 note c; Robinson et al., Critical Edition of Q, xcvi.
6 See Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 223; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §242, p. 79.
Danker has proposed. Therefore the phrase translated “everyone forces a way into it,” would be understood as a quotation of critics, who apparently complain that since John came, all sorts (even toll collectors and sinners), have been storming over the threshold of the kingdom.  

2.1.3. Post-resurrection texts:

The first passage depicts the risen Jesus, like the historical Jesus, arriving at a meal ἐκλητος. It describes how Jesus appears among the disciples and asks for food as they are discussing the event that occurred on the Emmaus road.  

Luke 24:36, 41–43:

36 Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων αὐτὸς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐλημὴ ἡμῖν... 41 ἔτι δὲ ἀπεσπόρτων αὐτῶν ἄπό τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, “Εξετή τι βρῶσιμον ἐνθάδε; 42 οἱ δὲ ἐπέδικαν αὐτὸ ἱχθύς ὑπὸ μέρος; 43 καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν.

36 While they were talking about this, Jesus himself stood among them and said to them, “Peace be with you.”... 41 While in their joy they were disbelieving and still wondering, he said to them, “Have you anything here to eat?” 42 They gave him a piece of broiled fish, 43 and he took it and ate in their presence.

The next two passages assert that those who welcome the risen Jesus will experience commensality with him.

---

7 This saying is possibly authentic, whereas the following three verses are clearly from a post-resurrection perspective. See Funk, Five Gospels, 347–48. On the par. Matt 7:13–14, see Stendahl, “Matthew,” §681n, 780.
8 See e.g. the discussion on Matt 11:12 and par. in W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew (3 vols; The International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1991), 2:254–56. The authors describe the text as “without a doubt, one of the NT’s great conundrums” (Ibid. 254). See also Robinson et al., Critical Edition of Q, 464–67.
10 Ibid. 236–37.
11 See §2.2.1 below.
Luke 12:36–37:

36 καὶ ὑμεῖς ᾠδιοις ἀνθρώποις προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ἑαυτῶν πότε ἀναλύῃ ἐκ τῶν γάμων, ὅταν ἔλθωσας καὶ κρούσας τοὺς εὐθέως ἀνοίζωσιν αὐτῷ. 37 μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἔλθων ὁ κύριος εἰρήσει γρηγοροῦντας· ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι περιζωσταί καὶ ἀνακλινεῖ αὕτοίς καὶ παρελθὼν διακαιόφροι αὕτοῖς.

36 Be like those who are waiting for their master to return from the banquet,\(^\text{12}\) so that they may open [the door] for him as soon as he comes and knocks. 37 Blessed are those slaves whom the master finds alert when he comes; truly I tell you, he will gird himself and have them recline (at table), and he will come and serve them.\(^\text{13}\)

Rev 3:20:

ἰδοὺ ἔστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρούσα· ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς μου καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, [καὶ] εἰσελθὼν πρός αὐτὸν καὶ δειπνήσω μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὔλισμεν μετ’ ἐμοῦ.

Here I am! I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with him, and he will eat with me. (NIV)

A fourth text, Luke 13:25–27, constitutes a warning that the door to the kingdom will be closed to those who do not know Jesus personally. The saying apparently refers to people who have not welcomed Jesus during his lifetime, and whose claim to have been his commensals is therefore invalid. Consequently, they are ineligible to attend the eschatological banquet.

25 ἢ δὲ ὢν ἐν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν καὶ ἀρέσκοι ἐξω ἐστάσαι καὶ κρούσαι τὴν θύραν λέγοντες, Κύριε, ἀνοίξου ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀποκρυθῆς ἔρει ἡμῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα ἡμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ. 26 τότε ἀρέσκοι λέγειν, Ἐφάγομεν ἐνσώιον σοι καὶ ἐπίσημον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας· 27 καὶ ἔρει λέγων ἡμῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα [ἡμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ, πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας.

---

\(^{12}\) Re γάμοι as usually, but not necessarily, a wedding banquet, see “γάμος, οὗ, δὴ,” 1. b, BAGD 151.

\(^{13}\) Re the notion of the master taking the servant’s role as “not at all true to life,” see Nolland, Luke, 701; and for further discussion see §3.3.5 below.
25 When once the owner of the house has got up and shut the door, and you begin to stand outside and to knock at the door, saying, 'Lord, open to us,' then in reply he will say to you, 'I do not know where you come from.' 26 Then you will begin to say, 'We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets.' 27 But he will say, 'I do not know where you come from; go away from me, all you evildoers!'

The next subsection focuses entirely on post-resurrection NT texts concerning hospitality, and demonstrates convincingly that the practice followed by Jesus and his itinerant disciples was maintained in early Christianity.

2.2. *The ongoing accent on hospitality:*

2.2.1. In Luke-Acts:

The prominence of the hospitality theme in Luke’s pre-Easter narrative is continued in the post-resurrection period. Of the Synoptic Gospels, only Luke has the risen Jesus actually eating with his disciples, and the hospitality motif is given particular emphasis in the account of the walk to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35). It involves an appearance of the risen Jesus as a stranger\(^{14}\) who is not recognised initially.\(^{15}\) A short citation from the story is sufficient to indicate how the disciples are privileged to recognise the risen Jesus only when they invite him to share their meal.

Luke 24:28–31:

\[28\text{Καὶ ἐνεγνώσαν εἰς τὴν καμήν ὑπὸ ἐπορεύοντο, καὶ αὐτὸς προσεποιήσατο παρράτερον πορεύεσθαι. 29 καὶ παρεβίασαν αὐτῶν λέγοντες, Μεῖνοι μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστίν καὶ κέκλεισεν ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖς. 30 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλύθησαι αὐτῶν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐὐλαβήσας καὶ κλάσας ἐπεδίουσαν αὐτοῖς. 31 αὐτῶν δὲ διημοῖρασαν οἱ ἀρτὸς καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδιστυρος ἐγένετο ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν.}\]

---

\(^{14}\) See v. 18; Zerwick and Grosvenor, *Grammatical Analysis*, 281; and also "παροικῶν," 2, BAGD 629, although the sense suggested in 1. a, BAGD 628 is the more probable.
28 As they came near the village to which they were going, he walked ahead as if he were going on. 29 But they urged him strongly, saying, "Stay with us, because it is almost evening and the day is now nearly over." So he went in to stay with them. 30 When he had reclined at table with them, he took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them. 31 Then their eyes were opened, and they recognized him; and he vanished from their sight.

Similarly, in Acts, Luke demonstrates the high value he places on hospitality by maintaining the emphasis that is so evident in his Gospel.\(^{16}\) The many references to board and/or lodging being offered to believers include Acts 9:43; 10:23, 48; 16:15, 33–34; 18:3; 21:8; 28:2, 7, 14.

2.2.2. In the NT epistles:

Although the hospitality theme is so conspicuous in Luke, the prominence given to it in a great variety of NT epistles proves that this phenomenon cannot be downplayed as merely a trait of one evangelist. The following citations demonstrate the great importance attached to hospitality in the early church.\(^{17}\) They also reflect the principle that offering a welcome to a disciple of Jesus (i.e. a believer) is accounted as if it were to Jesus himself.\(^{18}\)

Rom 12:13:

\[ \tau \alpha i \chi \rho \varepsilon i a i s \tau \omega n \ \alpha \gamma \iota \tau w n \ \kappa \alpha i n w \kappa o \omega \nu \sigma \iota n t e s, \ \tau i n \ \phi i l o \zeta e n i a \ \delta i \acute{w} k o u t e s. \]

Contribute to the needs of the saints; extend hospitality to strangers.

---

\(^{15}\) The passage recalls the idea that any stranger may turn out to be a divine envoy. See Chapter Three, \$2.3.


\(^{17}\) Note, however, that in the NT period the term \( \phi i l o \zeta e n i a \) is not necessarily to be understood literally. Although some disciples seeking board and lodging would be unknown to the host, it is apparent from Paul's letters that they would frequently have arrived with a letter of recommendation. See e.g. Rom 16:1–2; Phil 2:25–30; Col 4:10; Phlm 10–17. It seems that the emphasis shifted quite rapidly to welcoming \( \textit{fellow-Christians}, \) as against \( \textit{strangers}. \) See e.g. Rom 15:7; 3 John 10.

\(^{18}\) See Chapter Seven, §§3.1.3.7; 5.1; and 5.3.1.
1 Tim 3:2:

dei oon ton episkopon anepistemon einai, maz gynaiako anoora, nephaliou sofrova
kopiumon filodoxenon didaktikon . . .

Now a bishop must be above reproach, married only once, temperate, sensible,
respectable, hospitable, an apt teacher . . .

1 Tim 5:9–10:

9 Xira katalegesw mou elatton etoy ezhkonata geonuita, enos andros yuhi, 10 en
erogi kaloi marturoumene, el etekinotrofisen, el exenoðhtrion, el agiai podas
enwv, el thelomeneis epirkesen, el panti ergw agath epikolouthesen.

9 Let a widow be put on the list if she is not less than sixty years old and has been
married only once; 10 she must be well attested for her good works, as one who has
brought up children, shown hospitality, washed the saints’ feet, helped the afflicted,
and devoted herself to doing good in every way.

Tit 1:7–8:

7 dei gar ton episkopon aneggelitou einai ws theou oikonomon, mh aerithi, mh
orgiwo, mh paroion, mh pliktis, mh axioskeredi, 8 alla filodoxenon filagaithon
sofrova dikaiou dosion egkratith.

7 For a bishop, as God’s steward, must be blameless; he must not be arrogant or quick-
tempered or addicted to wine or violent or greedy for gain; 8 but he must be hospitable,
a lover of goodness, prudent, upright, devout, and self-controlled.

Heb 13:2:

tis filodoxias mhe epiloutheose, dia tautes gar elaithon timei xeniosautes aggelous

Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for by doing that some have
entertained angels without knowing it.
1 Pet 4:9:

φιλάξενοι ἐνο άλληλοις άνευ γογγυσμοῦ . . .

Be hospitable to one another without complaining . . .

Examination of miscellaneous NT texts with a focus on commensality has revealed that offering hospitality to Jesus and/or his disciples is of crucial importance both before and after the resurrection. We continue to utilise this approach as we turn now to the investigation of the meal scenes within the Marcan account of the passion.

3. The Passion Narrative:

3.1. Introduction:

In the review of Crossan’s work, three issues pertaining to the Passion Narrative were considered. Firstly, it was surmised that the Passion Narrative is partially fictitious, incorporating many details derived from OT material, although the basic outline and sequence represent actual events. Secondly, it was accepted that Mark 14–15 is shaped on the basis of the Persecution–Vindication tale, with Jesus featuring as the suffering righteous person who is ultimately rescued. Thirdly, it was mentioned that both Isaiah 52–53 and Mark 14–15 belong in the second of the two variations of the Persecution–Vindication folktale, in which the rescue occurs following the death of the victim. Consequently, it was acknowledged that Mark’s Passion Narrative establishes a connection between Jesus and the Suffering Servant imagery of Isaiah 52–53. It is worth noting here that my reason for utilising

---

19 See the remarks of Raymond E. Brown, Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels (2 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 514. Mark’s Passion Narrative being in continuity with the sequence presented by Paul in 1 Cor 11:23–25. Note also Brown’s rejection of the theory that the Passion Narrative consists entirely of imaginative reflections based on the OT (ibid. 1445).

20 See Chapter One, §§3.2.1.5 and 3.2.3.
Crossan’s treatment of the Passion Narrative is that he gives appropriate recognition to the Persecution–Vindication genre, and its relevance to Jesus.21

Having established the underlying principles, we will now consider the structure of the Passion Narrative, drawing on Mack’s model. Like Crossan, Mack has utilised the work of both Bultmann and Nickelsburg, albeit with some modifications.22 He lists the essential components of the narrative’s plot as the temple act; the arrest; the trials; and the crucifixion.23 In addition, he identifies four independent stories that function as a counterpoint. Of these, the meal is the most significant, with the anointing, Gethsemane, and the empty tomb each occupying secondary positions.24

Since we are focusing only on the meal traditions in the narrative, the investigation is limited to the anointing story and the Last Supper. Hence our main concern is with Mark 14, although reference will be made to other accounts as necessary.25

---

21 Cf. Brown, who mentions Nickelsburg’s work in his bibliography (Death of the Messiah, 99, citing “Markan Passion Narrative,”) but does not allude to the Persecution–Vindication genre. While he does acknowledge the similarity of the suffering just one in Wis 5:1–5 to the Passion Narratives and the probable influence of the Isaiah Suffering Servant on the former, Brown does not recognise the existence of an underlying literary motif. See ibid. 1452, esp. nn. 22–23.

22 See Mack, Myth of Innocence, esp. 253–55 re Bultmann; 262–63, 265–68 re Nickelsburg. Mack’s views depend also on the finding of earlier scholars that the Psalms, especially those expressing lamentation, were used extensively in the composition of the passion account (ibid. 256–57; and see Fig. 16, p. 256).

23 Mack, Myth of Innocence, 270. According to Mack’s model, the narrative actually commences at 11:1 with Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, which marks the transition to the final section of the Gospel (ibid. 273–74). Cf. the position of Brown, who treats the Passion Narrative as commencing at Mark 14:27, thus excluding the Last Supper (Death of the Messiah, 37). He considers that the passion (i.e. suffering) of Jesus did not begin until his agony at Gethsemane. However, the Pauline tradition makes a strong connection between Jesus’ actions at the Last Supper and his death (1 Cor 11:23–26).

24 Mack, Myth of Innocence, 271; and see Fig. 18, p. 272.

25 Note that while I follow Bultmann and Mack to some extent as to the structure of Mark’s Passion Narrative, I reject their views concerning the nature of the Last Supper. For Bultmann’s notion that Mark 14:22–25 derives from a “cult legend,” see his Synoptic Tradition, 265, 277, 284. For Mack’s belief that Mark’s account of the Last Supper is derived from a Hellenistic Christ cult, see his Myth of Innocence, 275–76.
3.2. Mark’s anointing account:

3.2.1. The text:

Mark 14:3–9:

3 While he was at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he reclined at the table, a woman came with an alabaster jar of very costly ointment of nard, and she broke open the jar and poured the ointment on his head. 4 But some were there who said to one another in anger, “Why was the ointment wasted in this way? 5 For this ointment could have been sold for more than three hundred denarii, and the money given to the poor.” And they scolded her. 6 But Jesus said, “Let her alone; why do you trouble her? She has performed a good service for me. 7 For you always have the poor with you, and you can show kindness to them whenever you wish; but you will not always have me. 8 She has done what she could; she has anointed my body beforehand for its burial. 9 Truly I tell you, wherever the good news is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be told in remembrance of her.”
3.2.2. Commentary:

Several of the points made during discussion of Luke 7:36–50 in Chapter Seven\(^{26}\) are applicable also to the investigation of Mark’s anointing account. Thus it is already accepted that despite their differences, the four accounts of the anointing derive from a single tradition, and that the event takes place during a formal meal, at which the woman has arrived uninvited. We may also surmise from the woman’s possession of an ἀλάβαστρος,\(^{27}\) and from its contents, that she is either a prostitute or an ex-prostitute.\(^{28}\)

On the grounds of the criterion of embarrassment,\(^{29}\) it is likely that the original story derives from an historical event.\(^{30}\) However, it is very probable that Mark has inserted his version at this point in the Passion Narrative to suit his authorial purpose.\(^{31}\) In doing so, he also draws attention away from the impropriety of the woman’s actions.\(^{32}\)

An important issue arising from the story is whether Mark sees any messianic significance in the anointing.\(^{33}\) The precise nature of the ointment is indeterminable, owing to uncertainty about the meaning of πιστικής in v. 3. It may connote genuine,

\(^{26}\) See §§6.2.1; 6.2.5.

\(^{27}\) See “ἀλάβαστρος, ὦ, ὄ and ἤ,” BAGD 34 re the variants ἀλάβαστρος and ἀλάβαστρον, τό.


\(^{29}\) See Chapter Two, §3.2.

\(^{30}\) Wilson considers that the “graphic detail” in Mark’s account supports its authenticity, while the disparity between this and other versions illustrates the ways in which the tradition was developed (“Mark,” §710c, 814). Hooker remarks that vv. 6–7 may go back to the historical Jesus (According to St Mark, 329). Mack, on the other hand, regards most of the pericope as redactional, seeing it as an expanded chreia (Myth of Innocence, 200). He suggests the original chreia as e.g.: ‘When Jesus was at table, a disreputable woman entered and poured out a jar of perfumed oil upon him. He said, “That was good.” ’ His proposal for the chreia and its elaboration illustrates one of the problems of this method: material that may well be authentic is automatically assumed to be redactional. For a detailed critique of the method, see Chapter Two, §3.3.3.

\(^{31}\) Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 263, 277; Hooker, According to St Mark, 327. However, Derrett sees the episode as belonging to the period shortly before the crucifixion (Law in the New Testament, 266).

\(^{32}\) Corley, Private Women, 105.
but could also refer to the Aramaic term for the *pistachio nut*, which is used in the production of ointments.\textsuperscript{34} However, it is apparent that the perfume is very costly (πολυτελής). In contrast, Samuel evidently used olive oil (יֶעֶר, LXX ἐλαιόν), rather than expensive spikenard for anointing Saul (1 Sam 10:1) and David (1 Sam 16:12–13). It is perhaps more illuminating to compare the descriptions of the anointings, and the verbs that are employed. The anointing of Jesus is similar to that of Saul in that the act is sudden and unexpected. In both cases the ointment/oil is simply poured out on to the head (κατάχθεω as against ἐπιχθεω respectively). In contrast, the anointing of David is more formal, and the verb used for the pouring of the oil is χρίω.\textsuperscript{35} One would therefore expect that if Mark intended to build on the triumphal entry of Jesus as the anticipated Davidid,\textsuperscript{36} he would have used the verb χρίω, rather than κατάχθεω, in the anointing story.\textsuperscript{37} Further, in v. 8, the verb used in reference to the anointing is μυρίζω, rather than χρίω. The former term is normally employed either in reference to an anointing performed by harlots and flute-girls, or to the embalming of a corpse, and it occurs only here in the NT.\textsuperscript{38} Hence, Mark’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Mark is probably accurate in stating that Jesus’ head was anointed, rather than his feet. See Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 327; and the discussion in Chapter Seven, §6.2.4.1.
\item \textsuperscript{35} See “ποιτικὴς,” BAGD 662; Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 328. Hooker considers that the difficult Greek terms in the description may be due to clumsy translation from the original Aramaic (ibid.).
\item \textsuperscript{36} This distinction between the cited OT anointings is made only with regard to the pouring of the oil, and not to the end result. In the LXX, the verb ἐπιχθέω translates the Hebrew πύ (pour out) in 1 Sam 10:1a, while χρίω is used to render πυ (anoint a person) for the pouring of the oil on David in 1 Sam 16:12. However, πυ is used in 1 Sam 10b in the statement that Saul has been anointed. Similarly, for the anointing of Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:6a, πυ and ἐπιχθεω are used for the pouring of oil, while πυ and χρίω are then used for the statement “I anoint you king . . . ” in v. 6b. In the case of Jesus’ anointing, there is of course no such statement about the significance of the action immediately afterwards.
\item \textsuperscript{37} See Mark 11:10; Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries*, 310.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Nevertheless, some scholars consider that the anointing of Jesus has messianic implications (ibid. 310, nn. 37–39). Both Evans (ibid. 310) and T. W. Manson [*The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 84–85] draw a comparison between Jesus’ anointing, and that of Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:1–13.
\item \textsuperscript{38} See “μυρίζω,” BAGD 529; Ravens, “Luke’s Account of the Anointing,” 283.
\end{itemize}
choice of the verb μυαλεῖω seems to indicate that he associates the anointing only with Jesus’ imminent death, and not with his royal status.  

Hooker aptly observes that Jesus’ response to the criticism of the woman (vv. 6–7) “forms a natural climax” to the episode, and that nothing further is needed.  

Indeed, the following two verses of the passage are almost certainly redactional. Although death was a frequent topos at formal meals in Jesus’ lifetime, it is improbable that he actually referred to his burial in relation to the anointing. Thus it seems that Mark has added vv. 8–9 to provide a new perspective to the story, and to shift the focus according to his authorial intent. In the next subsection, when the motif of death looms large once more in the context of feasting, we will particularly be considering issues pertaining to commensality, as against Mark’s continuing emphasis on the passion.

3.3. The Last Supper:

3.3.1. A Passover feast?

The Last Supper traditions are extremely complex, and involve many controversial issues. The first to be considered is the nature of the meal, i.e. whether it was, in fact, a Passover feast. All of the Gospels agree that Jesus was crucified on a Friday, and that the Last Supper took place on the previous evening, but there is inconsistency concerning the day on which the Passover occurred. According to the Synoptics, the Friday was Nisan 15, the first day of the Passover, so that the feast would have been held the previous evening. However, John’s chronology requires that the Passover coincided with the Sabbath in that year. Hence, by his reckoning, the paschal lambs were being slaughtered at the time of Jesus’ death, and the Last Supper was not the

39 Ibid.
40 According to St Mark, 329. See also Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 263.
41 See Chapter Four, §5.
Passover feast.\textsuperscript{43} We will examine the data with reference to Mark’s account, citing other texts as necessary.

Mark 14:12–25:

12 Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουν, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὁ μαθηταίς αὐτοῦ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθὸντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγης τὸ πάσχα; 13 καὶ ἀποστέλλει δῶο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἀνατίθησιν ἰμέν ἀνθρώπων κεράμιον ἰδατος βαιστάξων ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ 14 καὶ ὅπου ἔσται τυφλὸν, ἐπετα τῷ οἰκουμένῳ ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει. Ποῦ ἔσται τὸ κατάλληλο μου ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; 15 καὶ αὐτοῖς ἰμέν δείξει ἀνάγαιλον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἐτοιμόνιν· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν. 16 καὶ ἐξῆλθον ὁ μαθηταίς καὶ ἤλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὗρον καθώς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. 17 Καὶ ὁ ψύχος γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα. 18 καὶ ἀκακεμένοις αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιότων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἄμην λέγω ἵμιν ὅτι εἶς εἰς ἰμῶν παραδώσει με ὁ ἐσθίων μετ’ ἐμοί. 19 ἤρξαντο λυπέσασθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς κατὰ εἰς. Μητί ἐγώ; 20 ὅ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμπαστάμονις μετ’ ἐμοῖ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον. 21 δι τὸ ἐμὲ υἱὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ὅ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ ἐμείνῃ ὁ ὕδως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλῶν αὐτῷ εἰ ὁ εὐγενεία ὁ ἀνθρώπως ἐκείνος. 22 Καὶ ἐσθιότων αὐτῶν λαβῶν ἄρτου εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τούτῳ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα μου. 23 καὶ λαβών ποτήριον εὐχρηστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπικατ οἱ αὐτῶν πάντες. 24 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς. Τούτῳ ἔστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυσόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. 25 ἀμήν λέγω ἵμιν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πώς ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμήλου ἐκείς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καυνοῦ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

12 On the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover lamb is sacrificed, his disciples said to him, “Where do you want us to go and make the preparations for you to eat the Passover?” 13 So he sent two of his disciples, saying to them, “Go into the city, and a man carrying a jar of water will meet you; follow him, 14 and wherever he enters,
say to the owner of the house, “The Teacher asks, Where is my guest room where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?” 15 He will show you a large room upstairs, furnished and ready. Make preparations for us there.” 16 So the disciples set out and went to the city, and found everything as he had told them; and they prepared the Passover meal. 17 When it was evening, he came with the twelve. 18 And when they had taken their places and were eating, Jesus said, “Truly I tell you, one of you will betray me, one who is eating with me.” 19 They began to be distressed and to say to him one after another, “Surely, not I?” 20 He said to them, “It is one of the twelve, one who is dipping bread into the bowl with me. 21 For the Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that one by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been better for that one not to have been born.” 22 While they were eating, he took a loaf of bread, and after blessing it he broke it, gave it to them, and said, “Take; this is my body.” 23 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he gave it to them, and all of them drank from it. 24 He said to them, “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. 25 Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.”

Various attempts have been made to explain the disparate Last Supper chronologies in John and the Synoptics, in a bid either to show that both are legitimate, or to determine which is more likely to be accurate. While several scholars are persuaded that the synoptic chronology is valid, there is substantial evidence in favour of the Johannine perspective. Firstly, it seems highly improbable that the events as depicted in Mark could all have been accommodated within a twenty-four hour period, and

43 Meier, Roots of the Problem, 386–90.
46 I.e. from the beginning of the meal on Thursday evening to the commencement of the Sabbath on the Friday evening. For the view that this tight sequence of episodes is a literary device, see Nolland, Luke, 1025–26. But note that 1 Cor 11:23 provides independent evidence of a rapid succession of events (Meier, Roots of the Problem, 429 n. 109).
particularly that such incidents could have taken place on a holy day like the Passover.\textsuperscript{47} Secondly, many significant elements of the Passover meal are absent, notably the paschal lamb.\textsuperscript{48} Thirdly, the episode concerning Barabbas (Mark 15:6–15; John 18:39–40) suggests that the Passover feast is still to take place, since the rationale would be to allow the released prisoner to attend the festive meal.\textsuperscript{49} Fourthly, the statements in John 18:28 and 19:14, indicating that the Passover commenced on the Friday evening, are corroborated by 1 Cor 5:7, according to which Jesus is envisaged as the paschal lamb.\textsuperscript{50} In the light of the evidence, then, the Johannine chronology is to be preferred.\textsuperscript{51} Even if it seems unlikely that Jesus died during the very period in which the paschal lambs were being slaughtered,\textsuperscript{52} it is still reasonable to conclude that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal. The implication is that Mark 14:12–16 must be redactional,\textsuperscript{53} and that the identification of the Last Supper with the Passover is the result of later theological reflection.\textsuperscript{54}

Nevertheless, owing to the imminence of the festival, a strong focus on the Passover is presupposed.\textsuperscript{55}

3.3.2. The link with Exodus 24:

We will be considering Jesus’ sayings over the bread and cup in detail below, but it is salutary at this point to mention the likelihood of a link between Mark 14:24 and

\begin{itemize}
\item Hooker, \textit{According to St Mark}, 333.
\item Meier, \textit{Roots of the Problem}, 400; Marshall, \textit{Last Supper}, 64.
\item Meier, \textit{Roots of the Problem}, 429–30 nn. 108–109; Brown, \textit{Death of the Messiah}, 1373; see also Marshall, \textit{Last Supper}, 64, although he is sceptical about the strength of this argument.
\item Meier, \textit{Roots of the Problem}, 395–401; Hooker, \textit{According to St Mark}, 334.
\item I.e. because it fits so well with John’s theological concerns (Meier, \textit{Roots of the Problem}, 430 n. 109). See Brown, \textit{Death of the Messiah}, 1372, re “the sixth hour” as the time at which the slaughter of paschal lambs commenced. This same hour (noon) is mentioned in all the canonical Gospels (ibid.). In John 19:14 it marks the time at which Jesus is sentenced to death, while in the Synoptics, it is the beginning of the three hours of darkness (Mark 15:33; Matt 27:45; Luke 23:44).
\item Especially in view of the obvious similarity to details in 11:1–6 (Hooker, \textit{According to St Mark}, 332). See also Bultmann, \textit{Synoptic Tradition}, 278.
\item Hooker, \textit{According to St Mark}, 334; Charlesworth, \textit{Judaism}, 103.
\end{itemize}
Exodus 24. The phrase: “my blood of the covenant” in the cup saying is strikingly similar to Moses’ words in the ritual at Sinai: “See the blood of the covenant that the Lord has made with you . . .” The possibility that Jesus is alluding to the establishment of the covenant is often acknowledged, but another significant point has apparently been overlooked. In the description of the ritual at Sinai, two separate traditions are mentioned as the means of effecting the covenant: a blood sacrifice (Exod 24:3–8) and a sacred communal meal (Exod 24:1–2, 9–11). The importance of this insight about the two strands of tradition will become clear in due course.

3.3.3. The meal:

Although the exact details of the Last Supper are irretrievable, it is widely acknowledged as historical that Jesus and his immediate circle of disciples were gathered for a meal on the evening before his crucifixion. Whether or not it is accepted that it was foreseen as a farewell meal, it is generally agreed that Jesus did and said some striking and extraordinary things on the occasion. Meier offers a feasible explanation of the circumstances: that Jesus, sensing his arrest was imminent, arranged with the support of a wealthy follower to hold a farewell meal with his close disciples. Assuming the impecunious situation of the group, then even if we were to dismiss the idea of Jesus’ premonition about his death, the most

60 Meier, *Roots of the Problem*, 399.
61 Ibid.
plausible situation is that the meal was hosted by an anonymous Jerusalemite. It is then an open question as to whether Jesus requested the event, or the hospitality was offered, but the answer is immaterial. Under the proposed scenario, the crucial point is that instead of taking the traditional view that Jesus is the host, we may envisage him in the role of chief guest.

The reason behind the usual assumption that Jesus is the host at the Last Supper is that he breaks the bread. The significance of this is that Jesus’ actions—giving thanks to God, and breaking the bread before its distribution to those present—are considered to represent the ritual performed by the host to signal the beginning of the meal. Likewise the blessing of the cup of wine at the conclusion of the meal is understood as a task performed by the host. However, it should be borne in mind that these descriptions of the protocols at a formal meal are based on an elaborated reconstruction that derives from rabbinical literature, and hence from well after Jesus’ lifetime. It will therefore be of value to consider other references to the breaking of bread, and the possibility of alternative interpretations.

A significant OT text is Isa 58:7, in which sharing food with the hungry is expressed:-share your bread with the hungry. However, the verb is usually rendered here as “to share,” and as we

---

64 Marshall, Last Supper, 19.
65 See ibid. Note the paucity of evidence about Jewish meals during the NT period, and the consequent need to draw on rabbinical sources from much later periods (Noy, “Meaime for Scholars,” 136, 142 n. 13). The depiction of a formal meal is derived from the Babylonian Talmud, which was probably not redacted until the sixth century, although most of the rabbis cited are dated to the second and third centuries. See ibid. 136, and 142 nn. 23–27, citing b. Ber. 43a, 47a, 46a, respectively. Re dating, see Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 142 n. 13. Note that despite the uncertainty as to the accuracy of the
saw in Chapter Four, §2.3.1, מֵאַכַּל may be understood as food in general.67 Hence the meaning of the phrase is not confined to bread, nor does it relate specifically to the supposed ritual at a formal meal.68 The only other undisputed OT usage of the verb אכילה in its qal form is in Jer 16:7, where it occurs with the implicit meaning share or offer food, although there is no actual reference to food or bread.69 The meaning is clear from the context, which relates to the “meal of comfort” held for the bereaved, following a funeral.70 In the LXX, the root אכילה is rendered with διαθέσπισμα in Isa 58:7,71 but with κλίω in Jer 16:7. Cognates of κλίω are used extensively in the NT with reference to the breaking of bread, notably for the occasions in which Jesus does so. The latter include the accounts of the feeding miracles; the Last Supper; the incident on the Emmaus road (Luke 24:30); and a reference to the Last Supper in 1 Cor 11:24.72 In addition, terminology involving the “breaking of bread” (with κλίω) is used in relation to meals in Acts 2:46; 20:7, 11; 27:35; and in 1 Cor 10:16,73 and these instances have led some scholars to regard the expression as an early designation for the Eucharist.74 However, this perspective ignores the fact that in the OT, as we have seen above, to “break bread” already has the broader connotation of

details, the reconstructed procedure has been influential. E.g. see “κλίω,” BAGD 433, where it is asserted that the breaking of bread by the head of the household is the signal to commence the meal. 67 The NIV translates the phrase: to share your food with the hungry. See also “סח: qal,” Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 298. Klauck (“Lord’s Supper,” ABD 4:369) overlooks Isa 58:7 as an OT example of “breaking bread,” and cites only Jer 16:7.

68 The same is true of the quotation of Isa 58:7 in Barn. 3:3, where δρυς surely implies food in a general sense, not simply bread.

69 Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 298. In the LXX, i.e. the text evidently utilised by Luke, the meaning of Jer 16:7 has been made explicit by the addition of the word δρυς.

70 See Noy, “Mealtime for Scholars,” 140. The NIV has: “No one will offer food to comfort those who mourn for the dead... nor will any one give them a drink to console them.”

71 This is the only occurrence of the verb in the LXX (“διαθέσπισμα,” BAGD 183). The two different translations of אכילה in the LXX are insignificant since both verbs mean to break.


73 Ibid.

eating a meal.75 Hence, the occasions in Acts involving the “breaking of bread” are not necessarily to be seen as celebrations of the Eucharist, and are probably better understood as shared meals,76 especially as this interpretation coheres so well with the instruction in Luke 3:11 that food (βρώματα) is to be shared with those who have none.

Now, the mystical bonding that occurs through commensality has already been highlighted,77 and is clearly applicable to the notion of breaking bread and sharing it among those at table together.78 Nevertheless, Luke’s reiteration of the terminology in the Emmaus story and Acts indicates that following the resurrection, a much greater significance is imputed to the phrase “the breaking of bread.”79 The implied links between the extraordinary characteristics of meals in the apostolic church,80 and the tradition concerning Jesus’ breaking of bread, signal a need for further investigation of the Last Supper. First, however, we need to ascertain the probable features of the venue in which the meal took place.

3.3.4. The venue:

The tradition that the Last Supper took place in a large upper room derives from Mark 14:15, and therefore could be fictional, since vv. 12–16 have been surmised as a Marcan composition.81 However, this detail could be authentic since it is consistent with what is known of affluent Palestinian households in Jesus’ lifetime. We saw

75 Contra Jeremias (Eucharistic Words, 119, 120, and esp. 120 n. 1), who asserts that it refers only to the ritual marking the beginning of the meal. On this matter he is followed by Just (Ongoing Feast, 234, 234 n. 39, 235), and Robinson (“Emmaus Story,” 491, 496 n. 40).
76 See the conclusions of Robinson (ibid. 493–94).
77 See Chapter Four, esp. §2.6.
78 See also Feeley-Harnik, Meaning of Food, 86; Marshall, Last Supper, 82.
80 A likely reason for a distinctive quality in Christian table fellowship is that the disciples would surely be attempting to fulfil the ideals promoted by Jesus, viz. inclusiveness and humility. The incident described in Acts 6:1–6 indicates that the early Christians were at least endeavouring to comply, although they were clearly failing in both areas. On this passage see also §3.3.5.9.4 and n. 271 below.
previously that in this period, the more opulent homes in Jerusalem reflected Roman architectural styles, and were comparable with dwellings found in Pompeii, some of which had second storeys. In particular, there was an emphasis on maximising the views obtained from dining areas, and a large, second storey banqueting hall would not be abnormal. An affluent establishment like this would usually have included several *triclinia*, from which the host would select the one most appropriate for the season and the number of guests.

Since the Last Supper was a formal meal, with the guests reclining, we may presume that the *triclinium* in which it took place conformed to the standard π shape. This arrangement of the couches normally accommodated three persons on each, with the host seated in the centre of the middle couch (i.e. at Jewish banquets). In the usual situation, each of the banqueters would be able to reach the table, which was placed centrally between the couches. However, the number of guests at the Last Supper was unusually large, totalling at least thirteen, and the standard layout of the couches would need to be modified for a group of this size. Although large groups and dining areas became more common in the later Empire, there is little evidence of them in the early first century, and the way in which couches were laid

---

81 See above, §3.3.1, esp. n. 53.
82 See Chapter Four §3.3, esp. n. 181; and §3.4.2, esp. nn. 266–268, 270; and also Marilyn M. Schaub, "house," 1, *HBD* 442.
83 See e.g. paintings of villas, Figs. 1–2, pp. 18–19, in Ward-Perkins and Claridge, *Pompeii*; and diagram of the House of the Menander, in Part IV, "The house," (ibid., re item no. 88).
84 See Chapter Four, §3.3, esp. n. 181 re dining areas with views.
85 Dunbabin, "Triclinium and Stibadium," 124.
86 See §3.4.2, Chapter Four.
87 Dunbabin, "Triclinium and Stibadium," 125.
88 Twelve guests attended Octavian's infamous banquet, described in Suetonius, *Aug.* 70, and at Trimalchio's there were sixteen, including two late arrivals (Dunbabin, "Triclinium and Stibadium," 124). See ibid. 139 n. 21 for details of other large gatherings. Note Trimalchio's assertion that one of his guestrooms will accommodate a hundred guests (Petronius, *Sat.* 78).
89 Dunbabin, "Triclinium and Stibadium," 127. In a Pompeii house, a room with space for twelve guests has been documented, but its dimensions and layout are unknown (ibid. 139 n. 21).
90 Ibid. 125.
out is mostly unclear in these instances.91 If the room were very wide, a single, central table would not be practical, and small individual tables may have been brought to the guests.92 The number of dining places was probably extended by adding extra couches at each end.93 Since the host reclined on the top couch, these additional places would be considered very inferior, especially those right at the ends.94

One of the implications of the reclining banquet was the necessity for servants, since the diners were not always able to serve themselves.95 In the original style of the Roman triclinium, with its nine places, the diners were close together, with access to the food on the central table.96 However, it appears from the examples of triclinia at Pompeii and Herculaneum that the wine krater would not have been accessible from the couches, and banqueters would have been reliant on the servants to replenish their cups.97 This would continue to be the case after the removal of the food table(s), following the meal.98 Servants would probably be required to assist banqueters more often during the meal in situations where individual tables were in use.

Owing to the number of guests at the Last Supper, we can surmise, in view of our findings, that the meal was held in a large triclinium, possibly with extra couches on the ends, or perhaps in a wide room. In either case, it is likely that individual

91 Ibid. 124; idem, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 92. See Figs 10 and 11, showing the Palazzo delle Colonne at Piolemais, and note the large triclinia, rooms 10 and 11 (ibid. 95–96). The mosaics probably date from the Flavian period (69–96 C.E.), but it is likely that the rooms were used as triclinia at an earlier time also (ibid. 96).
92 Dunbabin, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 127. Alternatively, in lieu of a table, there may have been a ledge in front of the couches, as the mosaic pattern on the floor suggests in the House of the Months at Thysdrus (ibid. 127–28; Plates/Triclinium and Stibadium, Fig. 17).
93 Dunbabin, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 126.
94 Idem, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 95.
96 Dunbabin, “Ut Graeco more biberetur,” 89; idem, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 123.
tables would have been used for at least some of the guests, and perhaps for all. The wine *krater* was probably located some distance away from the couches. This visualisation of the scene will be helpful as we turn now to investigate Jesus’ conduct during the meal.

3.3.5. Jesus’ actions at the Last Supper:

3.3.5.1. Jesus’ status and situation:

It has already been stated that Jesus is the chief guest, rather than the host, at the Last Supper, and it follows that his actions cannot be regarded as the supposedly conventional rites at the commencement and end of the meal. Although it could be argued that Jesus and/or the Twelve might have been present as ἡκλητοι, this is very unlikely, and I accept Meier’s explanation of the occasion as a formal farewell meal, at which Jesus and the Twelve were *invited* guests.99 The normal expectation would be for the chief guest to be offered the place of honour on the top couch, at the host’s right. Nevertheless, Jesus’ repeated emphasis on humility,100 and his supposed remarks in Luke 14:7–11,101 might suggest that he would insist on reclining in one of the lowest two positions at the ends. This, then, is the proposed scenario in which Jesus performed some very unconventional actions at the Last Supper.

3.3.5.2. The actions:

Owing to the diverse traditions concerning the words pronounced by Jesus over the bread and cup, the precise *sayings* are almost certainly irretrievable.102 However, there is greater consistency between the various accounts as to what Jesus *did*, and

---

97 For typical locations of the wine *krater*, see ibid, and Plates/Triclinium and Stibadium, Figs 6 and 7.
98 See Dunbabin, “Triclinium and Stibadium,” 126.
99 See Roots of the Problem, 399. However, I obviously do not concur with Meier’s inference that Jesus was *presiding* at the meal.
100 See the discussion in §5.2, Chapter Seven.
his actions can therefore be described more confidently.\footnote{Reading γάμου in Luke 14:8 as simply a banquet, rather than a wedding celebration. See n. 12 above.} When they are considered in the context proposed here, they are recognisable as similar to those of an OT prophet.\footnote{Marshall, \textit{Last Supper}, 51; O'Toole, \textit{“Last Supper,”} 238–39.} Although my interpretation of the events is conjectural, it does cohere with the probable milieu of the Last Supper, and also with other relevant texts, as I endeavour to show in the subsequent discussion.

The action with the bread:

The phrase: καὶ ἐσθιόντων (in Mark 14:18, and repeated in v. 22) indicates clearly that according to Mark, Jesus’ action with the bread takes place during the meal.\footnote{On the style of the actions, see Just, \textit{Ongoing Feast}, 234, citing Léon-Dufour re the frequency of “figurative and efficacious” gestures among the biblical prophets.} This factor presents a difficulty for the traditional interpretation, which assumes that a single large loaf was shared among all commensals.\footnote{Re the repetition, Marshall discusses the view that vv. 22–25 are derived from a liturgical formula that was inserted into the narrative (\textit{Last Supper}, 34–35). He concludes that ἐσθιόντων belongs in an historical account of Jesus’ action at the meal (ibid. 35). However, his opinion relies on the premise that it was a Passover feast. That allows him to locate the breaking of bread during the meal rather than at the beginning, but makes the explanation unsatisfactory. Hooker (\textit{According to St Mark}, 336, 340) explains the repetition of ἐσθιόντων on the grounds that Mark believed it was a Passover feast, and also that he has combined two traditions concerning the meal.} What is much more likely, however, is that there was a basket of small loaves, each intended as an individual serving, and that Mark 14:22 refers to Jesus simply “taking” (λαβὼν) one of these to commence his action. The notion gains support from v. 20, which indicates that the loaf Jesus divides is not his initial serving of bread, as he has already been dipping in the bowl, presumably using bread as a substitute for cutlery.\footnote{See Nolland (\textit{Luke}, 1048) for the view that further bread would be provided as needed during the meal, but note his understanding of it as the Passover.} In addition, there is substantial evidence to suggest that the bread at the Last Supper would have been in

\begin{thebibliography}{10}
\bibitem{} Marshall, \textit{Last Supper}, 51; O'Toole, \textit{“Last Supper,”} 238–39.
\bibitem{} Marshall, \textit{Last Supper}, 83.
\bibitem{} On the style of the actions, see Just, \textit{Ongoing Feast}, 234, citing Léon-Dufour re the frequency of “figurative and efficacious” gestures among the biblical prophets.
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the form of small loaves. In the NT, loaves of bread appear to be comparable with stones in Matt 4:3 and par. Luke 4:3, and in Matt 7:9, suggesting there is a resemblance in size and shape. Although in the temptation story Jesus, in his famished state, would require several loaves, one is evidently of a size to suit the hypothetical child in Matt 7:9. Further, in the story about the friend requesting food at midnight (Luke 11:5–8), the three loaves needed for the one guest would be excessive unless they were small. The idea of these small loaves of bread being served in a basket is affirmed by representations of bread in the Jewish art of the period.

When the loaf taken by Jesus is envisaged in this way, it is apparent that his action represents a completely unconventional episode within the context of the formal meal. The extraordinary nature of his action is emphasised in that he gives thanks for this one particular loaf (v. 22), when the entire meal would presumably have been blessed already at its commencement. The actual division of the loaf in v. 22 is significant in itself, and will be discussed below, but the more important issue at present is the distribution of the portions. As we saw in Chapter Four, the assignment of portions is a major responsibility, and is performed by persons in

---

108 Many of the OT references to bread suggest that the loaves, or “cakes,” were quite small, and that one per person would usually suffice. Relevant texts include 2 Sam 6:19 and par. 1 Chr 16:3; Jer 37:21 (םִ֥ים); 1 Kgs 17:13; 19:6 (סַפָּה); 2 Sam 13:6, 8, 10 (סַפָּה); and Lev 7:12–14. Note the baskets of ( unleavened) bread in Exod 29:3; Lev 8:2; Num 6:15; etc. See also “סַפָּה,” “סַפָּה,” and “הֵסַפָּה: piel,” in Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 175, 264, 172, respectively. On loaves and cakes, see “סָפָּה,” “סַפָּה,” ibid. 104–105, 156, respectively.

109 While the Greek term λίθος that is used in these examples may refer to stones of any kind, large or small, it is reasonable to imagine them as about the size of a modern bread roll. Similarly, the λίθος with which the Gerasene demoniac bruised himself (Mark 5:5) were probably small enough to be held in one hand.


111 See Marcus, Mark 1–8, 409, re grace said before Jewish meals; and also m. Ber. 6:1. The mishnaic evidence is late, but in this case is probably applicable to first century practice. The meals at Qumran described in 1QS VI, 4–5; 1QSa II, 17–19 also indicate that grace was said before the commencement of the meal (Klauck, “Lord’s Supper,” 369). However, evidence from Qumran does not necessarily reflect typical Jewish practices.
authority.\textsuperscript{112} In contrast, serving food is regarded as a lowly duty,\textsuperscript{113} and the distribution of portions would normally be delegated to ordinary servants. Yet at the Last Supper, it appears that Jesus has performed the distributive role himself as a part of his dramatic act. Such conduct would be very unconventional and conspicuous, since he would need to rise from his place before offering the portions of bread, with the instruction: "\textit{A\d{e}xe\kappa e,}" (v. 22).\textsuperscript{114}

Now, if we accept the presence of the Twelve and the sharing of the loaf between them as authentic traditions, this situation raises two important issues. Firstly, while Jesus has apparently participated fully in the formal meal to this point, I believe that he gives away the whole of this particular loaf.\textsuperscript{115} Secondly, in the scenario outlined above, there is at least one other person in the triclinium besides the guests, viz. the host, and conceivably, disciples other than the Twelve attended as well.\textsuperscript{116} The issues regarding the number and identities of the guests are considered further below.

The action with the cup:

While Mark’s narrative has Jesus’ action with the cup following immediately after the apportionment of the bread, Paul’s and Luke’s accounts indicate that it took place after the meal.\textsuperscript{117} It is possible that this represents an authentic reminiscence of the occasion, and that the cup action took place after the tables had been removed.

\textsuperscript{112} See Chapter Four, §2.5, esp. nn. 78–85.
\textsuperscript{113} Performed either by servants, or by women, as e.g. in Mark 1:31.
\textsuperscript{114} Gaining access to his commensals is not an issue if small individual tables are envisaged for all of the guests, as would be the case if the room were very wide. See §3.3.4 above, esp. nn. 86–93.
\textsuperscript{115} As we will see in §3.3.5.6 below, Jesus’ apportionment of the loaf signifies the appointment of successors, and this action makes sense only if he himself abstains. Re the issue of Jesus’ abstinence, see also Marshall, \textit{Last Supper}, 44, 163 n. 52. On the sharing of the one loaf, see esp. 1 Cor 10:16b–17.
\textsuperscript{116} For reasons explained below in §3.3.5.9.2, I consider it very probable that other guests were present, e.g. some of the women who followed Jesus. See also O’Toole, “Last Supper,” 237, re the possibility that women were present.
However, the details are irrecoverable, and not particularly significant, although if the two actions were separated, Jesus must have returned to his couch and risen for a second time for the sharing of the cup. It is also possible that in taking on the role of cup-bearer, Jesus replenished his own cup from the krater, 118 before giving thanks and sharing the contents (v. 23).

3.3.5.3. The emphasis on servanthood:

3.3.5.3.1. John’s account of the Last Supper:

When Mark’s Last Supper narrative is interpreted as above, there is a conspicuous accent on Jesus’ servanthood, evoking comparisons with several other texts, and notably with the account of the meal in John 13:1–20. In this version, there is no mention of any action involving bread and/or wine, 119 and the emphasis is almost wholly on Jesus’ exemplification of humility and servitude. 120 As well as describing the washing of the disciples’ feet in detail, the account refers specifically to Jesus’ rising from his couch (ἐγείρεται, v. 4), and returning to his place (ἀνέπεσεν τάλιν, v. 12), and the fact that his actions take place during the meal (δείπνου γινομένου, v. 2). It is quite possible that these latter details reflect genuine reminiscences of the occasion, 121 although I would certainly regard the bread and cup actions, rather than the footwashing, as historical events.

3.3.5.3.2. Luke’s emphasis on servanthood:

The idea that Jesus performed the bread and cup actions in the manner of a servant also coheres with Luke’s insertion of the dispute about greatness within his Last
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117 See Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:23–25. Marshall (Last Supper, 83, 85) asserts that the two actions were separated by the length of the meal. See also O’Toole, “Last Supper,” 238.
118 Cf. Od. 9.9–10; and re serving wine see Burkert, “Oriental Symposia,” 19. On the position of the krater see §3.3.4 above, esp. nn. 97–98.
120 Reference to bread in v. 18 cites Ps 41:9, and pertains to Jesus’ betrayal by one of his commensals.
Supper narrative (22:24–27). Although this does not furnish proof concerning my suppositions, it does seem to indicate Luke’s desire to highlight the servanthood aspects of Jesus’ actions.


24 Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλοσεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μεῖζων. 25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐφράτεια καλοῦνται. 26 ἢ μεῖζος ὃς οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ’ ὃ μεῖζον ἐν ἴμιν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεότερος καὶ ὁ ἡγοῦμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. 27 τίς γὰρ μεῖζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἔγω δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἶμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

A dispute also arose among them as to which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest. 25 But he said to them, “The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. 26 But not so with you; rather the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like one who serves. 27 For who is greater, the one who is reclining at table or the one who serves? Is it not the one reclining at table? But I am among you as one who serves.”

This text should be understood in the light of Jesus’ extraordinary conduct at the Last Supper, rather than as an indication that waiting at table was his regular practice.

Our previous discussion on the topic of humility has demonstrated that Jesus exhorted his disciples to exercise leadership by means of servitude, and this text does likewise: the youngest in a group is the person of lowest status. However, in addition, Luke appears to have utilised the pericope to make a connection between

---

121 Especially in view of the apparent accuracy of John’s chronology, over against that of the Synoptics, concerning the Passover.
122 Cf. Mark 10:42–45 and par. Matt 20:25–28, where the tradition is associated with the request of James and John.
123 As suggested by e.g. Marshall, Last Supper, 104. Clearly, since Jesus typically received hospitality as an ἀκελπτός, he would not normally be in a position to wait on his disciples. Likewise, Nolland (Luke, 1062, 1065) misses the point of the passage, asserting that Jesus is the host at the Last Supper.
124 See §5.2, Chapter Seven.
125 Green, Gospel of Luke, 756. Re the youngest in a group as the person of lowest rank and least prestige, see ibid. 769; and re νεύτερος in v. 26, see “νέος,” 2. β, BAGD 536.
Jesus’ action at the Last Supper, and his anticipated conduct after the resurrection.

This can be seen from the “watchful slaves” passage, Luke 12:37:

μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἑκέινοι, αὖς ἔλθων ὁ κύριος εὐρήσει γηγεροῦτας ἀμὴν λέγω
ἐμὲ ὅτι περιζώσκεται καὶ ἀνακλίνει αὐτοὺς καὶ παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς.

Blessed are those slaves whom the master finds alert when he comes; truly I tell you, he
will gird himself and have them recline at table, and he will come and serve them.

As in Luke 22:27 and John 13:4–12, Jesus is to be characterised as ὁ διακονών rather
than as ὁ ἀνακλίνων. 126

3.3.5.3.3. The links with the Suffering Servant:

In §3.1 above, in the introductory discussion on the Passion Narrative, it was noted
that a link exists between Jesus and the Suffering Servant, in that each is depicted as
a persecuted victim who is rescued following his death. Earlier, in Chapter One, 127
reference was made to another connection between the two figures, on the grounds of
the key words παῖς in LXX Isa 52:13; Did 9:2; 10:2, 3, and παραδίδωμι in LXX Isa
53:12; 1 Cor 11:23. In view of the finding that Jesus acted in the role of a servant at
the Last Supper, the occurrences of the term παῖς in the Didache are of interest, since
its usage here pertains to the Eucharist. 128 In these passages, παῖς is aptly translated as
servant, 129 especially as the term is used in reference to David (Did. 9:2), as well as to
Jesus. 130 Yet Jesus is depicted as the servant of God, rather than of his disciples, so
there is no apparent connection between the use of the term παῖς for Jesus in Did.
9:2, 3 and 10:2, 3, and the way in which he distributed the bread and wine at the Last

126 See M. Sabbe, “The Footwashing in Jn 13 and its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels,” ETL 58
127 §3.2.1.4.
128 The occurrence of παραδίδωμι in Mark 14:24 is discussed below in §3.3.5.8.5.
129 See e.g. Klauck, “Lord’s Supper,” 369.
130 Cf. the rendition child, in the LCL trans. by Kirsopp Lake.
Supper. Nevertheless, the concept that Jesus was acting in obedience to God’s will is significant, as we will see in the next subsection.

3.3.5.4. The symbolism of portion and cup:

Mention was made in Chapter Four of special portions of food being assigned to particular persons, and we need now to investigate this matter and its significance. As Grottanelli has observed in relation to the root וְהָעָלִים, there is an etymological link between the “portion” one receives, and one’s destiny. This can be seen in Isa 65:11–12, where the god Destiny features with the appellative “Meni,” deriving from וְהָעָלִים. In addition to their connection with this figurative sense of apportionment by a deity, cognates of וְהָעָלִים are associated with portions of food. E.g. מָנָה refers to the allocation provided to priests and Levites from temple offerings, while in 1 Sam 1:4–5; 9:23, מָנָה connotes the portions given to commensals at the sacrificial meal. The idea that fate is under the control of deities is found also in relation to the Semitic noun gadh, which occurs in Isa 65:11 (in parallel with Meni), as the god Fortune. The same is true of the root מָלַשׁ, which likewise is associated with division or apportionment, referring primarily, in a social sense, to the receipt or gift of a portion that is due according to law or custom. From that meaning, the root has assumed a sense of the portion in life determined by God, or destiny, and it very frequently carries such overtones in OT usage. Examples include the “portion” assigned to nations or individuals, often as a consequence of their conduct.

---

131 “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 133; and see Chapter Four, n. 78.
132 J. Conrad, “נַפְֹלָה; מָנָה; מָנָה; מִנָּה; מִנָּה; מִנָּה; מִנָּה; מִנָּה,” TDOT 8:400, n. 41; K.-D. Schunck, “גַּדִּית,” TDOT 2:383.
133 Conrad, “מָנָה; מָנָה.” 400.
136 Ibid.
137 Ibid. 451.
In the OT, imagery of the “cup” (훽") is used, like that of “portions,” in reference to one’s “lot” in life, i.e. to fate or destiny.\textsuperscript{138} It sometimes has a positive sense, as in Pss 16:5; 23:5; 116:13, but is more often used to signify God’s judgment, i.e. “cup of wrath,” as in Pss 11:6; 75:8; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15–28; Ezek 23:31–34.\textsuperscript{139}

Now, in light of this background, the fact that Jesus’ actions at the Last Supper involve both portions and a cup suggests an underlying symbolic meaning connected with, firstly, the destiny of Jesus, and secondly, that of the Twelve. We will consider each in turn.

3.3.5.5. Jesus’ destiny:

With regard to Jesus’ sense of destiny, I believe that he anticipated an imminent death, and that he understood and accepted this as his “lot” assigned by God. Such an interpretation accords fully with depictions of him in the Gospels and other Christian literature as God’s servant,\textsuperscript{140} and as conforming to the Suffering Servant imagery of Isa 52:13–53:12. Yet such a trust in God would undoubtedly have included hope of salvation, and consequently I see Psalm 16 as significant, and as possibly having been influential on Jesus’ approach to his fate. The relevant section comprises vv. 5–11.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{141} Dahood considers Psalm 16 to be the composition of a Canaanite who has been converted to Yahwism, with v. 2 as his profession of faith, and vv. 3–4 his abjuration of the gods he previously worshipped. Vv. 5–11 describe the blessings of his new-found faith. See Mitchell Dahood, \textit{Psalms I, 1–50} (AB 16; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), 87.
Ps 16:5–11:

5 Lord, you have assigned me my portion and my cup; you have made my lot secure.

6 The boundary lines have fallen for me in pleasant places; surely I have a delightful inheritance. 7 I will praise the Lord, who counsels me; even at night my heart instructs me. 8 I have set the Lord always before me. Because he is at my right hand, I shall not be shaken. 9 Therefore my heart is glad and my tongue rejoices; my body also will rest secure, 10 because you will not abandon me to Sheol, nor will you let your faithful one see decay. 11 You will make known to me the path of life; you will fill me with joy in your presence, with eternal pleasures at your right hand. (NIV)

V. 10 is of obvious relevance for Christian reflection on the resurrection, but with our focus on commensality, vv. 5 and 11 are of greater significance. The translation of v. 5 is debated, but since both both אֶלְכָּל and יָמִים are associated with the determination of destiny by Yahweh, I believe לַכְּלָל is best understood here as meaning to determine, or appoint. V. 11 provides evidence of the psalmist’s belief in an afterlife, envisaged as an eternal banquet at which he is seated at the right hand of God.

142 And is cited in Acts 2:27 and 13:35.
143 Reading מְכַל for מַכְל. See “Neal, pi.,” HALOT 2:599; “מעל, piel,” Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 201. Cf. Dahood, (Psalms 1, 89), who vocalises the verb in the same manner, but treats לַכְּלָל as a hendiadys, and translates the phrase as “you have portioned out my cup of smooth wine.”
144 Ibid. 91; and for further reference to Ps 16:11, see ibid. 71. Discussion of Jesus’ exaltation to God’s right hand naturally must also include reference to Ps 110:1. We will return to this issue in §5 below.
3.3.5.6. The destiny of the Twelve:

Before discussing the implications of Jesus’ assignment of portions to the Twelve, we need to look again at some relevant OT texts. It is possible to discern a link between several passages in which special portions of food may perhaps foreshadow the destiny of the recipients. The texts are:

- Gen 43:32–34, in which Joseph assigns a special portion to be taken from his table to his brother Benjamin.\(^{145}\)
- 1 Sam 1:1–20, in which Elkanah assigns a special portion to his wife Hannah (v.5), and she subsequently conceives a son, Samuel.\(^{146}\)
- 1 Sam 9:1–10:1, in which the prophet Samuel assigns a special portion to be given to Saul, and later anoints him as Israel’s first king.\(^{147}\)

A link exists between the three incidents in that the main characters are all descendants of Jacob and Rachel. Joseph and Benjamin are their sons; Elkanah and Samuel are descendants of Ephraim, one of Joseph’s sons; and Saul is from the tribe of Benjamin.\(^{148}\) This affirms the idea that with regard to the election of a sovereign, the destiny of Israel is being fulfilled according to a divine plan that spans many generations. Moreover, it is possible to interpret the interconnectedness of the passages as an indication that God delegates the authority for assigning special portions to certain Israelites, in order to signify the destinies of the recipients. According to this notion, authority is given to Joseph, Elkanah, and Samuel, to identify Benjamin, Hannah, and Saul as individuals with special destinies. Applying

---


\(^{146}\) See idem, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 132–33.


\(^{148}\) See idem, “Aspetti del sacrificio,” 132.
the concept to the Last Supper, it would follow that God delegates authority to Jesus to assign to the Twelve, portions which signify their destined roles in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{149}

A further interpretation of the assignment of portions to the Twelve derives from the symbolism associated with the division and distribution of a sacrificial victim. In Chapter Four, it was observed that the bond between commensals at a sacrificial meal is much greater than can be explained from their consumption of a common substance. The proposed reason for this phenomenon was that the former life and integrity of the slaughtered victim are symbolically transferred to the participants, and become a unifying force among them.\textsuperscript{150} Now, since Jesus identifies the loaf of bread that he apportions to the Twelve as representative of his body (Mark 14:22), the relevance of this notion for the Last Supper is clear. It is consistent with the idea that the occasion was a farewell meal, and with the ritual that is typical of such occasions, viz. the appointment of successors, and the transfer of authority to them.

3.3.5.7. Interpretation of the sayings:

3.3.5.7.1. The original sayings?

Although it has already been observed that the precise sayings over the bread and cup are irretrievable, it is necessary now to make some judgments about their most probable form. Debate on the subject is ongoing,\textsuperscript{151} and it will not possible to reach a definitive outcome. However, it may prove illuminating to investigate the

\textsuperscript{149} This notion coheres well with Luke 22:29–30, though not with its Matthaean parallel (19:28), which occurs outside the Passion Narrative. Note that there is no corresponding passage in Mark’s Last Supper account. On the concept, see below in §3.3.5.9.2 and on Luke 22:29–30 see Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 1066–68.

\textsuperscript{150} See Chapter Four, §2.5, and esp. nn. 70–71.

pertinent material with a focus more on commensality, than on the passion. As the account in Mark 14:22–25 is the simplest, it will be used as the basis for discussion.

3.3.5.7.2. The bread saying:

Since the phrase “This is my body” is present in all four accounts of the event, its authenticity is not in doubt, and the simplest form, in Mark, probably represents the original saying. The instruction to repeat the ritual in memory of Jesus (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24, 25) is generally considered secondary.

3.3.5.7.3. The cup saying:

The phrase Τὸ τὸ ἄμα μου is particularly difficult in that after the Twelve have drunk from the cup, Jesus then appears to identify the contents as his blood. However, since the cup contains wine, not blood, the statement is obviously metaphorical, and the verb ἐστιν is better understood as signifies. The meaning of the saying can be clarified further by examining the cultic relationship between blood and wine. It appears that according to primitive Semitic beliefs, deities desired food, and could ingest both the flesh and the blood of sacrificial animals. However, liquid offerings appeared to be consumed more readily since they disappeared into the ground. While in later times the settled Semites came to believe that food must

152 Mark 14:22; Matt 26:26; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24. Note that most recent studies indicate that the longer text of Luke (22:15–20) is to be preferred (Gundry, Mark, 829). The closeness of the Lucan sayings to the Pauline versions makes it likely that Luke depends either on 1 Cor 11:23–26, or on the same early tradition from which it derives (ibid.).
153 Re the neuter τοῦτο in Mark 14:22, 24, see the comments of Gundry, Mark, 831, 841.
154 Nolland, Luke, 1046. See also §3.3.5.9.4 below.
155 Re the horror a Jew would feel about drinking blood, see Hooker, According to St Mark, 342; O’Toole, “Last Supper,” 238.
156 See ibid. Marshall notes that the original logion in Aramaic or Hebrew would lack the verb (Last Supper, 85). On this point see also O’Toole, “Last Supper,” 238.
158 Smith, Religion of the Semites, 229; Burkert, Greek Religion, 71.
be turned into smoke to be consumed by the gods, they maintained the practice of pouring out the victim's blood at the altar. That this ritual is in reality a libation, or drink offering, can be surmised from Ps 16:4, and from the reference in Ps 50:13 to the idea of Yahweh drinking goats' blood. An interesting feature of North Semitic rites is that later, when wine, rather than blood, is typically used for libations, it is poured out at the base of the altar in the same way as blood. Moreover, in Sir 50:15, the wine used for libation is termed "the blood of the grape," and Smith concludes that in some sense, libations of wine are a surrogate for drink offerings of blood.

Now, although the pouring of libations evidently derives from very ancient beliefs concerning the need to feed the gods, the custom seems to have been assigned a different meaning in later times. As Burkert has observed, the libation is "the purest and highest form of renunciation," because after a liquid has been poured out, it is irretrievable. This interpretation clearly applies to David's drink offering of water in 2 Sam 23:16–17, and shows that by this time, pouring libations has become imbued with theological meaning. We may also discern that while David's act is apparently construed as noble, and acceptable to God, libations of either blood or wine meet with Yahweh's disapproval if they are offered to foreign gods, as in Ps

---

159 Smith, Religion of the Semites, 224, 236.
160 Ibid. 229–230, 233. Note that according to Dunnill (Covenant and Sacrifice, 98), the status of the top part of the altar was distinct from that of its base. Blood was dashed on all the sides of the altar for sacrifices other than expiatory offerings and ordination rites. For the latter types, the blood was poured out at the base of the altar, e.g. in Exod 29:12; Leviticus 4, Lev 5:9; 8:15; 9:9.
162 Smith, Religion of the Semites, 229–230. This practice distinguishes the Hebrew ritual from that of the Greeks and Romans, who poured libations of wine over the flesh of the sacrificial victim (ibid. 230). See also Burkert, Greek Religion, 71.
163 Smith, Religion of the Semites, 230–31, 231 n. 1, citing Sir 50:15; Josephus, Ant. 3.233–234. For other references to this concept, see Burkert, Greek Religion, 375 n. 60, and on libations of wine, see ibid. 70–73.
164 Ibid. 72.
16:4; Isa 57:6; 30:1.\textsuperscript{165} Examples of acceptable libations are Gen 35:14; 2 Kgs 16:13;\textsuperscript{166} and Ps 116:13. The last example raises some significant points. The libation of wine that is to be offered to Yahweh in Ps 116:13 is termed a “cup of salvation,”\textsuperscript{167} bringing to mind the inherent theological connotations of the ritual. Such a libation is clearly regarded as appropriate and pleasing to God: the intention of the psalmist in offering the wine, and a sacrifice (v. 17), is to “repay” God for “his goodness” (v. 12). Thus God is envisaged as pouring out a cup of blessing for faithful individuals (v. 10), while conversely, as we saw above, Yahweh pours out a “cup of wrath” upon those who offer libations to foreign gods.\textsuperscript{168}

These findings are relevant to the interpretation of Jesus’ cup saying in two ways. Firstly, it appears that the OT imagery for divine retribution or reward frequently utilises an anthropomorphic concept, in which God is regarded as “pouring out a cup,” in the same way as humans offer a libation of wine. The “portion” which the cup contains can be viewed as a response to human offerings, and may either be one of blessing, or one expressing divine wrath.\textsuperscript{169} This point is obviously relevant to the Pauline terminology “the cup of blessing” in 1 Cor 10:16.\textsuperscript{170} Secondly, it is clear that when “cup” imagery is used, the emphasis is not on the actual contents of the vessel, i.e. wine, but on the theological significance of the action, either for blessing or for judgment.

---

\textsuperscript{165} In Isa 30:1, a treaty has apparently been sealed by pouring out a drink offering to Egyptian gods. See Bright, “Isaiah—1,” §442c, 510; §440f, 509.
\textsuperscript{166} See “יָתוֹם & מַּשָּׁהֲ,” Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 239–240.
\textsuperscript{168} See §3.3.5.4, and nn. 138–39 above.
\textsuperscript{169} See Brown, Death of the Messiah, 168–69, re the “cup of wrath” as an ancient notion in the Near East for referring to divine punishment.
\textsuperscript{170} See below in §3.3.5.9.3; and on the significance of the cup, see Brown’s discussion of Mark 14:36 in relation to the cup saying in 14:23–24 (Death of the Messiah, 168–72, esp. 170).
Both points are applicable to usage of the imagery in the NT, as well as in the OT, as we see from the ποτήριον (Rev 16:19), and φιάλαι (Rev 16:1–4, 8, 10, 12, 17) that are poured out, signifying God’s wrath. Moreover, the verb used for “pour out,” both here and in Mark 14:24, is ἐκχύω. In the light of these findings, it therefore seems probable that in Mark 14:24, the Τοῦτό refers not to the contents of the cup (i.e. “my blood of the covenant”), but to the ποτήριον itself. That is theoretically possible, since αἷμα and ποτήριον are both neuter nouns, but admittedly, the phrase τὸ ἐκχυωνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν appears to refer to the “blood,” rather than the cup. On the other hand, the Lucan/Pauline version of the cup saying coheres well with the theory that it is the cup, rather than the “blood,” that is poured out. Thus it seems probable that the original saying was something like: Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἥ [καλὴ] διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἷματί μου τὸ [ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν] ἐκχυωνόμενον, i.e. “This cup which is poured out [for you] is the [new] covenant in my blood.” It is interesting to note that if this version of the saying is substituted for that in Mark 14:24, the awkwardness of the transition to v. 25 vanishes.

At this point it is appropriate to acknowledge the significance of Zechariah 9–14 for the shaping of the Marcan Passion Narrative. As Brown has recognised, Mark appears to have drawn on these final chapters of Zechariah at a number of

---

171 Note that in some instances a bowl or cup of wrath is poured out on land, or water, as in Rev 16:2–4, or on certain people (e.g. in Ps 11:6; Rev 16:19). In other cases God prepares a cup which the recipient(s) must drink, as e.g. in Ps 75:8; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15–17; Ezek 23:31–34; Mark 14:36.

172 Luke 22:20b. The lack of ἐκχύω in Luke’s cup saying supports its claim to authenticity since there would have been no copula in the original Hebrew or Aramaic. See Hooker, According to St Mark, 341; O’Toole, “Last Supper,” 238.

173 The word order is that of the NRSV, which is preferred to the NIV since the τὸ in the phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυωνόμενον is in apposition to Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, in the nominative case, while the word for “blood” is in the dative. Re the instrumental use of ἐν here, see Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §119, p. 40. I do not agree with Marshall (Last Supper, 43, 163 n. 51) that what is poured out must logically be the blood, nor with Brown’s assertion that Luke’s Jesus speaks of “my blood which is poured out for you” (Death of the Messiah, 33).
places.\textsuperscript{175} For our purposes, the text of particular relevance is Zech 9:11, which seems to resemble Mark 14:24 closely.

Zech 9:11:

καὶ σὺ ἐν αὐτῷ διαθήκης ἔκπληκτος δεσμόις σου ἐκ λάκκου σῶκ ἔχοντος ὦδωρ

As for you also, because of the blood of my covenant with you, I [Greek: you] will set your prisoners free from the waterless pit. \textit{(NRSV)}

However, Ollenburger demonstrates the disparity between the two passages by emphasising the difference in the meaning attached to the blood in Ex 24:8, as against Zech 9:11.\textsuperscript{176} In the former, the blood represents the Hebrews’ acceptance of the covenant and their agreement to keep it. In Zech 9:11, on the other hand, the blood is that of Zion, and it is on the grounds of this “blood of the covenant” that God undertakes to intervene, and release Zion’s prisoners. In view of Mark’s extensive borrowing from \textit{other} passages in Zechariah 9–14, it seems likely that he has been influenced by the terminology in Zech 9:11 in his version of the cup saying in 14:24. The evidence of his considerable usage of Zechariah in his Passion Narrative thus provides further support for the authenticity of the Pauline/Lucan form of the saying.

The references to the covenant and to the pouring out of the cup (or the “blood”) are important, and will be considered in turn during discussion of Exod 24:8 and Isa 53:12. Issues concerning the qualifier καίνη (Luke 22:20b; 1 Cor 11:25)

\textsuperscript{174} Cf. the existing vv. 24–25. See Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 1051. Note Gundry’s acceptance of the originality of the Pauline/Lucan cup saying over against Mark’s version (\textit{Mark}, 831–33).

\textsuperscript{175} \textit{Death of the Messiah}, 1451. Mark 11:1–10 is based on Zech 9:9; Mark 11:15–19 draws on Zech 14:21; Mark 14:27 reflects Zech 13:7. As well as incorporating these instances in their Marcan parallels, Matthew and John have used additional passages: Matt 27:3–10 draws on Zech 11:12–13; John 19:34, 37 on Zech 12:10.

and the words ὑπὲρ πολλὰν (Mark 14:24) or ὑπὲρ ὕμων (Luke 22:20b) will be dealt with below, in §§3.3.5.8.4 and 3.3.5.8.5, respectively.

3.3.5.7.4. The saying about the kingdom:

Jesus’ assertion that he will not consume wine again until he drinks it in the kingdom is by no means as difficult as the previous saying. It is very likely that some form of the logion is historical,\(^{177}\) and Mark 14:25 is probably closer to the original than the Lucan parallel.\(^{178}\) The saying points clearly to Jesus’ belief that the Last Supper is his final meal in this life, and that his next will be the eschatological banquet in the coming kingdom.\(^{179}\) Jesus’ apparent foresight of imminent death, and confident anticipation of the heavenly feast, both affirm that his approach to his destiny may well have been influenced by Psalm 16.\(^{180}\)

3.3.5.8. Links with other texts and traditions:

3.3.5.8.1. Preamble:

Jesus’ sayings at the Last Supper, and the context in which the meal takes place, are capable of multiple interpretations, and different emphases seem to have developed in various Christian communities.\(^ {181}\) The following discussion reviews the areas in which the early church appears to have linked the Last Supper sayings with other texts and/or traditions. Apart from the first of these, which concerns the bread saying, the connections relate to the saying over the cup, and/or to participation in the heavenly banquet. In each case we will consider how the text may be linked with Jesus’ commensality, as well as with his death.


\(^{180}\) See §3.3.5.5 above, and esp. Ps 16:10–11.

\(^{181}\) Note e.g. the absence of any reference to Jesus’ bread and cup sayings in *Didache* 9–10, and the reversal of the bread–cup order (Hooker, *According to St Mark*, 339). Nolland (*Luke*, 1044) posits that
3.3.5.8.2. The Passover:

With regard to the context of the meal, it was observed above that although the occasion was not, in fact, the paschal feast, the Passover would be a significant focus.\(^\text{182}\) In 1 Cor 5:7, Jesus is explicitly termed "our paschal lamb," who "has been sacrificed," and this identification is also made implicitly in John's account of the passion.\(^\text{183}\) Hence, in these traditions, the accent is firmly on Jesus' death. However, it is probable that by Jesus' time the Passover was not only an occasion for remembering Israel's redemption from Egypt, but also for looking towards her future salvation, and the eschatological banquet.\(^\text{184}\)

3.3.5.8.3. Exod 24:1-11:

It has already been observed in §3.3.2 that the phrase "blood of the covenant" occurs in both Mark 14:24 and Exod 24:8,\(^\text{185}\) and the significance of this fact is evident. Even though the Lucan/Pauline "the [new] covenant in my blood" is preferred over against the Marcan cup saying, there is a probable connection between Jesus' actions at the Last Supper, and the establishment of the Sinai covenant.\(^\text{186}\) We therefore need

---

\(^{182}\) See §3.3.1, esp. n. 55.

\(^{183}\) Viz. in that Jesus' death occurs on the eve of Passover, at the time when the lambs are being slaughtered at the temple (Meier, *Roots of the Problem*, 430 n. 109; Marshall, *Last Supper*, 71, 168 n. 48).


\(^{185}\) It is appropriate to mention here the occurrence of the phrase "blood of the covenant" in the Heb 9:19–20 reference to the establishment of the first covenant. In fact, the use of that terminology here is not relevant to discussion of Mark 14:24. The author of Hebrews has made noticeable modifications to the Ex 24:1–11 description of the ritual, and the statement concerning "the blood of the covenant" differs from that in Exod 24:8 (Fred B. Craddock, "The Letter to the Hebrews: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," *NIB* 12:110). The emphasis in the Hebrews passage is on the necessity for the shedding of the victim's blood in order to inaugurate the covenant (Harold W. Attridge, "Hebrews, Epistle to the," *ABD* 3:101–102; Craddock, "Letter to the Hebrews," 109–10). Jesus' death is interpreted as the means by which the new covenant is established (ibid. 109). The wider purpose of the writer can be seen in Hebrews 8–10, in which the passion is considered in terms of the ritual on the Day of Atonement (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 957 n. 55; Attridge, "Hebrews," 101). As Brown has observed, there is nothing to suggest that Mark interprets the passion in such a manner (*Death of the Messiah*, 942).

\(^{186}\) The link is widely acknowledged. See n. 56 above, and also Marshall, *Last Supper*, 43, 91.
to investigate the Exod 24:1–11 account. As we saw previously, the narrative comprises a blend of two traditions, one concerning a mountaintop meal with God (vv. 1–2, 9–11), the other a sacrifice at the foot of the mountain (vv. 3–8). We will first consider the latter tradition, and in particular, the relationship between blood and covenant.

According to the Levitical laws, the blood of the sacrificial victim is its "life," and since it is too holy for consumption, it is offered to God by pouring it out at the altar. However, this practice dates from the postexilic era, while the ritual described in Exod 24:3–8, involving the sprinkling of blood, is much more ancient, deriving from the Old Epic tradition. The efficacy of the ritual lies in the division of the blood into two parts, with one part being dashed against the altar, and the remainder sprinkled on the people, after they have vowed obedience to the law. The blood of the victim is understood as the vehicle by which its life is transferred to the participants, and sprinkling it remains customary as long as Jewish sacrificial rites are maintained.

It is important to note that the fundamental concept underlying the sacrificial rites of the Hebrews is the worshippers’ intention of achieving communion, and

\[\text{\textsuperscript{187}} \text{Stalker ascribes vv. 1–2, 9–11 to J, and vv. 3–8 to E ("Exodus," §196h, 233).} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{188}} \text{See Lev 17:10–14; Chapter Four, n. 20.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{189}} \text{Smith, Religion of the Semites, 345–46, 379.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{190}} \text{Ibid. 215–16, 215 n. 1; Anderson, Living World, 93. The rite used at Sinai is comparable with the even earlier one between Abraham and Yahweh (Gen 15:8–21; Jer 34:18), in that the sacrificial victim is divided into two parts [Smith, Religion of the Semites, 480–81]. The reference to the parties in the covenant passing between the pieces of the victim is not well understood, but is perhaps explained by Exod 24:5–8, as Smith suggests. He presumes that the flesh of the animal, as well as its blood, is divided between the parties, and that each of the parties (viz. Yahweh, and the Israelites as a group) consumes an appropriate portion. (Note that such division is applicable only to the offerings of wellbeing, not to the burnt offerings, in v. 5.) By this means, each participant in the animal’s flesh is taken into its mystical life. See ibid. 481, 691–92; and also Brueggemann, “The Book of Exodus,” 880–81.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{191}} \text{Exod 24:3–8. Note that v. 3b, referring to “all the ordinances,” belongs to a later tradition (Anderson, Living World, 95; Stalker, “Exodus,” §196i, 233).} \]
establishing a bond, with God.\textsuperscript{193} Indeed, according to Ps 50:5, every sacrifice is understood as a covenant.\textsuperscript{194} At times when the community believes that the bond with the deity is impaired, and Yahweh’s favour can no longer be anticipated with confidence, it is seen as necessary to restore the relationship by means of a sacrificial rite.\textsuperscript{195} For this reason, the early Semitic rituals are bound up with notions of restoring communion with an estranged deity,\textsuperscript{196} and all animal sacrifices have an atoning function.\textsuperscript{197} Two significant points arise in this regard. Firstly, the element of atonement that exists in relation to sacrifice has nothing to do with satisfying the deity in a penal sense.\textsuperscript{198} Secondly, the efficacy of the ceremony lies not in the death of the victim, i.e. in the pouring out of its blood, but rather in the application of the blood to the parties involved.\textsuperscript{199}

Turning again now to the Last Supper and the saying over the cup, our findings indicate that it bears little or no relation to the means by which the first covenant was established. As we saw previously, the meaning of Jesus’ saying is likely to be found in the theological significance of the cup that is being poured, rather than its contents. In contrast, the establishment of the covenant in Exodus 24 depends entirely on the appropriate distribution of the victim’s blood. Another major difference between the events is that the metaphorical “blood” at the Last Supper is drunk by the Twelve, whereas the actual blood at Sinai, though shared, is not

\textsuperscript{192} Smith, \textit{Religion of the Semites}, 341, 344–346, 201–202; Lev 8:23; 14:6–7, 14. Note that the application of blood to the doorposts in the Passover ritual is equivalent to sprinkling it on all members of the household (ibid. 344).
\textsuperscript{193} Ibid. 216, 345, 385.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid. 319, 319 n. 2.
\textsuperscript{195} Ibid. 319–20.
\textsuperscript{196} Ibid. 348, 319–20.
\textsuperscript{197} Sin offerings as described in Leviticus (4:1–5, 13; 6:24–30; 8:14–17; 16:3–22) are unknown in the old history of Israel, and all sacrifices have an atoning value (ibid. 237–38). See also Gundry, \textit{Mark}, 841–42.
\textsuperscript{198} Smith, \textit{Religion of the Semites}, 336.
\textsuperscript{199} Ibid. 338, 340.
consumed. Moreover, it cannot be assumed that Jesus’ reference to the wine as his “blood” is directly relevant to his death, since, as Smith has shown, the blood of the sacrificial animals is dissociated from the actual death of the victims. 200

On the other hand, the feasting associated with the first covenant is conspicuously relevant to the Last Supper, and especially to the saying concerning the eschatological banquet (Mark 14:25). This is particularly true of the account in Exod 24:1–2, 9–11, in which representatives of Israel eat and drink with God on the mountain. 201 Other elements of the two occasions are comparable also, and the Exodus 24 narrative will be discussed further below. 202

3.3.5.8.4. Jer 31:31–34:

As well as being redolent of Exod 24:1–11, the reference to the covenant in the cup saying brings to mind the new covenant prophesied in Jer 31:31. The latter verse may therefore be the source of the word ἐλαυνι[ in Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25, 203 although it could be authentic. More important for our purposes is Matthew’s addition of the words “for the forgiveness of sins” (26:28) to Mark’s version of the cup saying. 204 This phrase is likely to derive from the prophesy in Jer 31:34 that Yahweh will forgive the iniquity of Israel, and “remember their sins no more,” although it could

---

200 Ibid. 336. But cf. Heb 9:18–21 in which the purpose is evidently to show that Jesus’ death ratifies the new covenant, in the same way as the sacrificial rite involving the sprinkling of the victim’s blood sealed the Sinai covenant. See Brown, Death of the Messiah, 1076–77; Craddock, “Letter to the Hebrews,” 110. The author interprets Jesus’ death against the background of the Levitical cultus, and argues for its necessity to establish the new covenant (ibid.). This portion of Hebrews thus provides evidence that the writer’s community, like those influenced by Paul’s theology of the cross, interpreted Jesus’ death in terms of atonement. However, as we have seen above, the original saying probably did not refer to the contents of the cup, but rather to its theological significance. The Hebrews passage is therefore not important for the present discussion. See also n. 185 above.
201 See §3.3.5.9.
203 Hooker, According to St Mark, 338, 343.
indicate Matthew’s interpretation of Jesus’ death as an atoning sacrifice. Yet it is interesting to note that Isaiah’s anticipation of the eschatological banquet (25:6–8) refers to both death and forgiveness. In v. 7 the promise is made that וְיָרְד (death) will be swallowed up forever, while v. 8 refers to the removal of the פִּקּוּל (disgrace or reproach) of Israel, indicating that her sins will be forgiven. The fact that the same term פִּקּוּל has been used to describe Israel’s “disgrace” in Jer 31:19 shows that its meaning in Isa 25:8 is comparable with the Jer 31:34 reference to her וֶשָּׁן (iniquity) which will be forgiven, and her עֵו (sin) which will not be remembered hereafter.

We see then that the eschatological banquet is strongly associated with the new covenant between Israel and Yahweh, i.e. with a restored relationship in which atonement is assured. The eschaton is also envisaged as a time in which the great enemy וְיָרְד will have been overcome.

3.3.5.8.5. Isa 53:12:

Our particular interest at this point of the investigation is the connection between Jesus and the Suffering Servant figure of Isa 52:13–53:12. More specifically, we will compare Mark 14:24 and Isa 53:12, and consider their influence on the notion of Jesus’ death as an atonement for sin.

---

205 Ibid. 343.
206 See "וְיָרְד," Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 188.
208 See "וֶשָּׁן," and "עֵו," Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 268, 100–101, respectively.
In view of the nature of Jesus’ death, it is not surprising that early Christian
tradition would identify him with the Suffering Servant. However, Mark’s cup saying
undoubtedly magnifies the resemblance between the two figures by its inclusion of
key words from Isa 53:12, which concludes:

he poured out himself to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore
the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Consequently, the traditional interpretation of the phrase “poured out for many” in
Mark 14:24, is that Jesus’ blood is shed in order to atone for sin.209 The idea that
Jesus’ death could be regarded as that of a martyr appears sound,210 especially since
texts in 4 Maccabees show that the notion was extant in contemporary Jewish
thought.211 Moreover, Mark 14:24 asserts that Jesus’ blood is poured out on behalf of
many, echoing the statement in 10:45b that he came to “give his life as a ransom for
many.”212 Thus Mark 10:45b and 14:24 both seem to reflect the fundamental idea
of Isa 53:12; in addition, the “many” is common to all three verses.213

Yet the connection between the Marcan texts and Isa 53:12 is in fact
tenuous.214 Firstly, the verb used for “pour out” in Mark’s cup saying is ἐκχέω,

209 See e.g. Marshall, Last Supper, 89.
210 See e.g. Green, Gospel of Luke, 763; Hooker, According to St Mark, 250–51, 343.
211 See ibid. 250; and 4 Macc 6:28–29; 17:21–22; Marshall, Last Supper, 88–89. Re dying on behalf
of others, see also Nolland, Luke, 1054.
212 In both verses, the word “many” is used in contrast with the “one” who dies on their behalf [cf.
“many” as against “all”] (Hooker, According to St Mark, 249, 343).
213 Hooker, According to St Mark, 343; Marshall, Last Supper, 98.
214 Hooker, According to St Mark, 248–49.
whereas the LXX version of Isa 53:12 uses παραδίδομεν to render the Hebrew רָשָׁע.\textsuperscript{215} Secondly, Mark 10:45b, with its notion of Jesus as "a ransom for many," is generally regarded as inauthentic,\textsuperscript{216} and in any case, the term λύτρον (ransom) has no relation to the Hebrew אִישׁ used in Isa 53:10 with the sense \textit{an offering for sin}.\textsuperscript{217} Thirdly, the expression παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἥψυχή αὐτοῦ in Isa 53:12 (literally "his soul was given over to death") is merely an approximate equivalent of "he gave up the ghost," and is not applicable to the notion that Jesus willingly gave up his life.\textsuperscript{218} Hence, the supposed links between Mark 10:45b; 14:24, and Isa 53:12 do not stand up to scrutiny, and cannot be used to support the idea of Jesus' death as an atoning sacrifice. In addition, it seems likely that, like Mark 10:45b, the phrase ὑπὲρ πολλὰς in 14:24 has been inserted by the evangelist, probably in order to undergird the supposed link with Isa 53:12.\textsuperscript{219}

In contrast, we had already found that the Lucan/Pauline version of the cup saying (Luke 22:20b; 1 Cor 11:25) is more likely to be original than Mark's,\textsuperscript{220} and can reasonably suppose also that the words ὑπὲρ ὕμων are authentic.\textsuperscript{221} As far as we can determine then, the cup saying reads: "This cup which is poured out for you is the [new] covenant in my blood." On the other hand, we found that Mark 14:22, concerning the bread, is to be preferred over Luke 22:19, and that the saying about the kingdom in Mark 14:25 is probably authentic, rather than Luke 22:18.

\textsuperscript{215} In Isa 53:12 the verb (היפָל) has the meaning abandon (i.e. הָשָּׁם הָרֹעֶל הָרָעֶל means he abandoned his flesh to death). See "∽: hif,,” Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 282.

\textsuperscript{216} Nolland, Luke, 1063; Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 144, 148, 151, 155; Hooker, According to St Mark, 248.

\textsuperscript{217} Ibid. See also "∽," Holladay, Hebrew Lexicon, 29–30.

\textsuperscript{218} Hooker, According to St Mark, 248.

\textsuperscript{219} Contra O'Toole, ("Last Supper," 238), who prefers "for many" over "for you."

\textsuperscript{220} See §3.3.5.7.3 above.

\textsuperscript{221} Note the correspondence with the 2d per. pl. in Moses' statement about the covenant in Exod 24:8.
Significantly, none of the three sayings judged most likely to be historical implies that Jesus’ blood is poured out as a sacrifice to overcome sin and death. In fact such an act seems unnecessary, since the prophecies in Isa 25:6–8 and Jer 31:31–34, indicating that Yahweh will forgive sins and defeat death, contain no reference to an intermediary. The proposed alternative to the idea of Jesus’ sacrificial death is that his actions at the Last Supper foreshadow blessings, and this concept is explored in the following subsection.

3.3.5.9. Review of the Last Supper and its meaning:

3.3.5.9.1. Preamble:

It has been demonstrated that the events of the Last Supper can be interpreted in a variety of ways, and that there are sound reasons for linking them with the establishment of the covenant in Exod 24:1–11. We will now examine those connections further, considering in turn three issues that are relevant to the description of each occasion: the participants; the covenant; and the blending of traditions.

3.3.5.9.2. The participants:

Representation of the twelve tribes:

There is scarcely any doubt that Jesus chose an inner circle of twelve disciples, or that he expected them to have leadership roles in the kingdom, as indicated in Luke 22:29–30 and par. Matt 19:28. The Twelve are usually understood as representative of the twelve tribes, and connected with the anticipated restoration of

---

222 Note that the atonement concept is virtually absent from Luke’s Gospel, with relevant imagery being confined to the words “This is my body given for you,” in 22:19b. Re Luke’s apparent lack of interest in the atonement, see Marshall, Last Supper, 101–102; Robinson, “Emmaus Story,” 489.

223 See §3.3.5.8.4 above.

224 Sanders includes the call of the Twelve among the “certain or virtually certain” data about the historical Jesus (Jesus and Judaism, 326).

225 Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 115; Evans, Jesus and His Contemporaries, 311 n. 42.
Israel. The presence of the Twelve is a prominent feature in the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper, and has a correlate in the meal at the foot of the mountain in Exodus 24. In the latter, Moses builds an altar, and sets up twelve pillars corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel (v. 4).

On these grounds one can discern an analogy between Jesus’ action with the bread, and the gruesome OT story about the Levite’s concubine in Judges 19. As mentioned in Chapter Four, the Levite’s action of cutting the body of his concubine into twelve pieces and sending them throughout Israel, may be construed as an attempt to unite the tribes against the men of Gibeah. Likewise, if Jesus is perceived as a sacrificial victim, and the bread that he apportions to the Twelve is understood as his body, the action can be interpreted as signifying his expectation of Israel’s reunification. In making this comparison it is important to remember that the unifying force which ostensibly acts on the portions is the original integrity and life of the victim. The power exerted on the recipients by the portions derives from the desire of the remaining “life” in them to be reconstituted into wholeness. Since the portions in the Judges 19 episode are non-comestible, there is obviously no suggestion that they are to be eaten by the recipients. Similarly, it is unthinkable that Jesus would distribute portions purporting to signify his actual body, and instruct the Twelve to consume them. Thus, Jesus’ actions and sayings at the Last Supper are not to be literally understood in terms of animal sacrifice, and so are distinctly different

---

226 Meier, Roots of the Problem, 208; idem, “Reflections,” 90–91; Charlesworth, Judaism, 136–38; Freyne, Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels, 266. See also Chapter One, §2.7.3.1, and esp. n. 78 re restoration eschatology.
227 The tradition of the Twelve is barely mentioned in John, but reference to them, and to Judas, in 6:70–71 anticipates the conversation in 13:21–30.
228 See §2.5, esp. n. 74.
229 It is clear from Judg 20:12–14 that the original intention was to gain the support of Benjamin against Gibeah, though Judg 19:29–21:25 shows that the outcome was very different. Note, however, that the twelve pieces of the woman’s body are distributed to only eleven of the tribes. Thus the
from Exod 24:3–8. Although they relate to ancient traditions of sacrifice in a
metaphorical sense, the portions given to the Twelve are not to be interpreted as
deriving from Jesus’ body, but as components of a loaf. Nevertheless, they are still
capable of exerting a unifying influence,230 and the distribution of the bread may
certainly be understood as an anticipation of Israel’s re-unification. As we saw
previously, it also signifies the transfer of authority to Jesus’ successors.231 The
ongoing task of the apostles is to undertake the distribution of the “bread”
themselves, i.e. to continue Jesus’ teaching and healing ministry.232

Only the Twelve?

We come now to the question of whether other disciples of Jesus may have been
present at the Last Supper, in addition to the Twelve. For three reasons, I consider
that it is extremely probable. Firstly, the idea of an exclusive gathering for a mere
fraction of Jesus’ total following is completely contrary to his beliefs about
hospitality and commensality.233 The second point is based on two premises: that the
attendance of ἄκλητοι at banquets was a regular feature in contemporary Palestinian
society, and that when such uninvited guests were Jesus’ followers, he regarded them
as being present in his name. On these grounds it is logical to suppose that disciples
who arrived at the occasion without a formal invitation would have been welcomed.

Thirdly, Mark’s location of the anointing story (14:3–9) immediately before the Last
Supper account adds considerable weight to the argument that ἄκλητοι attended the
latter occasion as well. Moreover, despite the traditional view that only Jesus and the

failure to win Benjamin’s support could perhaps be attributed to the fact that this tribe did not receive
a portion, and so was not subjected to the unifying power of the victim’s “life.”
230 We will consider this matter further in the next section.
231 See §3.3.5.6 above.
232 On the symbolic meaning of “bread,” see Chapter Six, §4.1.2.1; Chapter Seven, §7.2.1.3.
233 See esp. Chapters Five, Six, and Seven; and also Dorothy A. Lee, “Presence or Absence? The
Twelve attended the Last Supper, the following investigation of the scriptural
evidence suggests that other disciples were present.

Looking first at Mark’s account, it seems that Jesus’ identification of his
betrayer as “one of the Twelve, who is dipping into the bowl with me,” implies the
presence of others besides the Twelve.234 Again, the episode concerning the young
man who flees naked when Jesus is arrested (14:51–52) suggests that a larger group
of disciples is with him on that evening.235 Further, Mark’s description of the arrival
of the Twelve (14:17–18) allows for the interpretation that while the invited guests
reclined, the ἀκλητοὶ simply gathered around, perhaps sitting on stools, or standing
behind the couches like the woman in Luke 7:38. Although a large number of
ἀκλητοὶ would have been an embarrassment in a traditional triclinium designed for
nine banqueters, we have already concluded that the venue must have been large.236
Indeed, the room may have had a gallery, which would readily have accommodated
many extra guests behind the couches.237 Another possibility is that there was
sufficient room on the couches for extra guests to recline.238 Thus, Mark’s account of
the Last Supper certainly permits the interpretation that ἀκλητοὶ were present, and we
may presume that such a group would have included the women who followed Jesus
to Jerusalem (15:40–41).239 It is noteworthy that in Mark’s narrative, the major issue

234 Ibid. 9. Cf. Jesus’ more general comment in Mark 14:18, which could refer to a member of a larger
group of disciples. On this point, see also Gundry, Mark, 837.
235 Lee, “Presence or Absence?” 9. As Lee observes, the young man would not be so described at this
point in the narrative if he were one of the Twelve (ibid.). However, the episode may be fictional.
236 See §3.3.4, above.
237 E.g. like an Egyptian or Corinthian oecus, in which the area behind the colonnades was designed
for the attendants of the guests. See Nielsen, “Royal Banquets,” 117–18; and Fig. 15, p. 116;
238 See ibid. 139 n. 21, referring to “five or more poured on to a couch,” citing Cicero, Pis. 67. While
Cicero used the incident in reference to Piso’s bad taste, it does indicate that the couches could
accommodate additional guests.
239 Lee, “Presence or Absence?” 7.
involving the Twelve is Judas’ betrayal of Jesus (14:10, 17–18, 20, 43), and that otherwise, the emphasis on their presence at the meal seems merely symbolic.

Matthew’s account follows Mark fairly closely, and again, only the Twelve are reported as reclining (ἀνέκειμαι) for the meal (26:20). However, the presence of other disciples in the triclinium is not ruled out, and could even be implied by the fact that in 26:26, Jesus is described as distributing the bread to “the disciples” rather than to “the Twelve.” As in Mark’s account, the betrayal is the main issue concerning the latter group. Apart from the reference to them in 26:20, οἱ δώδεκα occur in Matthew’s Passion Narrative only in relation to Judas’ betrayal in 26:14, 47; elsewhere, the term οἱ μαθηταί is employed.

In Luke’s account of the Last Supper, the one factor which would suggest that only the Twelve are present is his insertion of Q 22:28–30 within the narrative. Matthew places the logion elsewhere (19:28), and it is significant that Luke does not otherwise refer to those at the Last Supper as “the Twelve,” but as “disciples” (22:11) and “apostles” (22:14). As in the other Synoptics, the betrayal is a major feature, and the only references to the Twelve in Luke’s Passion Narrative, apart from 22:30, are in relation to Judas (22:3, 47).

In the Gospel of John, the Twelve are not named, and they play only a minor role, almost entirely related to Judas’ betrayal of Jesus. They are not mentioned specifically in his Last Supper account, and there is nothing to suggest that only the Twelve are present with Jesus at the meal. According to Lee, the Johannine

---

240 The criterion of embarrassment is clearly applicable to the betrayal of Jesus, and the historicity of the incident is not in doubt (Hooker, According to St Mark, 331).
241 See Lee, “Presence or Absence?” 12.
242 See Robinson et al., Critical Edition of Q, 558, re the question as to the original location of the logion. According to the team of scholars, Q concludes with vv. 28, 30 (ibid. 558–61).
expression "his own" employed in 13:2\textsuperscript{244} clearly includes disciples other than the
Twelve, particularly women, as well as "the beloved disciple."\textsuperscript{245} Thus John's
Gospel, even more than the Synoptics, indicates that other disciples besides the
Twelve were participants at the Last Supper.

It is worthy of note that in the synoptic lists,\textsuperscript{246} the identities of the Twelve
vary somewhat, and also that after the replacement of Judas,\textsuperscript{247} relatively few of them
appear to be important in the evolving church. Moreover, in the Pauline tradition, the
Twelve have little significance, and the term "apostle" refers not only to them, but
also to James the brother of Jesus, Junia, Andronicus, and Paul himself.\textsuperscript{248} The
account of the Last Supper in 1 Cor 11:23–26 contains no mention of the Twelve,
thus affirming that as a group, they are not of crucial significance in relation to the
eucharistic rite.

Hence, although the idea of uninvited guests at the Last Supper is speculative,
it coheres well with all of the Gospels, and with Pauline writings. To extrapolate the
notion: I propose that while the Twelve who attend symbolically represent the tribes
of Israel, the types of ἄκλητοι who could be present may be categorised into two
groups. The first comprises ἄκλητοι who are not normally invited to formal meals,
owing to their gender or social status, viz. women and slaves/servants. The second
consists of "outsiders" who are not regarded as being among the "elect." This
category could include anyone who did not fit within established boundaries for table
fellowship, and/or who did not observe the Law, e.g. outcasts such as prostitutes and

\textsuperscript{244} And also at other crucial points. See John 1:11; 10:3–4.
\textsuperscript{245} "Presence or Absence?" 14–15, nn. 48–57.
\textsuperscript{246} Mark 3:16–19; Matt 10:2–4; Luke 6:14–16.
\textsuperscript{247} See Acts 1:13, 15–26.
\textsuperscript{248} See Lee, "Presence or Absence?" 16, and also 1 Cor 15:5–10; Gal 1:19; Rom 16:7. Re Paul’s
reference to "the Twelve" in 1 Cor 15:5, note Gundry’s comment that in view of Judas’ apostasy, the
post-resurrection use of this terminology suggests that it has become stereotyped (Mark, 835).
toll collectors, and non-Jews. We will consider the different types of ἐκλητοί further in discussion below, but meanwhile I suggest that Jesus should be envisaged as distributing the bread and wine equitably among everyone present, without discriminating between the Twelve and the ἐκλητοί. Since the distribution of portions is understood as the appointment of successors, then it is apparent that all present at the Last Supper, not just the Twelve, are authorised as apostles. All are assigned equal status as potential leaders in the Christian community, and have the ongoing task of distributing bread (i.e. teaching and healing).

The grounds for the presence of those in the first category are stronger than for the second group. The case for women to have attended gains support from the references to female followers in Mark 15:40–41; Luke 8:2–3, and from Mark’s location of the anointing story just prior to the Last Supper. The notion that slaves/servants were included is based on two premises. Firstly, we have seen earlier that παιδία are typically ἐκλητοί, but that they are welcomed by Jesus. Secondly, the theory that at the Last Supper, Jesus included the householder’s servants in the distribution of the bread and wine, is likely on the basis of Luke 12:37. The idea is also consistent with the situations described in Acts, where entire households are added to the Christian community, e.g. 11:14; 16:15, 31–32.

The conjecture that non-Jews may have attended the Last Supper is much more difficult to justify, as there is no scriptural evidence. It could be argued that the presence of Gentiles, slaves, and women, as well as the Twelve, is supported by the conjunction of Jew–Greek, slave–free, male–female, in Gal 3:28. However, there is no proof that the view expressed by Paul has any connection with the Last Supper. Another reason for doubting the notion is the well-documented tension over table fellowship with Gentiles in the early church. However, the proposed scenario does
not involve Jews at table in a Gentile environment, as is the case in the dispute recorded in Galatians 2 and Acts 15, and the background to the latter in Acts 10–11. On the contrary, the situation involves one or more Gentiles possibly arriving uninvited at a meal in a Jewish home, and is comparable with Mark 7:24–30. Hence there are no problems here about dietary restrictions. The only significant issue is whether or not Jews and Gentiles associated with each other in such a way, and I believe Sanders has demonstrated that they did so. Although Jews prided themselves on their separateness and distinctiveness, they did associate with Gentiles to some extent. The crux of the matter is that Jews could not eat in a Gentile household unless Jewish food and wine were provided, but entertaining Gentiles was not a problem for Jews. The proposal that some Gentiles were among the first apostles does not explain what prompted the early church to be so proactive in seeking Gentile converts. However, it would provide a possible reason for the speed with which Christianity spread beyond Palestine in the post-resurrection period. We will continue to explore the idea as we consider the new covenant, and its relationship with the eschatological banquet.

3.3.5.9.3. The covenant:

While the tradition in Exod 24:1–2, 9–11 has the covenant being established by means of a communal meal with God, no details are given as to what is consumed. However, in order for Yahweh to be a participant in the meal, it would be necessary for the worshippers to make an offering of the appropriate portions. Similarly, in the Exod 24:3–8 tradition, Yahweh not only receives the burnt offerings in their entirety, but is also assigned portions of the offerings of wellbeing, including half of the

250 Ibid. 181, quoting James D. G. Dunn, “The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2.11–18),” JSNT 18 (1983): 14 [i.e. pp. 138–139 in Dunn’s article as published in Jesus, Paul and the Law].
victims' blood. The procedure at the Last Supper is quite different, with nothing having to be offered for supposed consumption by the deity. The implication is that communion with God may be accomplished simply by giving thanks for the produce of the land, and then sharing it equitably with one's commensals.

Jesus functions in two separate roles as he distributes the eucharistic elements. In offering the bread and the wine as gifts to those present, he is acting as God's agent. Yet he is also chief guest at the meal, and by ending his participation, he foreshadows that at future gatherings of his disciples he will be physically absent. The presumed rationale of the rite is that divine "life" is present in the cereal grains and the grapes from which the bread and wine are produced; when its source is properly acknowledged, it is received by means of consumption.\textsuperscript{251} For instance, with regard to the bread, the concept that "life" (ζωή) is present in it during the eucharistic rite is apparent in Did. 9:3. Another factor is that while God facilitates the growth of the grain and the vine,\textsuperscript{252} and imbues them with life, the end products are the work of human hands. Thus God and humankind may be perceived as partners in creating the eucharistic elements.\textsuperscript{253}

While the Sinai covenant is established by the participation of divine and human parties in a sacrificial meal, priority is given in the Exodus 24 account to the

\textsuperscript{251} There is substantial attestation for the association of divine life with food, esp. with grain and wine, as e.g. Ceres and Bacchus (Smith, Religion of the Semites, 597, 597 n. 2). Note the Manichean belief that Jesus is to be found in the fruits of the trees, created by the power and energy in the air (ibid.). The "soul" of cereal grains is of particular significance in primitive societies (Eerdmans, "Unleavened Bread," 460–61).

\textsuperscript{252} The idea that growth depends on God alone is clear in the Jewish grace presumed in m. Ber.6:1: "[Blessed art thou . . . ] who createst the fruit of the vine . . . " and "who bringest forth bread from the earth" (Danby). God's role in facilitating both biological and spiritual growth is also clear in I Cor 3:5–9. Re the mysterious divine factor that engenders growth, see again Chapter Four, §2.3.2, esp. n. 40.

\textsuperscript{253} Note that whereas under the Levitical laws, leavened bread is considered unclean and is not permitted as an offering, both the elements in the eucharistic rite contain ferments. See Eerdmans, "Unleavened Bread," 461; Smith, Religion of the Semites, 220–21, 387. Wine was evidently an early exception to the prohibition of fermented foods in sacrifices (ibid. 220–21 n. 7).
efficacy of the rite performed with the blood (v. 8). Similarly, in all accounts of the Last Supper, the establishment of the covenant is associated more with the saying over the cup, than with the bread saying. This is probably connected with the fact that the earlier means of sealing an alliance, i.e. the sprinkling of blood, was superseded by the pouring of a libation (of wine) to the relevant deity.\textsuperscript{254} As we saw previously, when God is imagined as “pouring out a cup” of wrath or blessing, the anthropomorphic imagery either mimics the human act of pouring a libation, or comprises the preparation of a cup of wine to be drunk by the recipient.\textsuperscript{255} Although Jesus’ action with the wine is of the latter type, and not a libation, the saying over the cup is expressed in sacrificial terminology, as if the contents are his blood.\textsuperscript{256} Thus the cup that Jesus offers, as God’s agent, simultaneously represents the “pouring out” of blessings, and signifies the sealing of the covenant.

This interpretation points to a significant difference between the old and new covenants. Under the new covenant God is not the recipient of sacrificial offerings, but rather is the provider of “life” through the vehicle of the eucharistic elements. The only offering required for the bread and wine to be so blessed is that the human recipients give thanks. The requirement for thanksgiving is of the utmost importance, in light of the apparently universal concept that a gift is revocable if the recipient exhibits ingratitude.\textsuperscript{257} Failure to express thanks for God’s gifts is likely to result in retribution, as shown in Paul’s warning against participating in the Eucharist unworthily (1 Cor 11:27–30). The inherent danger involved in receiving such gifts is evident in the double meaning of the ancient Germanic word Gift, which may denote

\textsuperscript{254} See n. 165 above re Isa 30:1; 27:15.
\textsuperscript{255} See above, §3.3.7.3.
\textsuperscript{256} Note the close connection between wine and blood in Rev 16:4.
\textsuperscript{257} See Mauss, The Gift, 50.
either gift or poison. What is initially given as a blessing may become a curse, if it is received in an inappropriate manner.

There are similarities, as well as differences, between the two covenants. In each case, the repetition of the rite renews the covenant, and restores, or maintains, the relationship between the worshippers and God. Moreover, although in the first instances the covenants are sealed primarily by means of the blood/wine, both elements (flesh/bread as well as blood/wine) are significant in the subsequent repetition of the rituals. Furthermore, we can surmise that a loaf of bread, like a sacrificial victim, retains its divine “life” when divided, and exerts a bonding influence on the recipients. This is clearly seen in Did. 9:3–4.

The new covenant foreshadows the eschatological banquet in at least two ways. Firstly, since cereal grains are symbolically equivalent to meat, the bread–wine order at the Last Supper ritual maintains the ancient tradition of the meat–wine sequence, and so corresponds with the Isa 25:6–8 description of the eschatological banquet. Secondly, while participants must bring a contribution for the feasts prescribed under Levitical laws, the bread and wine at the Last Supper correspond to the fare to be provided at the heavenly banquet—they represent gifts from God.

In the following discussion, we consider the eucharistic traditions arising from the Last Supper, and their relationship with the eschatological banquet.

---

258 Ibid. 61–62. Judas’ betrayal of Jesus after receiving a portion is a prime example of the dangers supposedly associated with the eucharistic rite, and this alone could account for the warnings in 1 Cor 11:27–30.
259 The principle is demonstrated in the banquet parable, where God’s hospitality is transformed into inhospitality, as a result of the original guests’ ingratitude. See §4.2 below.
260 See Chapter Four, §2.3.
261 See ibid. §2.1.
262 See ibid. §2.5, esp. nn. 95–96.
3.3.5.9.4. The blending of traditions:

As we have observed previously, there is evidence in both Exodus 24 and the Last Supper, of two distinct meal traditions. According to Exod 24:3–8, the first covenant is effected by sacrifices, and depends on the efficacy of the ritual performed with the blood. The other tradition, represented by vv. 1–2, 9–11, records that the covenant is established by means of a communal meal with God, with no details about what is eaten and drunk. When we compare these traditions with those of the Last Supper, Jesus’ actions with the bread and wine correspond approximately with vv. 3–8, since the “body” and “blood” terminology used in the sayings evokes sacrificial imagery. In both, the reports give the impression that the covenants are made between God and the Israelites, as represented by the twelve tribes. The Last Supper itself, however, has little in common with the meal described in Exod 24:11 except that again, there is no description of the banquet fare, and that official participation is limited to invited representatives.

In fact, apart from the accounts of Jesus’ actions, we know virtually nothing about the Last Supper, and the occasion is often perceived as almost synonymous with the inaugural eucharistic ritual. However, the eucharistic rite comprises more than thanksgiving and the sharing of food, and according to our proposal, has additional characteristics which distinguish it from the meal ostensibly provided only for Jesus and the Twelve. Firstly, while we have assumed that the host welcomed the ἐκλεκτοὶ who arrived at the gathering, it is unlikely that they would have received the same quality or quantity of food and wine as the invited guests. The servants would not have participated in the meal at all. In contrast, it is reasonable to assume that Jesus provided equivalent portions to all present, making no distinction between the Twelve and the ἐκλεκτοὶ. Secondly, while the servants would have waited at table for
the actual meal, Jesus himself distributed the bread and wine in his eucharistic action. It follows that to comprehend the various ways in which the Last Supper was commemorated in the early church, we must acknowledge the disparity between the eucharistic rite, and the meal itself, as well as the merging of the traditions. As shown in the above discussion, multiple interpretations can be imposed on both the Last Supper as a farewell meal, and the eucharistic rite performed by Jesus, either as separate entities, or as blended traditions. Presumably, the various interpretations engendered the diversity of liturgies and practice in the nascent church.

In at least some early Christian communities, the initial existence of two distinct traditions was recognised by celebrating the Eucharist either during or after an Agape meal, and this practice apparently continued into the second century. Yet there was evidently considerable variety in liturgical practice, and it seems unlikely that Jesus included any specific instruction to repeat the eucharistic rite; if he had, more uniformity might be expected. The most striking disparity between the traditions of different communities is seen in the liturgy of Did. 9:2–3, as against

---


264 See Pliny, Ep. 10.96; Rackham, Acts of the Apostles, 40, 40 nn. 3–4; Marshall, Last Supper, 111, 172 n. 7; C. E. Robinson, ed., Pliny: Selections from the Letters (The Roman World; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1939), 72. The Christian meal referred to in Pliny’s epistle is evidently the Agape, which by this time was held separately from the Eucharist (ibid.). Pliny’s letter is dated to ca. 110 C.E. (Robinson, “Emmaus Story,” 492). The reason the gathering in the evening is perceived as an Agape, without a Eucharist, is that the food is described in Pliny, Ep. 10.96.7 as “ordinary” and “harmless.” It is therefore to be distinguished from the Communion, which was widely thought to involve feasting on human flesh (Robinson, Pliny: Selections, 72).

265 E.g. regarding the order of the actions with the bread and wine, and whether they should be juxtaposed. See Marshall, Last Supper, 144–45; Hooker, According to St Mark, 339; Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 1031 n. 302.

266 On this question see e.g. Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 360 n. 23, arguing that the injunction to repeat the ritual is secondary; Marshall, Last Supper, 51–53, 89–91, arguing for its authenticity. See also Nolland, Luke, 1047; Green, Gospel of Luke, 762; O’Toole, “Last Supper,” 238.
the eucharistic sayings in the Gospels and the Pauline accounts.\textsuperscript{267} Firstly, the Didache tradition makes no mention of the passion or resurrection, but focuses on thanksgiving for Jesus and the gifts received through him.\textsuperscript{268} Secondly, the reference in Did. 9:4 to the broken bread is reminiscent of the concept outlined above, concerning the divine life contained in the portions, and its exertion of a unifying force upon the participants in the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{269} Both of these points affirm that it is possible to interpret the eucharistic rite appropriately in terms of commensality, as well as sacrifice.

A further contrast may be perceived between the Lucan and Pauline traditions. Earlier, it was observed that the occasions described in Acts as “the breaking of bread,” are not necessarily Eucharists, and most likely are simply communal meals.\textsuperscript{270} If this is true, then we need to investigate Luke’s apparent disinterest in the Eucharist as an entity. The practice of gathering for shared meals is understandable in that even without a specific instruction to do so, the disciples would surely have continued to assemble for table fellowship. Yet it is possible that for Luke, the rationale for the custom lies in the interpretation of Jesus’ words. The instruction: “Do this in remembrance of me” in Luke’s bread saying (22:19), may have traditionally been understood in the evangelist’s community to mean that Jesus’ actions, rather than his words, were to be repeated. That belief could plausibly have led to Christian meals in which the essential characteristics were inclusiveness, thanksgiving, and equitable sharing of food, with the apostles waiting at table. Such

\textsuperscript{267} Hooker, According to St Mark, 339; Mack, Myth of Innocence, 121 n. 15.
\textsuperscript{268} See ibid.
\textsuperscript{269} See §3.3.5.9.2. The separate grains growing on the hillside are envisaged as having been drawn together to produce the one loaf. The hope is then expressed that similarly, the fragments of the divided loaf will exert a unifying influence on those who consume them, so that the Church will be gathered into the kingdom from “the ends of the earth.” The saying is cited in the Sacramentary of Sarapion. See R. J. S. Barrett-Lennard, The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis (Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 25; Bramcote: Grove, 1993), 26.
an interpretation coheres with the meals mentioned in Acts 2:42, 46; 6:1–6, and particularly the latter, in which the apostles are depicted initially as taking the role of servants.\textsuperscript{271}

Although the meals in Acts differ from those depicted in 1 Cor 11:17–26, there is evidently an expectation in both, that the needy are to be included, and that food is to be shared equitably with them. In addition, it is probable that in the meals described in Acts, the “bread” (i.e. food), is to be understood as providing nourishment which is in some sense otherworldly.\textsuperscript{272} The idea that the eucharistic elements of bread and wine are infused with divine life is certainly to be discerned in Didache 9, and in 1 Cor 10:1–22 Paul sees them as “spiritual food” and “spiritual drink.”\textsuperscript{273} For this reason, and particularly in view of Mark 14:25 and parr., Jesus’ actions at the Last Supper, and commemorations of them in the Eucharist, are often perceived as an anticipation of the eschatological banquet.\textsuperscript{274} Similarly, the concept that God will provide food that satisfies is found in the feeding stories (Mark 6:30–44; 8:1–9 and parr.) and the second Beatitude (Luke 6:21 and par.).\textsuperscript{275} For our purposes, what is of greater interest than the supernatural quality of the food, is a consideration of the old and new covenants in relation to the eschatological banquet.

Under the old covenant, God is a participant in communal meals for which the food and drink are provided by the Israelites. In contrast, the Isa 25:6–8 vision of the eschaton is that God will provide rich banquet fare, not only for Israel, but for all nations. In the meantime, under the new covenant, until the kingdom has fully come,

\textsuperscript{270} See §3.3.3, esp. nn. 75–76.

\textsuperscript{271} The subsequent delegation of this task to surrogates indicates that at least in this sphere, it was not long before the disciples ceased to follow Jesus’ example of humility. See also n. 80 above.

\textsuperscript{272} E.g. in Acts 20:7–12, the food which Paul consumes at midnight (v. 11) apparently provides extraordinary spiritual sustenance which enables him to continue preaching until dawn (Robinson, “Emmaus Story,” 492).


\textsuperscript{274} Ibid.
an interpretation coheres with the meals mentioned in Acts 2:42, 46; 6:1–6, and particularly the latter, in which the apostles are depicted initially as taking the role of servants.\footnote{See §3.3.3, esp. nn. 75–76.}

Although the meals in Acts differ from those depicted in 1 Cor 11:17–26, there is evidently an expectation in both, that the needy are to be included, and that food is to be shared equitably with them. In addition, it is probable that in the meals described in Acts, the “bread” (i.e. food), is to be understood as providing nourishment which is in some sense otherworldly.\footnote{The subsequent delegation of this task to surrogates indicates that at least in this sphere, it was not long before the disciples ceased to follow Jesus’ example of humility. See also n. 80 above.} The idea that the eucharistic elements of bread and wine are infused with divine life is certainly to be discerned in Didache 9, and in 1 Cor 10:1–22 Paul sees them as “spiritual food” and “spiritual drink.”\footnote{E.g. in Acts 20:7–12, the food which Paul consumes at midnight (v. 11) apparently provides extraordinary spiritual sustenance which enables him to continue preaching until dawn (Robinson, “Emmaus Story,” 492).} For this reason, and particularly in view of Mark 14:25 and parr., Jesus’ actions at the Last Supper, and commemorations of them in the Eucharist, are often perceived as an anticipation of the eschatological banquet.\footnote{D. E. Smith, “Messianic Banquet,” \textit{ABD} 4:790.} Similarly, the concept that God will provide food that satisfies is found in the feeding stories (Mark 6:30–44; 8:1–9 and parr.) and the second Beatitude (Luke 6:21 and par.).\footnote{Ibid.} For our purposes, what is of greater interest than the supernatural quality of the food, is a consideration of the old and new covenants in relation to the eschatological banquet. Under the old covenant, God is a participant in communal meals for which the food and drink are provided by the Israelites. In contrast, the Isa 25:6–8 vision of the \textit{eschaton} is that \textit{God will provide} rich banquet fare, not only for Israel, but for all nations. In the meantime, under the new covenant, until the kingdom has fully come,
the ethic Jesus promotes through his Last Supper actions is that the needs of the poor are to be met through *hospitality* and *commensality*. In other words, when Jesus’ followers meet for communal meals, they are to welcome any ἄκλητοι, and to share what they have without discrimination. Hence, the inclusiveness and commensality depicted in Acts, and ideally practised at Agape meals, are to be traced to the influence of Jesus’ teaching, and specifically his actions at the Last Supper. The Beatitude “Blessed are you who are hungry now, for you will be filled,” applies not only to the end time, but to the interim, in which Jesus’ disciples are to live according to the ethics of the kingdom. Likewise, while the feeding stories are surely to be understood as examples of divine providence, they also point to a need for human input, as we will see in the following discussion.

3.3.5.10. The link between the Last Supper and the feeding stories:

As we saw previously, the themes of “bread” and “feeding” are of major significance in Mark 6:17–8:21. The section contains the two feeding stories, the first being associated with Israelites (6:30–44), and the second (8:1–9) with Gentiles.

**Mark 6:30–44:**

30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἄποστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἔποιησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδασαν. 31 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ἵματε ἀυτοὶ καὶ ἤδη ἔχετε χορομένους μετὰ τοῦ τόπου καὶ ἀναπάσασθαι ἄλλην. ἦσαν γὰρ εἰς ἐκεῖνον καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνος πολλοῖς, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίριον. 32 καὶ ἀπήλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἤδην. 33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ ποιῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἵκει καὶ προῆλθον αὐτοὺς. 34 καὶ ἔξελθον εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἔχλον καὶ ἐπιλάγχυσθε ἐπὶ αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μη ἔχοντα πουμένα, καὶ ἤρετο διδάσκειν αὐτούς πολλά. 35 Καὶ ἤδη ὡραὶ πολλῆς γενομένης προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ

---

275 Ibid. 789.
276 Note Paul’s admonition in 1 Cor 11:21–22.
277 Luke 6:21a, NRSV.
μαθηταί αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἡρακλῆς ἔστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλῆς. 36 ἀπόλυσα ἀυτοῖς, ἵνα ἀπελθοῦσες εἰς τοὺς κύκλους ἀγρόις καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν. 37 δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Δότε αὐτοῖς ἴμελες φαγεῖν. καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ἀπελθοῦσες ἀγοράζωσιν δημαιρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους καὶ διότι μεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν; 38 δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἔδετε. καὶ γνώτες λέγουσιν, Πέντε, καὶ δύο ἰχθύας. 39 καὶ ἔπεταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖνας πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τὸν χλωρὸν χόρτῳ. 40 καὶ ἀνέπηναν προσαίρας προσαίρας κατὰ ἕκατον καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα. 41 καὶ λαβόν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῖς] ἵνα παρατίθησιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν. 42 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, 43 καὶ ἔδωκεν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων. 44 καὶ ἔδωκεν οἱ φαγοῦσιν τοὺς ἄρτους πεντακοσιάκοις ἄνδρες.

30 The apostles gathered around Jesus, and told him all that they had done and taught. 31 He said to them, “Come away to a deserted place all by yourselves and rest a while.” For many were coming and going, and they had no leisure even to eat. 32 And they went away in the boat to a deserted place by themselves. 33 Now many saw them going and recognized them, and they hurried there on foot from all the towns and arrived ahead of them. 34 As he went ashore, he saw a great crowd; and he had compassion for them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and he began to teach them many things. 35 When it grew late, his disciples came to him and said, “This is a deserted place, and the hour is now very late; 36 send them away so that they may go into the surrounding country and villages and buy something for themselves to eat.” 37 But he answered them, “You give them something to eat.” They said to him, “Are we to go and buy two hundred denarii worth of bread, and give it to them to eat?” 38 And he said to them, “How many loaves have you? Go and see.” When they had found out, they said, “Five, and two fish.” 39 Then he ordered them to get all [the people] to sit down in groups on the green grass. 40 So they sat down in groups of hundreds and of fifties. 41 Taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and blessed and

278 Chapter Six, §4.1.2.1; Chapter Seven, §7.2.1.3.
broke the loaves, and gave them to his disciples to set before them; and he divided the two fish among them all. 42 And all ate and were filled; 43 and they took up twelve baskets full of broken pieces and of the fish. 44 Those who had eaten the loaves numbered five thousand men.

Mark 8:1–9:

1 Ἑν ἑκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ἡχὸν δύτως καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τι φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς, 2 Σεπλαγχώσουμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἡχόν, ὅτι ἡ ἡμέρα τρεῖς προσμένουσιν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἐχουσιν τί φάγωσιν. 3 καὶ ἔδει ἀπαλάκων αὐτοὺς νηστείς εἰς οἷκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρὸθεν ἔκασιν. 4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Πάνω τούτων δυνάσθαι τις ὅπως χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπὶ ἡμέρας; 5 καὶ ἡρώτα αὐτοῖς, Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Ἑπτά. 6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ἡχῷ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρτων εὐχαριστήσῃς ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἣν παρατίθεν, καὶ παρέδωκαν τῷ ἡχῷ. 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰσχύσια ὀλίγα καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπαν καὶ ταῦτα παρατίθεναι. 8 καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, καὶ ἤραν περισσοῦμεν κλαμάτων ἐπὶ σπυρίδας. 9 ἤσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι καὶ ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς.

1 In those days when there was again a great crowd without anything to eat, he called his disciples and said to them, 2 “I have compassion for the crowd, because they have been with me now for three days and have nothing to eat. 3 If I send them away hungry to their homes, they will faint on the way — and some of them have come from a great distance.” 4 His disciples replied, “How can one satisfy these [people] with bread here in the desert?” 5 He asked them, “How many loaves do you have?” They said, “Seven.” 6 Then he ordered the crowd to sit down on the ground; and he took the seven loaves, and after giving thanks he broke them and gave them to his disciples to distribute; and they distributed them to the crowd. 7 They had also a few small fish; and after blessing them, he ordered that these too should be distributed. 8 They ate and were filled; and they took up the broken pieces left over, seven baskets full. 9 Now there were about four thousand [people]. And he sent them away.
The tradition of a miraculous feeding is attested in all the Gospels, and it is possible that a historical incident lies behind the stories.\(^{279}\) Although the two accounts in Mark have undergone considerable redaction, they are probably based on independent pre-Marcan oral traditions.\(^{280}\) It is widely recognised that in both of Mark’s versions, Jesus’ words over the bread and fish have been influenced by the bread and cup sayings at the Last Supper,\(^{281}\) or perhaps by eucharistic liturgy.\(^{282}\) The similarity is more evident in the second account (Mark 8:6) than the first (6:41).\(^{283}\)

The Gospel tradition of a multitude being fed miraculously has parallels in 1 Kgs 17:8–16; 2 Kgs 4:1–7; and especially 2 Kgs 4:42–44,\(^ {284}\) and more importantly, is redolent of the provision of manna and quails for the Israelites in the wilderness (Exodus 16; Numbers 11).\(^ {285}\) In one respect, however, the food provided in the desert differs from that in the Gospel feeding stories. It is given directly by God, whereas the bread and fish in each instance are already in the possession of the disciples (6:38; 8:5).\(^ {286}\) Both situations differ from the eschatological banquet, where God, as host, will prepare and provide everything. This comparison highlights the fact that in the feeding miracles, as with Jesus’ Last Supper actions and the meals in Acts,


\(^{282}\) See ibid.; Guelich, *Mark*, 343, 406–407; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 409, 410 Fig. 15, 420, 496. The verbs ἔλατσία and ἐσχαροσύνε, which are both used in the Last Supper accounts and the feeding stories, are mostly considered interchangeable. See Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 1031 n. 302; Guelich, *Mark*, 401, 405; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 488. Regarding the ambiguity over who, or what, is blessed in Mark 6:41; 8:6, see Guelich, *Mark*, 342, 406–407; Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 409, 488. But note that, despite Meier’s assertion about traditions in the early church (*Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 964), there is no evidence that the eucharistic ritual was practised in Mark’s or Matthew’s communities. See Smith, “Banquet Reconsidered,” 73; Klosinski, “Meals in Mark,” 202.


whatever food there is, however little, is to be shared among everyone present. When this is done, God will bless the meal, and ensure that all are satisfied. Thus, the responsibility given to the disciples for feeding the hungry coheres with the idea that the new covenant involves a partnership between God and humankind.

It is illuminating to compare the feeding stories with the two meal traditions we have distinguished behind the Last Supper accounts. The first of the stories is located shortly after the sending out of the Twelve (6:6b–13). Although the account of John the Baptist’s death intervenes, the feeding story commences in v. 30 with the return of the Twelve, who gather around Jesus to report on their mission. The term “apostles” is used here, and the context indicates that the “disciples” who feature in the story (vv. 35, 41) are the Twelve. It is they who possess the meagre supplies (v. 38), and who subsequently distribute the bread and fish to the multitude (v. 41).

The fact that the remaining fragments fill twelve baskets demonstrates that the focus on the Twelve, and hence on Israel, is maintained throughout the story. It is interesting to observe that in citing the number in the multitude (v. 44), Mark uses the non-inclusive term ἐνδοξήστε. Thus the first feeding story apparently derives from

286 Marcus, Mark 1–8, 407. However, the manna has to be ground and baked into bread (Exod 16:23, 31; Num 11:7), and the quails would need to be prepared and cooked.
287 In this respect, it is interesting to observe that the verb ἑρμαῖκος (pass. be satisfied, eat one’s fill) occurs in both of the feeding accounts (Mark 6:42; 8:4, 8) as well as in the second Beatitude (Luke 6:21 and par.). Note Klauck’s point that the feeding stories would remind Christian readers/hearers of the obligation to feed the hungry by sharing their food, as they did at Eucharists and/or Agape meals (“Lord’s Supper,” 365).
288 See §3.3.5.9.3.
289 This instance is Mark’s sole usage of the word (Guelich, Mark, 337–38; Marcus, Mark 1–8, 416).
290 Marcus, (Mark 1–8, 415, 418, 420), particularly emphasises the role of the disciples in the distribution of the bread. In contrast, he interprets Mark 6:41 as meaning that Jesus himself distributes the fish (ibid. 410, 420). However, that reads too much into the text, and it is obviously more likely that while Jesus divided the fish, he then gave the pieces to the disciples to distribute.
291 The leftover food surely represents the food (i.e. ministry) which is available for distribution to the twelve tribes. On the numerical symbolism in the story, see Loader, Attitude towards the Law, 67; Guelich, Mark, 343–44.
292 Otherwise, the masculine plural form of πᾶς elsewhere in the account could be interpreted as gender-inclusive, as Matthew renders it in his modified version (cf. Matt 14:21). Even so, that would not have illustrated the inclusiveness as clearly as Matthew does.
a tradition which, like Mark's Last Supper account, is androcentric, and highlights the importance of Israel and the Twelve.

The second feeding account differs markedly. Jesus and his followers are now in Gentile territory, and the detail that some of the people have “come from a great distance” seems to affirm that they are non-Jews. Another indication of the Gentile component in the audience is that the term used for “basket” in the second story is σπυρίς. In contrast, the earlier account employs the word κόφυς, which is associated with Jewish travellers. In addition, it is likely that the seven baskets of food remaining symbolise the nations of the world, thus indicating the availability of the kingdom for Gentiles. In this account the term “disciples” (8:1, 4) may reasonably be understood as referring to a wider group than the Twelve, and in view of our findings about the composition of the audience, those who distribute the bread and fish (v. 6) can be envisaged as possibly including Gentiles. A further consideration is that the term τετρακοσία λαοί, used to state the number of people fed (v. 9), may be interpreted as gender-inclusive: the NRSV correctly renders it four thousand people. However, the case for visualising Gentiles among the disciples distributing the bread and fish is stronger than the argument that women were involved.

Now, as we saw above, the Last Supper sayings probably influenced the accounts of Jesus' words over the bread and fish, especially in the second of the

---

293 Lee, “Presence or Absence?” 18–19. In view of the exodus imagery in the account, it is possible that Mark's use of the term ἄνδρας echoes OT passages in which only the men are counted (Marcus, Mark 1:8, 414). See also Guelich, Mark, 344.
294 Guelich, Mark, 404; Marcus, Mark 1:8, 487. The imagery of being “far away” (i.e. from God) is used in the OT and elsewhere to signify Gentiles (ibid.).
295 Ibid. 411, 489.
296 Louser, Attitude towards the Law, 83. Marcus doubts the significance of the numbers in the account, but still considers Mark's aim is to present the recipients as Gentile (Mark 1:8, 491).
297 Cf. “men” for ἄνδρας in Mark 6:44.
feeding stories (Mark 8:6–7). It is therefore possible that some other details of the Last Supper were retrojected, particularly into Mark’s second account. Hence if Gentiles (and/or women) were present at the Last Supper, they could have featured in the tradition on which Mark 8:1–9 was based.\textsuperscript{298} The proposal provides a possible rationale for the accent on Gentiles in the second feeding story. However, it is highly speculative, and Mark’s emphasis on Gentiles in the second account should probably be seen as his celebration of their inclusion in the kingdom,\textsuperscript{299} rather than an inference of their presence at the Last Supper.

3.3.5.11. Concluding remarks concerning the Last Supper:

The investigation of the Last Supper with a focus on commensality has led to several important conclusions, which are entirely consistent with our findings from earlier chapters. If we accept that ἄκλητοι were present, the Last Supper stands in continuity with Jesus’ previous table fellowship, as well as with the ethos of the Agape and the meals depicted in Acts. Secondly, the eucharistic rite at the Last Supper prefigures the eschatological ingathering by symbolically drawing the participants into unity.

Admittedly, the case for the presence of women at the Last Supper is stronger than that for Gentiles. While the presence of Gentiles is consistent with our previous findings, there are no references to them that are comparable with Mark’s emphasis on women at the end of the Passion Narrative, and there is relatively little evidence of Jesus’ outreach to non-Jews during his ministry. We therefore need to consider whether Mark’s depiction of a ministry beyond Israel reflects genuine activity of Jesus, or simply a Marcan Tendenz. Therefore, as we turn now to the eschatological

\textsuperscript{298} Marcus suggests that the depiction of the disciples as intermediaries in 8:6–7 may represent the situation in Mark’s community, in which “the Twelve and other church leaders officiated at the Eucharist.” [Mark 1–8, 497 (emphasis added)]. This is obviously consistent with the concept that other disciples besides the Twelve were authorised as apostles at the Last Supper.
\textsuperscript{299} See Loader, “Mark 7:1–23,” 133.
banquet, we will be looking particularly in the two relevant Q passages, for evidence of Jesus’ concern for Gentiles. If such an interest is apparent in Q as well as Mark, it may support the argument that Gentiles were present at the Last Supper, and that Jesus symbolically appointed them as apostles.

4. **The eschatological banquet:**

4.1. *Jesus’ depiction of the banquet:*

The first text to be examined is Matt 8:11–12 par. Luke 13:28–29, which is generally considered to be from Q, despite the differences in the word order of the two versions. The saying does not appear to be in its original context in either Matthew or Luke, and it is best to treat it in isolation. Luke has probably rearranged the pericope to suit the “door” imagery in the preceding verses, and Matthew’s order is to be preferred. I have followed Meier’s proposed reconstruction of the passage (Matt 8:11–12) with only minor alterations:

11 Many [or: they] shall come from east and west, and shall recline [at table] with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God. 12 But you shall be thrown out. In that place there shall be weeping and grinding of teeth.

(*Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 314)

The saying, in a form similar to this, has a strong claim to authenticity. It is not certain that the word “many” is authentic, but there are sound reasons for retaining it.

---

300 See Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 309, 371 n. 76.
303 Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, 316, 376 n. 106; Robinson et al., Critical Edition of Q, 416. The phrase “from north and south” is probably redactional (Meier, *Mentor, Message, and
Since we do not know the original context of the saying, the "you" who are to be "thrown out" cannot be identified precisely, but are probably some Israelites (perhaps Pharisees), who have not accepted Jesus' message.\textsuperscript{305} The imagery is confusing, because it seems to require that those ejected from the banquet must already have entered the kingdom.\textsuperscript{306} Yet the scene is comprehensible when considered in relation to an earthly banquet. As we observed earlier, guests could usually gain access to the vestibule easily, and whether invited or not, could possibly go further into the house before being welcomed or rejected by the householder.\textsuperscript{307} Likewise, with respect to the heavenly banquet, the persons who will be "thrown out" are envisaged as having entered, in the belief that they are invited guests. However, Israelites do not have automatic right of entry to the eschatological banquet,\textsuperscript{308} and those being addressed are presumably rejected by the "householder" (i.e. God) because they have not demonstrated appropriate attitudes in their mortal lives.

\textit{Miracles}, 313; Braun, \textit{Feasting and Social Rhetoric}, 63 n. 4). There are several LXX parallels concerning eschatological gathering (Meier, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 373 n. 90; Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 735). The closest parallels, Ps 107:3; Isa 43:5–6, both refer to gathering of the dispersed tribes. For similar texts see Isa 49:12; Jer 3:18; and note that Jer 3:17 refers to the gathering of the nations to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{304} See Meier, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 313, 373 n. 88; Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 735.\textsuperscript{305} Meier, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 315–16.\textsuperscript{306} Ibid. 375 n. 99.\textsuperscript{307} See Chapter Four, §3.4.2; Chapter Seven, §§3.1.3.4; §7.2.1.4, nn. 283–84; §7.2.2.1, n. 291.\textsuperscript{308} Green, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 532; Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 733.
Scholarly opinions vary as to the identity of the “many” who are welcomed to the banquet, but I endorse Meier’s conclusion that it refers to Gentiles. The most relevant OT reference to the ingathering of Gentiles, and their inclusion in the eschatological banquet, is Isa 25:6–8:

6 On this mountain the LORD of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear. 7 And he will destroy on this mountain the shroud that is cast over all peoples, the sheet that is spread over all nations; 8 he will swallow up death forever. Then the Lord GOD will wipe away the tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people he will take away from all the earth, for the LORD has spoken.

The total inclusiveness envisaged in Isaiah’s prophecy of the end time is strikingly portrayed by the reiteration of all ( Heb.), which occurs five times in the passage. The contention that the “many” in Matt 8:11–12 are Gentiles is supported by the fact that, like Isa 25:6–8, the saying incorporates two motifs concerning the end time, viz. the ingathering of all nations, and the eschatological banquet. The passage also contains a third motif, i.e. the kingdom of God, and it is therefore apparent that the

---

310 Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 314–15. Meier considers the possibility that the “many” are Diaspora Jews, but dismisses the notion. See ibid. 315, 373 n. 100.
311 Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 90. See also the references in Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 314. As Meier observes (ibid.), there was no uniform doctrine about the coming of the Gentiles at the eschaton, and some of the prophecies are negative, while others view Gentiles in a positive light. See esp. Isa 2:1–4; 42:1–4; 49:6; 51:4–6.
312 Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 316.
historical Jesus did predict the participation of Gentiles both in the future kingdom, and at the eschatological banquet.\textsuperscript{313}

Significantly, the Matt 8:11–12 juxtaposition of the kingdom theme with that of the eschatological banquet recalls Jesus’ statement in Mark 14:25.\textsuperscript{314} Thus, although his ministry appears to have been directed primarily towards Israel,\textsuperscript{315} it is likely that he referred specifically to the end-time ingathering of the nations, and believed it was imminent. As we examine the banquet parable in the next subsection, we will consider whether it provides any further indication of Jesus’ interest in Gentiles.

4.2. The banquet parable:

4.2.1. Text and interpretation:

The parable about the great banquet occurs in three versions, Luke 14:15–24; Matt 22:1–14; and Gos. Thom. 64:1–12.\textsuperscript{316} While many scholars consider that the parable in its original form derives from Jesus,\textsuperscript{317} it appears that all three extant versions have been modified.\textsuperscript{318} This applies particularly to Matthew’s version, which is highly allegorised.\textsuperscript{319} Luke’s version, while not as simple as that in the Gospel of Thomas, is

\textsuperscript{313} Ibid. 316–17.
\textsuperscript{314} Ibid. 316.
\textsuperscript{315} Ibid. 315, 374 n. 98. See also Rom 15:8 (ibid.).
\textsuperscript{317} Hultgren, Parables, 339, 339 n. 28, 348, 348–49 n. 41.
\textsuperscript{318} Funk, Five Gospels, 235, 353, 510; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 3:194.
\textsuperscript{319} Funk, Five Gospels, 235; Hultgren, Parables, 342–43; Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, 376 n. 104. Cf. the opinion of Richard Bauckham in “The Parable of the Royal Wedding Feast (Matthew 22:1–14) and the Parable of the Lame Man and the Blind Man (Apocryphon of Ezekiel),” JBL 115 (1996): 471–88. He interprets Matthew’s version of the parable from the perspective of its narrative integrity. His argument fails to convince, particularly his view that the banquet is not necessarily ready to commence immediately, and with regard to Matt 22:11–14. See ibid. 486–88, esp. n. 58; and also §4.4 below.
considered the closest to the original parable, and is used here as the basis for discussion.

Luke 14:15–24:

15 Ἄκουσας δὲ τῆς τῶν συναινειμένων ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ὁ Μακάριος ὤστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 16 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ἂνφρωπός τις ἔποιεί δεῖπνον μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοὺς 17 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἶπεν τοῖς κεκλημένοις, Ἔρχονται, ὅτι ἔσοδοι ἔστων. 18 καὶ ἦραντο ἀπὸ μίας πάντες παραιτεῖσθαι. ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ᾿Αγρῶν ἤγορας καὶ ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἐξελθεῖν ἵδειν αὐτὸν ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παραθημένου. 19 καὶ ἔτερος εἶπεν, Ἱεύγη βουόν ἤγορας πέντε καὶ πορεύμασι δοκιμάσαι αὐτᾶ· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παραθημένου. 20 καὶ ἔτερος εἶπεν, Γνωάσακα ἐγήμα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν. 21 καὶ παραγενόμενος ὁ δοῦλος ἀπήγγελεν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα. τότε ὁργισθεὶς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἶπεν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ, Ἐξελθεί ταχέως εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ μῆμας τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν πτωχῶν καὶ ἀνατείρους καὶ τυφλῶν καὶ χωλῶν ἑισάγαγε ὥστε. 22 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ δοῦλος, Κύριε, γέγονεν ὁ ἐπέταξας, καὶ ἔτι τόπος ἔστων. 23 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος πρὸ τοῦ δοῦλου, Ἐξελθεί εἰς τὰς ὅδους καὶ φραγμοὺς καὶ ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ μου ὁ οἶκος. 24 λέγω γὰρ ἵδεν ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων γεύσεται μου τοῦ δείπνου.

15 One of the dinner guests, on hearing this, said to him, “Blessed is anyone who will eat bread in the kingdom of God!” 16 Then Jesus said to him, “Someone gave a great dinner and invited many. 17 At the time for the dinner he sent his slave to say to those who had been invited, ‘Come; for everything is ready now.’ 18 But they all alike began to make excuses. The first said to him, ‘I have bought a piece of land, and I must go out and see it; please accept my regrets.’ 19 Another said, ‘I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to try them out; please accept my regrets.’ 20 Another said, ‘I have just been married, and therefore I cannot come.’ 21 So the slave returned and reported this to his master. Then the owner of the house became angry and said to his slave, ‘Go out

---

at once into the streets and lanes of the town and bring in the poor, the crippled, the
blind, and the lame.’ 22 And the slave said, ‘Sir, what you ordered has been done, and
there is still room.’ 23 Then the master said to the slave, ‘Go out into the roads and
lanes, and compel people to come in, so that my house may be filled. 24 For I tell you,
none of those who were invited will taste my dinner.’ ”

The first and last verses are usually regarded as Lucan additions. V. 15
appears to have been inserted to sharpen the focus on hospitality, and to introduce
the topic of the eschatological banquet explicitly. There is some debate as to whether
v. 24 is part of the parable, i.e. spoken by the host, or an assertion put in the mouth
of Jesus, and addressed to his commensals. The problem with the former argument
is that the “you” is plural (ὑμεῖς), whereas the host has previously been addressing
only his servant; hence the verse is best seen as redactional.

In my opinion, the host and the servant in the parable represent God and
Jesus, respectively, and the occasion is the eschatological banquet. The depiction
of God as the offended host is thoroughly consistent with our earlier findings about
the divine punishment awaiting those who breach hospitality codes. The issuing of

321 The fact that cognates of καλέω (to call, invite) occur twelve times in vv. 7–24 points clearly to
hospitality as the general topic. See Willi Braun, “Symposium or Anti-Symposium? Reflections on
322 As indicated by the punctuation in the NRSV cited here. And see Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes,
109; Hultgren, Parables, 338.
323 As Bailey suggests (Through Peasant Eyes, 109).
324 Contra Bailey, who claims that the servant is identified with his master, and regards Jesus as the
host at the eschatological banquet (ibid. 110). For various other opinions, see Hultgren, Parables, 337,
337 nn. 18–19.
325 As Green notes, there are some hermeneutical difficulties in the parable (Gospel of Luke, 556–57).
However, he seems to adopt too literal an interpretation, in following Braun’s extensive examination
of the text in Feasting and Social Rhetoric, 62–131. See Green, Gospel of Luke, 557 n. 147. The
parable is better understood as a humorous story with a serious, but general, message. It has no exact
analogy either in the early church or during Jesus’ ministry (Nolland, Luke, 758).
326 See esp. Chapter Three, §4.1.
a second invitation to guests is apparently customary in the Middle East, but in the context of the parable it implies that the end time has come. 327

Identification of the initial guests is debated, but the following perceptions can be substantiated. "Those who had been invited" (v. 17) are evidently Jews, perhaps leaders in the community, 328 or Pharisees, corresponding with those in Luke 13:28 who consider themselves among the elect. 329 The phraseology used to describe the way in which one after another of the original guests responds, probably indicates that all of them in turn decline the invitation. 330

It is on the matter of the alternative guests that Luke’s version probably diverges from the original parable. Most likely, the story recounted by Jesus concluded as Robinson et al. surmise, with only one sending of the slave after the initial guests decline. Hence the parable would end with the following, or similar:

"Go out on the roads, and whomever you find, invite, so that my house may be filled."

(Critical Edition of Q, 446)

The basic outline of the story can still be regarded as authentic: the identification of the householder and slave as God and Jesus, respectively; the readiness of the banquet; the original guests’ offensive refusals; and the host’s outrage, and consequent instruction to his slave. The parable therefore corroborates our previous findings concerning Jesus’ ministry: he predicted that some “outsiders” such as (reformed) prostitutes and toll collectors, would be welcome at the eschatological banquet, while some who had considered themselves elect would be ineligible. The

327 Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 94–95.
328 Ibid. 99, 110.
329 Nolland, Luke, 753–54. Hultgren sees the initial invitation as corresponding to an earlier proclamation, issued by the prophets (Parables, 337).
parable does not provide any further evidence beyond Matt 8:11–12, that Jesus specifically predicted the inclusion of Gentiles at the eschatological banquet. Nonetheless, it would certainly have established a stance that would make their inclusion a likely future outcome, if not a logical consequence.

4.2.2. Eschatological reversal:
The main message of the parable is that of reversal, found likewise in Matt 8:11–12. Some of those originally invited to the eschatological banquet have chosen to forfeit their places, while others who were formerly are now . The thrust of the parable is thus consistent with the universality expressed by the five-fold repetition of ἐν Ἰσα 25:6–8: ultimately all will have received an invitation to the banquet. However, in the end, some of the original guests choose to be excluded.

4.3. The justice of the banquet:
As we saw in §4.3, Chapter Three, the eschaton is associated with the concepts that divine justice will finally be accomplished in the context of a banquet, and that those who have breached the laws of hospitality will be punished. Our findings throughout the present study have endorsed those perceptions, and demonstrated the centrality of hospitality and commensality in Jesus’ teaching and practice. Moreover, according to our conclusions, Jesus intimates that outsiders (including Gentiles) are to be invited to the eschatological banquet, while some Jews will ultimately be ineligible.

The inclusion of outsiders among the guests at the eschatological banquet may be seen in itself as an act of divine justice. The term relates mainly to

---

330 Nolland, Luke, 756; Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 95; Hultgren, Parables, 332. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that all Jews decline. See the discussion in Green, Gospel of Luke, 556, 556 n. 146.
331 On the reversal motif, see also Chapter Three, §4.2.
marginalised Jews who would not have expected an invitation to a banquet. These include persons designated as “sinners” owing to their despised occupations, or assumed to be so in light of their social circumstances or physical impairments, e.g. “the poor, crippled, blind, and lame,” as in Luke 14:13–14, 21. Yet it can also be envisaged as including Gentiles. The idea of justice for the nations (i.e. Gentiles) is found not only in Isa 25:6–8, but in Deutero-Isaiah, specifically 42:1–4 and 51:4–5. Isa 42:1–4 is particularly significant, as indicated by Matthew’s citation of it (12:18–21), identifying Jesus as the Suffering Servant: he will “proclaim justice to the Gentiles,” and “in his name they will hope” (NRSV).

Now, in view of the evidence that Jesus anticipated the inclusion of Gentiles at the eschatological banquet, we need to return to the question of their possible presence at the Last Supper. Overall, our findings cohere well with the notion that there were ἄκλητοι at the meal, and that Jesus included them in the distribution of the eucharistic elements. The case for the participation of women and παῖδια is stronger than for those categorised as “outsiders,” although Jesus’ ministry to marginalised Jews is consistent with the inclusion of the latter. Isa 25:6–8; 42:1–4, and Matt 8:11–12 offer some support for the idea that “outsiders” may have included Gentiles, but there is insufficient evidence to promote that argument. Nevertheless, those passages, together with the presumably authentic core of the banquet parable, do provide substantiation for the idea that at the end time, divine justice will prevail. Those who were formerly ἄκλητοι (including Gentiles) will be welcome at the eschatological banquet. Thus, if our supposition about the presence of some ἄκλητοι

333 Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 110.
334 Luke has probably taken the four groups from his version of the parable and inserted them in v. 13 as Nolland proposes (Luke, 757). However, the categories seem to have been drawn from the OT, as indicated in Luke 4:18–19; 7:22 (Funk, Five Gospels, 352). For an alternative interpretation of the groups, see also Bailey, Through Peasant Eyes, 100.
at the Last Supper is correct, it could certainly account for the prominence of women in the early church, while the inclusion of Jewish "outsiders" provides a logical basis for the subsequent application of the term to Gentiles.

In that light, an interesting contrast could be made between the justice apportioned to the ἄκλητοι, on the one hand, and to Judas, on the other. By his betrayal of a commensal, Judas clearly breached one of the fundamental laws of hospitality, and the dire punishment in store for him is indicated in Mark 14:21.336

4.4. The baptismal rite:

From the Acts 8:36–39 account of the Ethiopian eunuch’s baptism, it appears that according to Luke, the rite resembled the immersion ritual practised by John the Baptist. However, as we will see below, there are indications that one or more other elements formed part of the ritual in the very early post-resurrection period, and we need to explore this phenomenon.

In Chapter Six, §4.1.5, it was suggested that the baptismal rites in Matthew’s and Luke’s communities probably evolved in response to traditional Jewish concerns about boundaries. We saw that the establishment of initiation rites was likely to stem from a perceived need for “outsiders” to be incorporated, and transformed into “insiders,” particularly in relation to table fellowship.337 Since those who had previously been excluded from table fellowship were now to be admitted, issues over boundaries and ritual purity would have required observant Jews to undergo considerable attitudinal change. A major area of concern would be in relation to the admission of former ἄκλητοι to meals, especially to Eucharists, and the eschatological banquet. Despite Jesus’ teaching on the subject, it would have been

---

336 Re the episode see Mark 14:17–21 and parr.
337 See esp. §§4.1.5.3 and 4.1.5.4, Chapter Six.
extraordinarily difficult for conservative Jews to accept the eligibility of former
outcasts to attend.

As mentioned previously, I believe that baptismal customs may have
developed, at least partially, from the threefold Homeric ritual used for the reception
of a stranger. This involves bathing/washing, anointing, and the gift of a new
garment, before the outsider is admitted to table fellowship. The NT references to
Christian baptism indicate that it included a purificatory rite performed with water,
but no precise details are given, and in the first century, interpretations of the practice
seem to have varied. Moreover, Justin’s description of baptism, dating from ca.
150, refers only to the use of water. What is striking about the rite that evolved in
the early church is that it includes not only the element of immersion, as for the
baptisms performed in the Gospels and Acts, but also anointing, and often the gift of
a new robe.

Matt 22:11–14, where one of the guests is deemed to be inappropriately
dressed, may perhaps be an indication of the latter ritual. The episode is
reminiscent of the stipulation in m. Demai 2:3 that an Am Ha’arets wearing his own

338 See Chapter Three, §2.4, esp. 69–70. It is the gift of the garment that distinguishes the rite for
incorporating an outsider, from the threefold rite sometimes used in the Homeric world, in the OT, and
elsewhere. E.g. in Od. 4.244–253, Helen employs the triple rite for cleansing the “stranger” Odysseus
(disguised as a beggar), and it is clear that she provides the clothes for him. Similarly, the rite is used
when the stranger Theoclymenus is brought by Peiraeus to Odysseus’ palace (Od. 17.84–97), although
by then the seer is somewhat familiar to his host Telemachus. While both guest and host are bathed,
anointed and dressed anew, the garment donned by Theoclymenus is evidently a gift. The use of the
triple rite is consistent with Peiraeus’ vow to care for the stranger appropriately (Od. 15.539–546).
Other examples of a threefold rite where the person dons his own new/clean garment are: David
washing, anointing and changing his clothes in 2 Sam 12:20; and Trimalchio, in Petronius, Sat. 28.
Whether for the purification of a stranger, or in ordinary circumstances, the triple rite apparently took
place, like footwashing, prior to the meal, and perhaps only for formal occasions. Note that in the
account of Eumaeus’ hospitality to Odysseus, there is no reference to any washing prior to the meal


341 But note that the wedding garment may symbolise the ethical quality that was expected in the
community (Stendahl, “Matthew,” §690m, 791; Hultgren, Parables, 348). For various interpretations of
the garment, see ibid. 347–48, 347 nn. 26–35; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 3:204–205,
204 nn. 54–56, 205 nn. 57–58.

38
garment may not be received into the home of a ḥaber. Ḥag 2:7 illuminates the issue by stating that “For Pharisees the clothes of an Am-haaretz count as suffering midras-uncleanness” (Danby). These regulations have together been interpreted as indicating that an Am Ha’arets would be admissible to a ḥaber’s home after bathing and changing into a clean garment. The viewpoint appears reasonable since it reflects biblical purificatory procedures; however, it requires some presumptions, and is not necessarily accurate. A strict interpretation implies that the ḥaber should provide one of his own garments for the Am Ha’arets, thereby preventing the uncleanness from escaping beyond the protective layer of clothing. I believe that this convention possibly explains the incident described in Matt 22:11–14. Conceivably, what began as the custom of supplying a clean garment to conspicuously unwashed or inappropriately dressed persons arriving for meals could have evolved into an element of the community’s formal baptismal rite. Davies and Allison raise the possibility that the garment the guest lacks may be linked with baptism, but virtually discard the notion on the grounds that it does not cohere with the hortative nature of the parable. However, this view overlooks the probability

343 Buchanan, Consequences, 197–99.
344 As Buchanan acknowledges (Consequences, 206, cf. 200).
345 See Chapter Six, §4.1.5.1, esp. nn. 139–42.
346 In addition, the suggested interpretation could apply to Luke 15:22, in which the loving father instructs his slaves to bring a robe for his (indubitably unwashed) son. The provision of a garment is all that is needed to address the problem of uncleanness, while the instruction to bring the best robe, and a ring for his finger, relate to the honour being bestowed on the returning prodigal. Cf. the bathing, anointing, and provision of a handsome cloak for Laertes, in preparation for the banquet in the Finale of Odyssey (Od. 24.365–367). The situations of Laertes and the prodigal are similar in that although both are family members, not strangers, suitable garments must be provided prior to their admission to a banquet. See Od. 24.248–250 re Laertes’ “wretched clothes” and “squalid” appearance (Murray, rev. Dimock, LCL).
347 Although Matt 28:19 implies only immersion.
348 Matthew, 3:204–205, 205 n. 57. Their preferred interpretations are that the garment represents (1) the resurrection body or its clothing; or (2) righteousness, or good works (ibid. 204, 204 nn. 54–56). In both cases, the guest is deemed to be improperly prepared for the eschatological banquet (ibid. 204).
that baptismal rites were designed to prepare the neophyte for the eschatological banquet, and evolved from procedures adopted in the early community life for dealing with tensions over the incorporation of former outsiders. Rituals practised for ordinary meals, as indicated by the mishnaic provisions about garments, would have been even more rigorously applied in relation to Eucharists, and for ostensible preparation for the eschatological banquet. The stipulation in Did. 9:5 that only baptised persons may partake of the Eucharist bears witness to the significance of baptism as an entry criterion. It is noteworthy that in the tradition, the term ἐνδομα (i.e. as employed for the garment in Matt 22:11–12), was used to refer to baptism or to a baptismal robe, and that removal of clothing before baptism, and dressing again afterwards, are already implied as elements of the rite in the Pauline epistles. The idiomatic use of the verb ἐνδόω in Gal 3:26–27 with regard to being baptised into Christ, and hence “clothed” with Christ, almost certainly indicates that the rite was concluded by putting on a new garment. Again, the imagery used in Col 3:9–10 of “stripping off” the old self and “putting on” the new, probably derives from the baptismal rite, as likewise the idea of “clothing oneself” with compassion, etc., in v. 12. Similar imagery was used in the fourth century by Optatus of Mileue, and in the Coptic Gospel of Mary.

350 I.e. mid. clothe oneself in, put on, wear (“ἐνδόω,” 2, BAGD 264).
351 See Meeks, “Image of the Androgyne,” 183; Buchanan, Consequences, 206.
352 Using the verbs ἀπεκδόμασιν and ἐνδόω respectively. See “ἀπεκδόμασιν,” 1, BAGD 83, and “ἐνδόω,” 2. b. BAGD 264.
353 Again using ἐνδόω. See Buchanan, Consequences, 207–208; Meeks, “Image of the Androgyne,” 183, 183–84 n. 82.
354 Buchanan, Consequences, 208, 208 nn. 4–5.
In the rite described in the *Apostolic Tradition*, anointing is a highly significant component, acting as a means for both the discernment and exorcism of demonic “impurity” in baptismal candidates. In this liturgy, the neophytes remove their clothes before the rite, which comprises anointing with the Oil of Exorcism, triple immersion, and a second anointing with the Oil of Thanksgiving. Following the ceremony, the neophytes put on their own clothes again. Hence in this tradition, only two of the three elements of the Homeric rite appear to have been utilised. Nevertheless, it is clear that the anointing with the Oil of Exorcism was intended to eliminate the dangerous forces thought likely to inhabit outsiders, i.e. non-Christians. Some early liturgies include all three elements of the Homeric rite, with the neophytes being clothed in new white garments at the end of the procedure.

Hence, there are several confirmed instances of the use of either two or three elements, and although we have no conclusive evidence, it is certainly possible that the Homeric ritual was influential in the development of baptismal rites. In any case, our findings indicate that the procedures used to incorporate neophytes into Christian communities closely resembled the customs associated with the reception of outsiders into table fellowship. Meeks has suggested that the procedures of undressing and being reclad during baptism became ritual acts “by being taken up

---


356 Ibid. 267–68.


359 See Buchanan, *Consequences*, 208–209, citing William Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols; London: Williams & Norgate, 1871), 1:43–44; and Cyril of Jerusalem 1.1–2.5; 4.8 (fl. fourth century). See also Barrett-Lennard, *Sacramentary of Sarapion*, 14. It is interesting to note that once the three fundamental purificatory elements were established in the baptismal rite, they were retained through the Middle Ages and beyond. In his 1549 revision of the Sarum service, Cranmer discarded four ceremonies, and several prayers, but kept the three elements of bathing, anointing, and the “gift”
into the symbolic language,” as in Col 3:9; 2:11; Eph 4:22.\textsuperscript{360} Whilst acknowledging that to change one’s clothing had other connotations in religion, and in the NT,\textsuperscript{361} he considers that the use of the symbolism in the Christian baptismal rite alludes most fundamentally to the myth recounted in Gen 1:26–27.\textsuperscript{362} Thus he sees the reclothed neophyte as being renewed in accordance with the image of God, and finds that Paul’s reference to the male–female categorisation in Gal 3:28 implies that baptism has reversed the division which occurred in Gen 2:21–22.\textsuperscript{363} J. Z. Smith also relates baptismal rites to Adamic typology, but considers that the rituals involving garments were derived from Gen 3:21, as well as being influenced by passages such as Col 3:9; 2 Cor 5:1–4.\textsuperscript{364} Neither of these arguments, however, throws light on why the reclothing procedure was adopted in the first instance (prior to Paul), or on the addition of the third element, unction, as well as the basic purificatory rite with water. Another problem with the theories is that while they suggest a rationale for the “reunification” of male–female in their interpretation of Gal 3:28\textsuperscript{365} and Gos. Thom. 37,\textsuperscript{366} they do not address the equally significant Pauline categories of Jew–Greek, and slave–free. I would argue, therefore, that the most likely background to the use of two, or all three elements of the Homeric purificatory rite is the adaptation of pre-existing procedures for incorporating outsiders into table fellowship.

Significantly, if the connection between baptism, new garments, and table fellowship is accepted as accurate, Gal 3:26–28 would cohere well with the notion that Gentiles, slaves/servants, and women were participants in Jesus’ distribution of

\footnotesize{of a white robe. The godparents’ responsibilities included the return of the robe! See G. J. Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy (2d ed.; London: Macmillan, 1982), 9, 59–61.}

\textsuperscript{360} “Image of the Androgyne,” 183.

\textsuperscript{361} Ibid. 184.

\textsuperscript{362} Ibid. 185.

\textsuperscript{363} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{365} Meeks, “Image of the Androgyne,” 185.
the bread and wine at the Last Supper. That occasion might appear to provide a logical background for Paul’s understanding that all in the baptised community—Jews and Gentiles, slave and free, men and women—are united in the body of Christ through the sharing of the eucharistic rite. However, as already observed in §3.3.5.9.2, that viewpoint cannot be substantiated. Rather, the acceptance of Gentiles may be seen as a logical development of the open commensality demonstrated by Jesus both at the Last Supper and during his ministry. The ethics of hospitality and commensality are relevant as we consider the status of Jesus and his disciples in relation to the eschatological banquet.

5. **The exaltation of Jesus:**

5.1. **Introduction:**

In this final section, our investigations are again based on commensality, and Jesus is envisaged as chief guest at the eschatological banquet, reclining in the place of honour at God’s right hand. From this position, he acts as guarantor on behalf of his disciples: as they seek entry to the banquet, he affirms that they are his followers, attending “in his name.” Those who have a personal relationship with Jesus are then assured of a welcome by God, the beneficent host, providing they display the required attitudes of humility and servitude.

5.2. **The influence of OT themes:**

Before exploring the topic further, we need to examine the traditions of Jesus’ appointment as the Son of God, and his enthronement at God’s right hand. The themes derive respectively, from Psalms 2 and 110, both of which would probably have been used on the occasion of a king’s enthronement or accession, or at the

---

367 See Chapter Five, §§4.2.2; and Chapter Seven, §§5.1 and 5.3.2.
368 See esp. Chapter Seven, §5.3.2.
autumnal festival. Both were interpreted by Christians as applicable to the risen Jesus, and cited or alluded to in various books of the NT.

5.3. *Psalm 2:*

For christological purposes, v. 7 of the psalm is the most significant, although the reference to the “Anointed One” of the Lord in v. 2 also has obvious relevance for Christian testimony about Jesus. In v. 7, the king refers to the divine decree by which he acquired his status as God’s son, adducing the covenant made with David in 2 Sam 7:14a: “I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me” (NRSV). The oracle refers not to a biological relationship, but to God’s *appointment* of the king as his anointed one, i.e. *adoption* of him as a son. Thus the rendition “today I have become your father” (NIV), is preferable to “today I have begotten you” (NRSV). While the meaning of “today” derives from the time of the king’s accession, the emphasis is properly owed to the speaker, i.e. to Yahweh himself. Allusions to Ps 2:7 occur in the triple tradition, both for Jesus’ baptism (Mark 1:11 and parr.) and for the transfiguration (Mark 9:7 and parr.). In addition, the oracle portion of the verse is cited in Acts 13:33 to support the claim concerning Jesus’ resurrection, and in Heb 1:5; 5:5. The title “Son” is repeatedly utilised in the first four chapters of the epistle, and retains its original sense of *appointment*, in reference to God’s adoption of Jesus as his son.

---
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5.4. Psalm 110:

Ps 110:1 is the OT text most frequently applied to the risen Jesus, with citations of it, or allusions to it, occurring in eleven NT books. While the citation of v. 1 in Mark 12:35–37 demonstrates that in first century Judaism the psalm was attributed to David, it is in fact about David rather than composed by him. Dahood’s translation probably best captures the original sense of the text, and deals appropriately with textual difficulties. However, to investigate NT employment of the text, we need to refer rather to Mark 12:36, which is equivalent to the LXX version of the verse, with the exception that it has ὑπόκατω (under) in lieu of ὑποπόδιον (footstool). In contrast, the Heb 1:13 citation of Yahweh’s utterance is identical to that in the LXX. The person called “my lord” in the original context is the king of Israel, who is addressed thus by the court poet/prophet. This polite form of address (Hofstil) is the norm for a subject addressing a superior, and simply means “you.” Notwithstanding, in NT citations of the verse, or allusions to it, the term is interpreted as meaning Lord, identifying Jesus as the Messiah, and elevating him to divine status.

374 Ibid. 90 n. 75. Quotations occur in Mark 12:36 and parr.; Acts 2:34–35; Heb 1:13; 10:12–13; and there are further references in the Synoptics, Acts, and Hebrews, as well as in Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; 1 Pet 3:22; 1 Cor 15:25; Rev 11:16–18; 12:5.
376 See Psalms III, 100–150 (AB 17A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970), 112.
377 Hooker, According to St Mark, 293; Loader, “Right Hand,” 210 n. 1.
379 Although evidence is lacking, Ps 110 was apparently thought in the first century to refer to the Messiah (Hooker, According to St Mark, 293; Loader, “Right Hand,” 199). The title “Lord” was certainly used of the risen Jesus by believers, e.g. as indicated by the prayer Marana tha, i.e. “(Our) Lord, come!” See Hooker, According to St Mark, 293; 1 Cor 16:22; Did. 10:6; “μαρανάθα ἐβίβα,” BAGD 491.
380 Hooker, According to St Mark, 293. See ibid. 290–94 for discussion on Mark 12:35–37. The question posed by Mark’s Jesus is unlikely to be authentic. See ibid. 291; Loader, “Right Hand,” 214–15.
In the Hebrew text, the imperative שָׁעָה derives from the root שָׁעָה, meaning sit, but when Yahweh is involved, the sense of enthronement is usually implicit, and hence supplied in translations, as e.g. in Pss 2:4; 102:13(12); 1 Sam 4:4. However, NT citations correctly render the Greek κάθως as simply sit (e.g. in Mark 12:36; Heb 1:13).

The phrase “at my right hand” signifies the traditional place of honour to the right of Yahweh, the King of kings. In Israelite coronations, the king was envisaged as being enthroned next to Yahweh, who was understood as fully present, though invisible. The idea that vanquished enemies are placed under the feet was widespread in the ancient Near East, and is also found in Josh 10:24 and Ps 8:7(6). The substitution of ουκατω for οποδιου in Mark 12:36 may well reflect the influence of Ps 8:7(6) on Christian thought.

Now, in its original context, Ps 110:1 clearly envisaged the king as a mighty warrior, and in fact it is likely that the psalm was composed in celebration of a military victory. In light of Jesus’ exhortation to love one’s enemies, therefore, its application to him seems inappropriate. Nevertheless, the military overtones in the psalm were evidently not a deterrent for early Christians, who wished to emphasise the risen Jesus’ status as Messiah and King, and his exaltation to the place of honour at Yahweh’s right.

Admittedly, the interpretation of Ps 110:1 that I propose, viz. that Jesus is to be imagined sitting, or better reclining, in the place of honour at the eschatological

382 Dahood, Psalms III, 114.
383 Ibid.
384 Ibid.
385 See respectively Anderson, “The Psalms,” §382d, 437–38; Hooker, According to St Mark, 293; and also Loader, “Right Hand,” 210, 210 n. 1.
386 Hooker, According to St Mark, 293.
banquet, is not consistent with the original setting of the psalm. However, it does cohere with the fundamental belief about the eschatological banquet that was current in Jesus’ lifetime. Moreover, the concept I espouse is consistent with Jesus’ statement at the Last Supper, in which he anticipated drinking wine in the kingdom (Mark 14:25). In this regard, it is interesting to consider Jesus’ words during his trial. Mark 14:62 conflates the Danielic vision of the Son of Man “coming with the clouds of heaven,” with the idea based on Ps 110:1, of the Messiah seated in glory at God’s right hand. Matthew follows Mark fairly closely here (26:64). However, Luke may have perceived the incongruity of the description over against the imagery connoted by the Last Supper account, since he omits the reference to the coming of the Son of Man, and depicts him only as “seated at the right hand of the power of God” (22:69). On the other hand, there is some tension in Luke’s Last Supper account in that his placement of Q 22:30 has the disciples both eating and drinking at table with Jesus in the kingdom, and sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes. Perhaps this tension is resolved to some degree through the concept of “the justice of the banquet”: at the eschaton, all will be judged according to the fundamental mores applicable to banqueting, viz. the hospitality/inhospitality dichotomy. Nevertheless, it is impossible to reconcile the imagery derived from Ps 110:1 with the reconstruction of Jesus determined in the present study.

The partial citation of Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:13 has already been mentioned, but the portion of the psalm of real significance in the epistle is v. 4. The main object of

387 Dahood, Psalms III, 112.
388 While Jewish beliefs about the afterlife were not uniform in the first century, there was certainly an expectation that the righteous would be rewarded by participation in the heavenly banquet. See Chapter Three, §4.3, and Chapter Four, §6.
391 Dating probably from the tenth century B.C.E. according to Dahood, Psalms III, 112.
the multiple references to Ps 110:4 in Hebrews is to demonstrate Jesus’ status as “a priest forever, according to the order of Melchizedek” (Heb 5:6, 10), and the superiority of his priesthood over that of the Levites.\textsuperscript{392} Although the allusions to Melchizedek in Hebrews are based on the Gen 14:17–20 depiction of this legendary figure, it is the reference to him and his priesthood in Ps 110:4 which forms the crux of the argument.\textsuperscript{393} The use of Melchizedek as the basis for theological argument is not limited to Hebrews, but the epistle is the only document of its time to establish a connection between Jesus and Melchizedek by means of Ps 110:4.\textsuperscript{394} What is perhaps surprising is that the early church does not seem to have discerned a link between the gestures of the priest Melchizedek in Gen 14:18–20 towards Abram, and Jesus’ distribution of bread and wine at the Last Supper.

Having examined the way in which themes from two royal psalms were employed in the NT to establish the credentials of the risen Jesus, we turn now to look at another possible influence on the description of his exaltation.

5.5. \textit{The exaltation of the Ambiguous Guest:}

The synoptic depiction of Jesus’ post-resurrection exaltation is explicable in terms of the Persecution–Vindication genre, with its central theme of reversal,\textsuperscript{395} but is more fully explained by means of the Ambiguous Guest motif.\textsuperscript{396} Although Jesus is not entirely comparable with the Ambiguous Guest archetype, there are close parallels. Like the three examples outlined in Chapter Three, Jesus is portrayed in the Synoptics as a traveller outside his home territory,\textsuperscript{397} who evidently has a reputation

\textsuperscript{393} Ibid. 86.
\textsuperscript{394} Attridge, “Hebrews,” 101.
\textsuperscript{395} See §3.1 above.
\textsuperscript{396} See Chapter Three, §3.
\textsuperscript{397} Re Jesus’ status as an itinerant stranger, see Mark 6:1–5 and parr.; Matt 9:58 and par.
for arriving at meals ἐκλητος. Moreover, he is depicted as charismatic, and as superior in contests, besting his opponents in debate; yet he is self-effacing, and delays disclosure of his real identity. He exhibits a profound sense of predestination. Following his death and resurrection, he undergoes a reversal of status: from humble servant in this world to royal status and sonship in the kingdom; and from uninvited guest to chief guest in the position of honour. He is thus given precedence over the guests already reclining at table, who include the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. All of these characteristics correlate with the features of the Ambiguous Guest.

It is noteworthy that interpreting the status reversal in this way allows a smooth transition to be made from Jesus' ministry as a humble ἐκλητος, via his lowly conduct and his actions at the Last Supper, and thence to his exaltation. In contrast, while the Persecution–Vindication genre explains Jesus' exaltation, it does not satisfactorily account for the themes of banqueting, hospitality and commensality, which are so prominent in the Gospels, and which also have a significant place in the Passion Narrative.

However, an important factor to be considered is that several features of the Ambiguous Guest archetype relate to the synoptic Jesus, rather than the historical Jesus. For instance, one characteristic particularly redolent of Mark's Jesus is his reluctance to reveal his identity—the phenomenon usually termed "the messianic

398 See Chapter Five, §4.2.4; Chapter Seven, §4.4.
399 E.g. Mark 1:45; 2:2, 12; Luke 2:40, 47, 52.
401 See e.g. Mark 1:25, 44; 3:12; 5:43; 8:30; 9:9.
403 Cf. esp. the exaltation of Odysseus and Saul at table. See Chapter Three, nn. 90–91.
secret.\textsuperscript{405} Since this trait is widely acknowledged as redactional,\textsuperscript{406} questions to be considered are whether the literary motif of the Ambiguous Guest could have been influential in Mark's portrayal of Jesus, and if so, which characteristics are historical.

Ambigious Guest features that can probably be deemed fictional are the descriptions of Jesus' charisma, superiority in debate,\textsuperscript{407} and secrecy about his identity. However, characteristics that I would attribute to the historical Jesus are his ministry as an itinerant stranger, his reputation as an uninvited guest, his lowliness, and his sense of predestination.\textsuperscript{408} It is also factual that following Jesus' death, his disciples believed that he was risen, exalted to divine sonship at God's right hand.\textsuperscript{409} Thus, since the historical factors provide the main characteristics of the Ambiguous Guest archetype, I think it is likely that the fictional material has been created in accordance with that motif.

Of the three Ambiguous Guest examples cited in Chapter Three, it will be apparent from the many comparisons made between Gospel texts and Odyssey, that I consider Odysseus the most significant. In fact, Mark possibly drew directly on Homeric epic to some extent; e.g. the detail in Mark 6:3 that Jesus was a carpenter may well derive from Odyssey. None of the other Gospels follows Mark here: Matt 13:55 has the bystanders describing Jesus as the son of a carpenter (\textit{τέκτων}), while Luke 4:22 and John 6:40 both have him as Joseph's son, without reference to his

\textsuperscript{405} On this topic, see Meier, \textit{Mentor, Message, and Miracles}, 652–53, 663–64, 712, 930.
\textsuperscript{406} See ibid. 649, 663 n. 9, 712, 930.
\textsuperscript{407} Here I am not discounting the authenticity of Jesus' witty aphorisms and parables, but rather suggesting that they have been incorporated in the Synoptics in contexts designed to highlight his debating ability. In reality, however, it is very unlikely that Jesus would have become involved in agonistic debate with his host. For a stranger to challenge his host was traditionally regarded as foolish. See Od. 8.204–213.
\textsuperscript{408} See §§3.3.5.4 and 3.3.5.5 above.
\textsuperscript{409} E.g. Acts 2:32–33; Col 3:1; Eph 1:20–22.
father’s occupation. However, there is no reason to believe that Mark has borrowed from Homer as extensively as MacDonald suggests.

Although some aspects of Mark’s Jesus are probably Homeric, the historicity of the essential Ambiguous Guest features—itinerant, expatriate, and ἀκλαπὸς—is not in doubt, since they are affirmed by Q material in the other Synoptics. In particular, the datum that Jesus had a reputation as an uninvited guest is supported by the arguably authentic reference to Jesus as a “glutton and drunkard” (Luke 7:34 and par.). Moreover, this feature and the other two essentials gain support from the missionary discourses, especially from the Q and L material in Luke 10:1–16. It is significant, too, that Matthew and Luke have modified fictional characteristics drawn from Mark’s account, playing down, though only slightly, Jesus’ alleged secrecy about his identity. On the other hand, Luke has placed emphasis on the lowliness of Jesus’ birth (1:48; 2:7), and on the anticipated reversal of circumstances (1:51–53). Furthermore, Jesus’ sense of predestination is attested not only in the triple tradition, but independently in Q, in the expanded account of the temptation (Luke 4:3–13; Matt 4:3–11), which depicts him as completely obedient to God’s will.

---

410 It does not seem possible to determine the truth about Jesus’ life or work prior to his ministry, nor why only Mark regarded him as a τεκτων. Perhaps Mark has simply elected to portray Jesus in this way, drawing on Odysseus’ reputation as a superb craftsman. See in particular Od. 5.234–256; 23.178, 184–205, esp. 189; and also 17.264–268, 339–341; 21.41–50; 22.126–128, 155–156, 257–258. For these insights I am indebted to Dennis R. MacDonald, The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 18–19, 209–10 nn. 21–25. MacDonald suggests the other evangelists were embarrassed by the notion that Jesus was a carpenter, and notes that some early mss of Mark follow Matthew’s wording (ibid. 210). Crossan’s explanation for the differences in the Gospels on this point is imaginative but unconvincing. See the discussion in Birth of Christianity, 349–50, and Crossan’s conclusion (ibid. 350) that τεκτων is a euphemism for a dispossessed peasant.

411 E.g., I certainly do not agree that the anointing story is based on Homeric epic, as MacDonald asserts (Homeric Epics, 190).

412 See the discussion in Chapter Seven, §3.1.

413 Luke 8:56 follows Mark 5:43, but Matt 9:26 omits the instruction to tell no one about the healing of Jairus’ daughter. Matt 17:9 follows Mark 9:9, but Luke omits Jesus’ charge to tell no one about the transfiguration, and has only that the disciples kept silent (9:36).

414 See n. 402 above.
Hence, I am proposing that some features of the tradition about Jesus were strongly reminiscent of the Ambiguous Guest archetype, and that this led Mark to shape his Gospel according to the basic pattern in a familiar literary motif. For Mark, the sole source for the archetype may have been Homer (directly or indirectly), but the motif was also more broadly available, e.g. as reflected in the Tale of the Doomed Prince and 1 Samuel 9.

In contrast with the Persecution–Vindication genre, which pertains only to the Passion Narrative, the Ambiguous Guest motif may comprise the underlying framework for the active period of Jesus’ life, as well as for his posthumous exaltation. It lends itself to the banqueting theme, which is similarly applicable to the period of Jesus’ ministry, and to his ultimate destiny in the kingdom. The reversal theme, an integral component of the Ambiguous Guest motif, readily accounts for Jesus’ remarkable rescue from the curse associated with his crucifixion, and his exaltation to his rightful place as the chief guest at God’s table.

6. Summary:

Chapter Eight draws on earlier findings to investigate several issues relating to Jesus and meals. §2 reviews two major NT themes pertaining to hospitality. The first subsection explores the frequent “threshold” imagery in the NT, which suggests an analogy between Jesus’ quest for hospitality in this world, and the attempts of others to enter the kingdom. The second part of this section highlights the ongoing accent

\footnote{Several times, I have drawn attention to the resemblance between the ethics of hospitality and commensality in the Homeric epic, and the Gospels. (See Chapter Seven, §§3.3; 5.1, and esp. n. 122; and Chapter Three, §2.3.) These similarities can be explained on the grounds that the ethic of providing hospitality for wayfarers and strangers, and the notion of divine retribution for those who fail to do so, are common to Greek and Hebrew philosophies. Clearly, not all resemblance to Homeric epic results from literary dependence.}

\footnote{See Chapter Three, §3.}

\footnote{See Chapter Seven, §7.2.2.4, esp. n. 318.}
on hospitality in Luke-Acts and the NT epistles, showing the importance of the theme in the early church.

§3 examines Mark’s account of the Passion Narrative, focusing especially on the two meal traditions, i.e. the anointing story, and the Last Supper. It is concluded that the anointing account is based on an historical event involving a prostitute; however, the supposed association with Jesus’ death is considered redactional. The investigation of the Last Supper shows that it is not a paschal meal, although the focus on the Passover is real. The Last Supper is envisaged as a farewell gathering at which Jesus and the Twelve are invited guests. Although Jesus is the chief guest, it is posited that he chooses to recline at the lowest place in the triclinium. His actions with the bread and wine are completely unconventional, and he distributes them himself, taking the role of a servant. Jesus is seen also as a servant of God, obedient to his destiny, and the relevance and possible influence of Ps 16:5–11 are noted. Jesus’ distribution of bread portions signifies the roles of the recipients in the kingdom, but also exerts a unifying influence. The meaning of the cup saying is probably to be found in the theological significance of pouring it out, rather than in its contents.

The multiple links made between the Last Supper sayings and other texts and traditions led to a variety of emphases in the early church, and to different eucharistic practices. Jesus’ death is not regarded as central in all Christian traditions, and the Last Supper actions and sayings may be interpreted as foreshadowing blessings. The new covenant is associated strongly with the eschatological banquet, and anticipates a time when sin and death will have been overcome.

The Twelve at the Last Supper represent the twelve tribes, and the distribution of portions symbolises both the restoration of Israel, and the disciples’
destinies as leaders. However, it is argued that ἔκλητοι were present—women and “outsiders” as well as the household servants—and that Jesus distributed the bread and wine to all in attendance without discrimination. Hence, the events at the Last Supper could explain the radical inclusiveness that characterised the early church. It is possible that the ἔκλητοι at the Last Supper included one or more Gentiles, but this notion cannot be substantiated.

The importance of including the needy in table fellowship is discerned in Acts and in 1 Cor 11:21–22, which show that the needs of the poor are to be met through hospitality. This finding coheres with the second Beatitude, and gains support from the investigation of Mark’s feeding stories.

Examination of Matt 8:11–12 and par. in the light of Isa 25:6–8 led to the conclusion that during his ministry, Jesus did predict the inclusion of Gentiles in the kingdom and the eschatological banquet. The coherence of the Q passage with the saying in Mark 14:25 suggests that Jesus believed the ingathering of Gentiles was soon to commence.

Investigation of Luke 14:15–24 provided endorsement for the view that Jesus believed the end time was imminent, and that outsiders would be welcomed at the eschatological banquet, although the parable did not necessarily allude to the anticipated inclusion of Gentiles. The thrust of the original parable was considered to be that ultimately, all Jews would have received an invitation to the final banquet, though some would decline to attend. However, there is scriptural evidence for the inclusion of Gentiles at the eschatological banquet, an act which represents divine justice. The concept that God’s justice will prevail in the context of the final banquet is also applicable to the fate of Judas.
It is probable that conservative Jews in the early church saw a need for neophytes to undergo a purificatory ritual as preparation for admission to Eucharists and to the eschatological banquet. Evidence suggests that the rites that evolved may have been influenced by the customs associated with the reception of strangers in Homeric epic. The custom of giving a new garment to neophytes after baptism may have arisen as a result of resistance to the attendance of “outsiders” at communal meals.

Essential features of the historical Jesus are that he was an itinerant, expatriate, and ἔκλητος, and almost certainly, that he possessed strong convictions about his destiny. These characteristics correspond with the basic elements of the Ambiguous Guest archetype, and it is likely that the fictional material in the synoptic depiction of Jesus—his charisma, debating prowess, and secrecy about his identity—was created in accordance with this literary motif, and/or influenced by Homeric epic. The reversal theme is an integral component of the Ambiguous Guest motif, and it contributes towards an understanding of Jesus’ exaltation to his rightful place at God’s table.
Chapter Nine

CONCLUSION

The overarching perspective for the thesis is table fellowship, with the primary focus being upon Jesus’ commensality with toll collectors and sinners. Within that framework, the principle element is the hypothesis that Jesus had a reputation for attending meals ἄκλητος, specifically as an itinerant stranger. The ethical obligation to provide hospitality to wayfarers/strangers was acknowledged not only in the OT, but throughout the ancient world. Hence the attribution of the term ἄκλητος to Jesus in no way implies a resemblance to the stock figure παράστασις/κόλαξ known from comedy. The fact that hospitality is a frequent topos in the NT epistles and Acts indicates its significance in the early church.

Investigation of the relevant texts involving toll collectors and sinners led to the conclusion that the two groups are characterised differently, although the demarcation is imprecise. Toll collectors collectively represent disciples who are relatively affluent, and who demonstrate their generosity and compassion by offering hospitality to Jesus and his followers. By doing so, they prove their eligibility for the kingdom, providing they possess the essential quality of humility. They are contrasted with Pharisees, who are depicted in the Synoptics as proud, and resistant to Jesus’ message. It was surmised that the Pharisees’ concern about ritual purity was a factor in their exclusionist approach to table fellowship.

The “sinners” with whom Jesus was reputed to dine were evidently reformed, and included prostitutes and toll collectors. It was proposed that following a host’s reception of Jesus, his disciples gained entry to meals by attending as his umbrae. Thus, persons who were typically ἄκλητοι became κλητοί through their solidarity
with Jesus, and by analogy, were also welcome in the kingdom, with Jesus acting as their guarantor.

In addition, humility was shown to be an essential quality for entry to the kingdom and the eschatological banquet, through Jesus’ employment of πατίδει, i.e. young slaves/servants, as exemplars of lowliness and dependency. This teaching is closely linked with the ubiquitous biblical motif of reversal, which infers that at the eschaton, a change of fortunes will occur through divine intervention. Important categories in which reversal is predicted are first/last, and humbled/exalted.

Investigation of the missionary discourses allowed a distinction to be made between reception and rejection of disciples. Reception implies that disciples are invited to share a meal with the host and his household, while almsgiving is tantamount to rejection. Reception vs. rejection of Jesus and/or his disciples is the criterion on which the final judgment will be based: people who have food, i.e. potential hosts, will be harshly punished if they do not share it with the needy. Thus Jesus’ criticism of some Pharisees may have been related to the exclusiveness of their table fellowship, as well as their failure to heed his message. However, there are no grounds for linking them with his arrest and death.

The meal traditions in the Passion Narrative were explored with a focus on commensality, and with particular emphasis on the Last Supper. This viewpoint, and the supposition that Jesus was a guest, not the host, facilitated an innovative interpretation of his actions and words on that occasion. The proposed scenario is consistent with Jesus’ teaching, and with the accounts of table fellowship in the early church. The notion that ἔκλειψοι attended the meal, and that Jesus distributed bread and wine to everyone present, provides a plausible explanation for the prominence of
women in the early church, and for the eventual inclusion of non-Jews, although it
does not specifically account for the effort to reach out to Gentiles proactively.

Jesus’ distribution of the bread to the Twelve symbolised the reunification of
Israel, while giving it to the others who were present signified that the time for the
eschatological ingathering had come. In addition, the sharing of the loaf connoted
that all of the recipients were appointed as apostles. The action with the cup signified
the pouring out of God’s blessings upon the group, as a foretaste of eschatological
cυφροούνη. Under the new covenant thus established, communion with God was
attainable by giving thanks for the produce of the land, and sharing it equitably
among all present. Accordingly, until the end time, the hungry were to be fed by
means of hospitality and commensality.

The historical Jesus was surmised as a Jewish, itinerant teacher, who was
regarded as an eschatological prophet and sage, and as a healer. He called disciples,
announced the imminence of the kingdom of God, and used parables and aphorisms
in his teaching. He was inspired by a profound sense of predestination; by the OT
prophets, especially Jeremiah and Isaiah; and possibly by Psalm 16. It is not
necessary to cite Cynic or Stoic influences to account for Jesus’ character or actions,
but if either were a factor, the latter would be more likely. Jesus was humble, and
ministered as an itinerant, away from his hometown, and was regarded as typically
arriving ἐκλητός at meals. His disciples in the early church believed that he was risen
from the dead, and exalted to sonship, and to divine and royal status at God’s right
hand. The way in which Jesus is depicted in the Synoptics was possibly influenced
by a pre-existing literary archetype, viz. the Ambiguous Guest, but Mark may have
drawn directly from Odyssey for some fictional characteristics.
The findings indicate that salvation is attainable through humble dependence on Jesus for entrée to the kingdom in his name; or for potential hosts, through offering inclusive commensality, with humility as a prerequisite once again. The passion is “necessary” in that the interpretation of Jesus’ Last Supper actions depends on his foresight of imminent death: the shared loaf symbolically represents his body as that of a sacrificial victim, whose “life” becomes a unifying force upon the recipients. Moreover, understanding the Last Supper as a farewell meal at which apostles were appointed, is also connected closely with Jesus’ acceptance that his death was predestined. However, the approach taken does not view Jesus’ death as willed by God in order to save humankind from sin. Rather, God is envisaged as a generous host, who ultimately has invited all humanity to the heavenly banquet, but who will punish those who have breached the mores of hospitality. Some examples of the latter are those who have offended the host by declining his invitation; those who have failed to share their food with the hungry; and those who have opted for almsgiving as against open commensality.

The findings of the thesis do not constitute “good news” for comfortable Christians in affluent societies. While we can surely rely on our personal commitment to Jesus for redemption, the church in the Western world mostly falls far short of gospel requirements in the areas of hospitality, commensality, and humility. In light of the dichotomy between hospitality and hostility, it would seem that if we earnestly desire global harmony, we must heed Jesus’ injunction to love our enemies, i.e. to practise φιλοξενία.
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