

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

1-1-2009

## Why Two Swords Were Enough: Israelite Tradition History Behind Luke 22:35-38

Kevin Lee Moore  
*University of Denver*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Moore, Kevin Lee, "Why Two Swords Were Enough: Israelite Tradition History Behind Luke 22:35-38" (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 445.  
<https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/445>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

Why Two Swords Were Enough:  
Israelite Tradition History Behind Luke 22:35-38

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the University of Denver and  
the Iliff School of Theology Joint PhD Program  
University of Denver

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Kevin L. Moore

June 2009

Advisor: Professor Gregory A. Robbins

© Kevin L. Moore 2009

All Rights Reserved

Author: Kevin L. Moore  
Title: Why Two Swords Were Enough: Israelite Tradition History Behind Luke 22:35-38  
Advisor: Dr. Gregory A. Robbins  
Degree Date: June 2009

## ABSTRACT

Jesus' charge in Luke 22:35-38 that his apostles should buy swords is one of the most enigmatic texts in the gospels. Although previous studies made use of a wide range of standard critical methods, none of these approaches satisfactorily revealed the pericope's meaning. In a fresh re-examination of Luke's sword-logion this project interweaves biblical and cultural intertextuality and asserts that the sword-logion is a Lukan literary foil that repudiates a well-known hagiographic tale. The provenance for this legendary saga (i.e., the "two-sword" *traditum*) was Gen 34 whose routine refraction in later Jewish writings led to its inclusion as part of the broader cultural milieu of the first century C.E. Based on that premise I argue that Luke 22:35-38 was Luke's censure of a minor, but familiar HB tradition that informed and shaped the identity of Luke's community. While this project employs an eclectic mix of standard historical critical methods, tradition and literary criticism serve as the two principal methodological strategies.

Chapter two examines the provenance of the "two-sword" *traditum* and identifies four motifs: family identity and honor; vindication of an honored one; national identity and honor; and justified vengeance. Using the story's main protagonists and these four motifs, the tradition's reappearance and subsequent development in the HB is tracked. Chapter three traces the refraction of the "two-sword" *traditum* in extracanonical writings. Particular attention is given to the amplifications of the tradition as it is retold and rewritten in Jewish writings of the Second Temple Period. After establishing that Luke routinely made use of oblique allusions and that he and his community knew Israel's scriptures and traditions, chapter four analyzes Luke 22:35-38 in light of that celebrated tradition. In the exegesis I argue that Luke exploits the "two-sword" *traditum* in order to exhort his community to reject a renowned HB tradition from their shared narrative universe. A survey of the gospel further corroborates that Luke attempts to persuade his readers to renounce the "two-sword" *traditum* and pursue peace instead of violence. Chapter five reviews the project and assesses its significance for future research.

## Acknowledgments

I want to thank the members of my dissertation committee Dr. Richard Valantasis, Dr. Pamela M. Eisenbaum, and Dr. Gregory A. Robbins who offered many helpful suggestions and continued to support me throughout this project.

I also want to thank Wolfgang Stahlberg who graciously read and corrected my German translations.

Finally, my deepest appreciation is offered to Candace, my companion, dearest friend, and wife, for her constant encouragement during this lengthy endeavor. My love to you  
εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

## Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction, Literature Survey, and Thesis .....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Literature Survey .....	4
1.2.1 Preliminary Observations.....	4
1.2.2 A Brief Overview of Previous Research.....	5
1.2.3 Theological Criticism: Hans Conzelmann.....	6
1.2.4 Literary Criticism: Paul S. Minear .....	14
1.2.5 Source and Redaction Criticism: G. W. H. Lampe and Joan F. Gormley..	18
1.2.6 Form Criticism: R. Heiligenthal, H.-W. Bartsch, and A. Vööbus.....	28
1.2.7 Ideological Readings: Samuel G. F. Brandon and Robert M. Price .....	40
1.2.8 Traditio-Historical Criticism: H. A. J. Kruger.....	51
1.2.9 An Entertaining, Eclectic Assortment of Scholars.....	56
1.2.10 Summary of Literature Survey.....	59
1.2.11 Excursus: Didactic Readings .....	60
1.3 Thesis and Methodology .....	63
1.3.1 Thesis and Scope of the Study.....	63
1.3.2 Theory Base and Methodological Approach.....	70
1.4 Anticipating the Project: Chapter Outline.....	80
Chapter 2: The Provenance of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Hebrew Bible.....	84
2.1 Introduction.....	84
2.2 The Canonical Source for the Tradition .....	87
2.2.1 Preliminary Observations and a Brief Overview of the Story.....	87
2.2.2 The Canonical Provenance of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	90
2.2.3 Summary of the Canonical Provenance of “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	134
2.3 The Transmission of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Hebrew Bible.....	135
2.3.1 Preliminary Observations.....	135
2.3.2 Hebrew Bible References to the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	137
2.3.2.1 Survey of Generic References to Simeon and Levi in the Hebrew Bible .....	137
2.3.2.2 Explicit Reference to the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Hebrew Bible .....	139
2.3.2.3 Implicit References to the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Hebrew Bible .....	144
2.3.2.4 Summary of References to the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Hebrew Bible .....	160
2.4 Chapter Summary and Review.....	161
2.5 Excursus: Did Shechem Rape Dinah? .....	164
Chapter 3: The “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods.....	170
3.1 Introduction.....	170
3.2 The Apocrypha .....	173
3.2.1 Judith (Second to First Century B.C.E.).....	173
3.2.2 <i>4 Maccabees</i> (Mid-First to Early Second Century B.C.E.).....	178
3.2.3 Summary of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Apocrypha .....	181
3.3 The Pseudepigrapha .....	182
3.3.1 <i>Jubilees</i> (Second Century C.E.) .....	182
3.3.2 <i>Aramaic Levi</i> (Third to Second Century B.C.E.?) .....	187
3.3.3 <i>Testament of Levi</i> (Second Century B.C.E.).....	189

3.3.4	Theodotus (Second to First Century B.C.E.) .....	194
3.3.5	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i> (First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.) .....	197
3.3.6	Summary of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in the Pseudepigrapha.....	201
3.4	Other Jewish Writings.....	202
3.4.1	Philo of Alexandria (First Century C.E.) .....	202
3.4.2	Pseudo-Philo (Late First to Early Second Century C.E.) .....	208
3.4.3	Josephus (First Century C.E.) .....	210
3.4.4	Summary of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> in Other Jewish Writings .....	213
3.5	Chapter Summary and Preview.....	214
3.6	Chapter Appendix .....	217
3.6.1	Sirach (Late Third to Early Second Century B.C.E.).....	217
3.6.2	1 Esdras (Second Century B.C.E.?) .....	219
3.6.3	<i>Testament of Simeon</i> (Second Century B.C.E.) .....	221
3.6.4	Appendix Summary .....	224
Chapter 4:	Luke’s Use of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	225
4.1	Introduction.....	225
4.2	Luke’s Use of Israel’s Scriptures and Traditions.....	226
4.3	Reading Luke 22:35-38 in Light of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	247
4.3.1	The “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> as Luke’s Narrative Background .....	248
4.3.2	The Setting of Luke 22:35-38 in the Gospel of Luke .....	250
4.3.3	Exegesis of Luke 22:35-38 in View of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	254
4.3.4	Summary of Exegesis.....	279
4.4	The Trajectory of Luke in Light of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	281
4.4.1	Introduction.....	281
4.4.2	A Hypothetical Reading of Luke 22:35-38 in Light of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	282
4.4.3	A Possible <i>Sitz im Leben</i> for Luke’s Community.....	288
4.5	Chapter Summary and Final Reflection.....	290
4.5.1	Chapter Summary.....	290
4.5.2	Final Reflection.....	293
Chapter 5:	Summary and Significance of the Investigation.....	297
5.1	Introduction.....	297
5.2	Project Summary and Review .....	298
5.2.1	Prior Research.....	298
5.2.2	Thesis and Method.....	303
5.2.3	The Canonical Roots of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	305
5.2.4	The Extracanonial Transmission of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	308
5.2.5	Luke’s Use of the “Two-Sword” <i>Traditum</i> .....	310
5.3	Project Assessment, Significance, and Contribution .....	314
Bibliography	.....	319
Appendix A: Abbreviations	.....	345

# Chapter One:

## Introduction, Literature Survey, and Thesis

And he said to them, “When I sent you without purse and bag and sandals, you didn’t lack anything, did you?” And they said, “No, nothing.” And he said to them, “But now, the one who has a purse must take it, and likewise a bag and the one who does not have must sell his cloak and buy a sword. For I say to all of you that this scripture must be realized in me: ‘And he was counted among the lawless’; for indeed it is about my end.” And they said, “Lord, look, here are two swords.” And he said to them, “It is enough” (Luke 22:35-38, author’s translation).

### 1.1 Introduction

G. H. W. Lampe once remarked, “[C]ommentators have floundered in a morass of perplexity when faced with this notoriously difficult passage...[E]xegetes...have tried rather desperately to establish the meaning, and indeed to make any sense at all, of this strange pericope.”<sup>1</sup> An initial reading of Luke 22:35-38 immediately raises a plethora of questions. Is this passage—or at least a portion of it—an example of clumsy source redaction?<sup>2</sup> Was the exchange between Jesus and his apostles included for a specific purpose? Is there any justification for its inclusion at all? Does the gospel suffer any substantive loss of meaning if the passage is omitted? Did Luke choose not to excise this anecdote because of its source? Is Jesus issuing a radical call for the disciples to arm themselves? Is he deliberately attempting to obscure his objectives and thus nonplus both his opponents and followers? Is the pericope an example of Luke’s poor memory recall? Was the

---

<sup>1</sup> G. H. W. Lampe, “The Two Swords (Luke 22:35-38)” in *Jesus and Politics of His Day* (eds. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 335.

<sup>2</sup> One perplexing feature about Luke 22:35-38 is the difficulty of connecting the text within the broader theology of Luke-Acts. Since Luke is generally regarded as an adroit and highly competent writer, though not without a number of historical inconsistencies and inaccuracies (e.g., G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* [Pelican Gospel Commentaries; New York: Seabury, 1968], 15-17, 27-31), a conclusion with which I wholeheartedly concur, I find the pericope’s clumsiness to be particularly surprising. For example, when Jesus refers to his sending out of the twelve, the instructions about not taking a bag, purse, or sandals correspond more closely with those given when the seventy(-two) were sent out, not when the twelve were sent out. Did Luke forget or just fail to review his notes? In addition, the quote from Isaiah is so brief and the apostles’ reply so cryptic that their meaning is uncertain.



oral tradition behind Jesus' sword-logion garbled or corrupted, whether intentionally or unintentionally? Were Jesus' instructions a riddle whose solution remains hidden even to this day?<sup>3</sup>

Arguably, Jesus' statement in Luke 22:35-38 that his apostles should procure swords is perhaps the most mysterious text in the gospels. It has baffled scholars for generations.<sup>4</sup> The exegetical dilemma originates from a number of different factors. First, it conflicts with the generally accepted characterization of Jesus as a staunch pacifist. Second, the passage appears to contradict other passages in Luke's gospel.<sup>5</sup> For example, shortly after this sword-logion Jesus reprimands the disciple who brandishes a sword to cut off the ear of the high priest's slave (Luke 22:51). In addition, Jesus had previously instructed his disciples to "carry no purse, no bag, no sandals" (Luke 10:4) or any other gear on their missionary journey. The "two-sword" passage therefore seems out of place and out of step with Luke's typical portrayal of Jesus, a discrepancy that scholars have long observed.<sup>6</sup> In general, the work of many scholars is not entirely forthcoming in two ways: (1) there is a noticeable reluctance to disclose the inherent—and

---

<sup>3</sup> C. F. Evans makes a similar point when he says, "This is perhaps the most puzzling passage in the Gospel, indeed in all the gospels, both in itself, and in its position as the conclusion of the Last Supper discourse...This second dialogue (vv.37-38), while apparently tying the whole passage to the coming arrest of Jesus, is indeed so cryptic—as is the whole unit—that it must have been as baffling to early readers of the Gospel as it has been to commentators ever since." See C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPINTC; London: SCM Press, 1990), 803-804.

<sup>4</sup> The following excerpts corroborate this observation: (1) „Die Aufforderung, ein Schwert zu kaufen, ist schwierig zu verstehen.“ (“The demand, ‘to buy a sword,’ is difficult to understand.”) Kiyoshi Mineshige, *Besitzverzicht und Almosen bei Lukas: Wesen und Forderung des lukanischen Vermögenethos* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 110; (2) „Der Zusammenhang bleibt dunkel.“ (“The connection remains vague.”) Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1977), 602; and (3) « S'il est un texte énigmatique dans l'Évangile de Luc, c'est bien celui-ci. » (“If there is an enigmatic text in the Gospel of Luke, this is certainly it.”) Roland Meynet, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc : Analyse rhétorique Commentaire* (Paris : Cerf, 1988), 2:217.

<sup>5</sup> Though I refer to the third canonical gospel as the “Gospel of Luke” or “Luke's gospel,” I make no assumption about the book's actual authorship. These phrases are used for convenience. Authorship is not an issue addressed in this project.

<sup>6</sup> For a similar line of thought, see Alexander Pallis, *Notes on St. Luke and the Acts* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), 43-44, who remarked, “I have repeatedly lingered over the purport of this sentence in combination with ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι δύο and ἱκανόν ἐστι [sic] of v. 38, but it is baffling. Not only is it incredible by itself that the Lord should have recommended his disciples to arm themselves, but such a recommendation flatly contradicts v. 51, where he deprecates violence and forthwith proceeds to cure the wound which one of his disciples had inflicted. *Such explanations as that he forewarns the Apostles of the dangers which would beset them henceforward in their mission are forced and ignore the immediate use of a weapon in v. 49*” (italics added).

sometimes bizarre—contortions embedded in the exegetical proposals; and (2) the investigations frequently give short shrift to the pericope rather than wrestle with this thorny passage.<sup>7</sup>

Besides the observations briefly mentioned above any attempt to interpret this unique passage requires one address other issues as well. These topics include, but are not limited to, the following: the location of the pericope within the Luke's gospel at the conclusion of the Last Supper; the testamentary role of the pericope within its near-context (i.e., Luke 22:14-38<sup>8</sup>) and the overall theology of the Gospel of Luke; the conspicuous absence of this passage from all other gospels, both canonical and extracanonical; possible sources and the authenticity of the sword-logion; the meaning of ἀλλὰ νῦν (“but now”), δεῖ (“it is necessary”) and ἱκανόν ἐστίν (“it is enough”); the purpose of the quote from Isa 53:12; the identity of οἱ ἄνομοι (“the lawless ones”); and the presence of significant textual variants, if any.

To say the least, this passage is enigmatic. It also entails an assortment of interpretative problems and a careful, reflective reading of the pericope generates provocative questions. Besides my own personal curiosity and interests, the preceding discussion certainly justifies a re-examination of this pericope. To that end, I will argue that Luke 22:35-38 is a Lukan literary foil that censures a minor, but familiar HB tradition that informed and shaped the identity of Luke's

---

<sup>7</sup> Although most authors readily admit to the veiled nature of this pericope, I found few who will openly acknowledge that most exegetical approaches to this text explain away rather than explain it. One exception, though, is Herschel H. Hobbs who opined, “Some interpreters endeavor to tone down these words by saying that Jesus was simply warning His disciples about persecution which they would endure in the future.” Herschel H. Hobbs, *An Exposition of The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1966), 308. A recent example of an author who treats this passage with short shrift is François Bovon. There is no discussion of the text other than to subsume it under a broad category that he calls “the equipping of the faithful (22:24-38).” François Bovon, *The Last Days of Jesus* (trans. K. Hennessy; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 9. Another example comes from Manfred Diefenbach who offers the following brief assessment of Luke 22:35-38. He states, „Das Summar (VV.35-38), das einen Rückverweis (Lk 9,1-6; 10,1-17) darstellt, faßt das Leben Jesu in aller Kürze zusammen.“ (“The précis [vv. 35-38], which represents a look back [Lk 9:1-6; 10:1-17], summarizes Jesus' life very briefly.”) Manfred Diefenbach, *Die Komposition des Lukasevangeliums unter Berücksichtigung antiker Rhetorikenelemente* (Frankfurter Theologische Studien, 43; Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1993), 124. The worst offender I found regarding his treatment of this passage, however, was Archie Matson who did not even reference the passage. Archie Matson, *A Month with the Master: For Twentieth-Century Christians—A Manual for Spiritual Growth Based on the Gospel of Luke and Suggested by the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958).

<sup>8</sup> After surveying both non-biblical and biblical testaments, Peter K. Nelson finds that “there is enough agreement [i.e., ‘correspondence of Luke 22:14-38 to the genre’] to warrant the conclusion that the text has been deliberately cast in this generic form [of a testament].” Peter K. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24-30* (SBLDS 138; Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 119. For Nelson's complete discussion regarding the correspondence between Luke 22:14-38 and the testamentary genre, see 97-119.

community. However, before I describe my thesis and methodological approach more thoroughly, a review and analysis of previous, significant research is both necessary and appropriate.

## 1.2 Literature Survey

### 1.2.1 Preliminary Observations

During the research process two criteria emerged and were used to determine if earlier research was significant and therefore warranted consideration in the literature survey. The first criterion was: did the author critically explore the passage in a decisive and innovative way? Or, did the scholar give careful and wide-ranging thought to the pericope's relationship to the theology of Luke, persistent ambiguity, history of interpretation, use of Isaiah 53, or its relationship to other passages? Scholarly contributions that focused on Luke 22:35-38 (e.g., Paul S. Minear, G. H. W. Lampe) or where the passage played a significant role in the exegete's argument (e.g., Hans Conzelmann, Samuel G. F. Brandon) met this criterion.<sup>9</sup>

Before moving on to the second criterion, one genre—namely, the commentary—requires a brief comment. After a methodical investigation of a wide cross-section of commentaries on the Gospel of Luke, most of them were excluded from an extensive review and analysis in the literature survey. I utilized this tactic because most commentators tended to offer only a few passing remarks about the text and presented little that was of noteworthy probative value.<sup>10</sup> In other words, most commentaries were neither particularly insightful nor provocative and more often than not merely repeated some version of the standard boilerplate jargon, that is, in Luke 22:35-38 Jesus instructs his apostles to equip themselves for a new situation because his

---

<sup>9</sup> Full bibliographic entries will be cited when these authors are analyzed later in the literature survey.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., John J. Kilgallen, S.J. who devotes all of one paragraph to Luke 22:35-38. See his *A Brief Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (New York: Paulist, 1988), 210-211; and Joseph A. Grassi, *God Makes Me Laugh: A New Approach to Luke* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1986), 135-136. Grassi also offers only one paragraph to Luke 22:35-38. According to him, "the key word is 'sent.' Representing Jesus, they needed nothing else. However, things will change. They will choose to be on their own and hence turn to money, possessions and even the sword for security." Grassi's explanation is wacky, since Jesus is the one who instructs the disciples to buy a sword. In other words, the disciples do not appear to be choosing anymore in Luke 22:35-38 than in Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-20. In each instance, they are being "sent out" on Jesus' instructions.

departure was imminent.<sup>11</sup> Obviously, my assessment on this matter is, as François Bovon observes regarding his decision to exclude some studies from his survey on Luke's Christology, "necessarily partial."<sup>12</sup>

The second criterion was: did other authors frequently reference or cite a particular scholar's work? The process of building a bibliography and becoming familiar with previous researches naturally led back to a relatively short list of scholars whose work on this pericope was deemed significant by their peers. To some extent this criterion is subjective like the first one. However, it seems less so given the natural vetting process to which these works have been subjected via purposeful, critical review, a process that led to the survival of the fittest. While many of the works were considered worthy candidates for inclusion in the literature survey because they were frequently cited, this was not true in every instance (e.g., Joan Frances Gormley, Roman Heiligenthal, Arthur Vööbus).<sup>13</sup>

## 1.2.2 A Brief Overview of Previous Research

The elusive meaning of the "two-sword" passage is clearly seen in various scholarly approaches to the Gospel of Luke. Prior research has commonly employed traditional historical-critical methods in order to propose theories about the meaning of Luke 22:35-38. For example, these methods have included: theological criticism (Hans Conzelmann); literary criticism (Paul S. Minear); source and redaction criticism (G. W. H. Lampe and Joan Frances Gormley); form criticism (Roman Heiligenthal, Hans-Werner Bartsch, and Arthur Vööbus); ideological readings

---

<sup>11</sup> One exception, though, is Evans, *Saint Luke*, 803-808. In six pages, Evans presents concise, detailed exegetical notes with references to many of the most influential exegetes who deal with this pericope.

<sup>12</sup> Bovon's full comment is: "So that our account be neither too long nor too monotonous, a selection had to be made. The lack of originality or excess of fantasy of certain contributions facilitated this choice, which is necessarily partial." François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research* (2d rev. ed.; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 134.

<sup>13</sup> Full bibliographic entries for authors mentioned in this paragraph will be provided at the appropriate place in the literature survey.

(Samuel G. F. Brandon and Robert M. Price) and traditio-historical criticism (H. A. J. Kruger).<sup>14</sup> More specifically, Conzelmann's theological approach set the passage within Luke's overall kerygmatic presentation of the grand periods of salvation history. Minear's literary analysis focused on the more immediate context (i.e., Jesus' supper dialogue and his arrest in the garden) in order to explain the Isa 53 citation and identify "the lawless ones." Both Lampe and Gormley used source and redaction criticism as a way to investigate Luke's editorial acumen, especially as it relates to his incorporation and adaptation of Isa 53:12 along with verses from Mark 14. In order to establish a plausible historical backdrop that might clarify Luke 22:35-38, Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus employed form criticism. Despite utilizing the same critical method, the fact that each scholar reached a different conclusion as to the specific historical setting further illustrates the complex nature of this pericope. Brandon and Price examined the sword-logion on the basis of an ideological assumption that encourages or permits, at the very least, the use of force by Christians. Finally, Kruger investigated the pericope in light of two OT traditions (i.e., the Divine Warrior and the Suffering Servant) and projects Jesus as a tortured persona who was caught—at least momentarily—between these two competing identities.

Looking ahead, the literature survey will therefore examine the critical approaches of the exegetes noted above, assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of their investigations, and identify crucial questions and/or issues that each scholar raises. Upon completion of the literature survey, I will also conduct a brief excursus that appraises a few of the better didactic readings.

### **1.2.3 Theological Criticism: Hans Conzelmann**

Hans Conzelmann, arguably the most influential scholar on Lukan research in the last century,<sup>15</sup> puts forward the proposition that Luke divided history into three epochs: "the period of

---

<sup>14</sup> Only the authors' names are included here. Full bibliographic entries will appear when each scholar's work is addressed later in the literature survey.

<sup>15</sup> Regarding the impact of Conzelmann's analysis of Luke, consider Paul S. Minear's comment: "Among the many contributions of Professor Hans Conzelmann's study of Lukan theology is the fact that he has impelled exegetes to examine many texts afresh to see what light they throw upon Luke's perspective." Minear, "A Note on Luke xxii 36," *NovT* 7 (1964): 128. Conzelmann's influence is unmistakable as Bovon rehearses the

Israel;” “the period of Jesus;” and “the period of the Church.”<sup>16</sup> Conzelmann’s view is that “the period of Israel” reached its terminal point with the conclusion of John the Baptist’s ministry (Luke 16:16).<sup>17</sup> “The period of Jesus” was marked by the absence or inactivity of Satan (Luke 4:13; 22:3).<sup>18</sup> This epoch, which spanned most of Jesus’ earthly ministry, was relatively calm—namely, “it was a time without temptation.”<sup>19</sup> In Conzelmann’s words, “Satan was far away.”<sup>20</sup> “The period of the Church” began with Jesus’ Passion. It was initiated by Satan’s return and radically altered the circumstances that the apostles were about to encounter (Luke 22:35-36).<sup>21</sup> From Conzelmann’s perspective, “the disciples of Jesus are again subject to temptation.”<sup>22</sup>

Though Conzelmann’s interpretative scheme is rightly identified as theological criticism, it is derived from a combination of source, redaction, and form criticism. According to Conzelmann, the kerygma went through a two-phase development. Form criticism “clarified” the first phase during which “the traditional material (up to the composition of Mark’s Gospel and the Q sayings)” was collected.<sup>23</sup> In the second phase, “the kerygma is not simply transmitted and received, but itself becomes the subject of reflection. This is what happens with Luke.”<sup>24</sup> Conzelmann explains Luke’s role in the second phase of the kerygma’s development as follows:

---

multitude of scholarly reactions and revisions offered in response to Conzelmann’s work. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 1-85, 139-141, 282-285, 310-313, 355-356. For further evidence of Conzelmann’s influence, see footnote 36.

<sup>16</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 16-17, 36, 50, 80-83, 103 n. 1, 150, 232-233. Translation of *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 16, 20-27, 101.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 16, 28, 106-107 n. 1, 124 n. 1, 170, 194-195.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 156-157, 186-187 n. 1, 199-200.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

But it is not until Luke that this demarcation, this distinction between then and now, the period of Jesus and the period of the Church, between problems of yesterday and those of today, becomes fully conscious. The period of Jesus and the period of the Church are presented as different epochs in the broad course of saving history, differentiated to some extent by their particular characteristics. Thus Luke can distinguish between those commands of the Lord which were meant only for the contemporary situation, such as the directions concerning equipment given when the apostles are sent out [i.e., Luke 9:1ff.; 10:1ff.], which in Luke xxii, 35-7 are explicitly annulled for the period to follow, and those which are permanent, such as in the Sermon on the Plain. Therefore he cannot simply project present questions back into the time of Jesus. His aim is rather to bring out the peculiar character of each period.<sup>25</sup>

Luke's reassessment of Jesus' earthly ministry and the kerygma that the early disciples subsequently collected was mandated by "the delay of the Parousia." Based on this postulate, Conzelmann therefore asserts the following about Luke's eschatological reconfiguration and adaptation of received kerygmatic materials:

In Luke however—and this is the measure of his great achievement—we find a new departure, a deliberate reflection: he confronts the problem of the interval by interpreting his own period afresh in relation to this fact; in other words, the treatment of his main problem is the result of coming to grips with his own situation. Therefore, reflection on the fundamental 'arché' is necessary.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 13. François Bovon agrees with Conzelmann's position regarding Luke 9:1-6, 10:1-20, 22:35-38—namely, that changing situations require different provisions for the disciples. Yet, for Bovon these texts also function in Lukan theology as an example of "human mediation," which Bovon maintains is part of "the mediatorial ambition of Luke,...[which he]...assigns...to people and to their dependent social or cultural relatives." Relying on a sociological definition of mediation—i.e., "communication, verbal or nonverbal, of a vision of the world or of an ideology"—Bovon contends in an engaging essay that "Luke considers [human mediations] propitious for the diffusion of the Christian message." Based on this premise, Bovon therefore claims that Luke 22:35-38 "signifies without a doubt that certain material means are necessary for the survival of the faith and indirectly, for the success of the mission. The words which conclude the passage and by which Jesus replies to the presentation of the two swords: 'It is enough' (Luke 22:38), though difficult to interpret, are perhaps meant to signal that human means should certainly not be overestimated. Yet, fragile as they are, they are nevertheless indispensable." François Bovon, *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives* (trans. Jane Haapiseva-Hunter; Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick, 1995), 51-66, esp. 52-54, 64-65.

<sup>26</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 13-14. For further comments on how the delay of the Parousia shaped Luke's theological reflections, see Conzelmann, "Part Two: Luke's Eschatology" and "Part Three: God and Redemptive History," 95-169, esp. 95-97, 109 (N.B., the remarks about "Luke xii, 52"), 113, 131-132, 135-136, 150. Cf. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 11-16. Agreeing with Conzelmann is Walter Schmithals who says, „Das «Schwert» kann man deshalb nur als Symbol für die Kampfzeit in den Gemeinden des Lukas deuten.“ ("Therefore, you can only interpret the sword as a symbol for the struggles of Luke's communities.") Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (ZBK; Zurich: Theologischer, 1980), 213.

Luke's "reflection on the fundamental 'arché'" concerning the End, thus bifurcates the kerygma into "the original meaning and Luke's meaning," in other words, into the period of Jesus and the period of the Church.<sup>27</sup>

Conzelmann's theological reading of the Gospel of Luke is chiefly based on his interpretation of four passages: Luke 4:13; 16:16; 22:3; and 22:36. These four passages are foundational for Conzelmann because they mark off the three epochs of "redemptive history." Two passages, Luke 4:13 and 22:3, function as "a framing unit" (my designation), since they form the bookends for Jesus' earthly ministry. Luke 4:13 states, "When the devil (διάβολος) had finished every test, he departed from him [i.e., Jesus] until an opportune time (ἄχρι καιροῦ)."<sup>28</sup> Luke 22:3 states, "Then Satan (σατανᾶς) entered into Judas called Iscariot, who was one of the twelve." Assuming a direct correspondence between διάβολος and σατανᾶς, Conzelmann draws on these two passages and his notion that the devil or Satan is inactive during the intervening chapters to conclude that Jesus' earthly ministry was "a time without temptation."<sup>29</sup>

Conzelmann uses Luke 16:16 to identify the terminus for "the period of Israel." This pivotal verse declares: "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 tries to enter it by force." For Conzelmann, Luke 16:16 consequently provides the means by which it is possible to understand how John's role is transformed in the Gospel of Luke, especially when compared with Matthew and Mark. Conzelmann asserts, "John no longer marks the arrival of the new aeon, but the division between two epochs in the one continuous story, such as is described in Luke xvi, 16."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 111. Conzelmann's observations about Luke 14:13ff. illustrate well the developmental process of the bifurcation of the Church's nascent theological understanding: "The emergence of the assertion concerning the resurrection in the general form of 'there is a resurrection', that is, a judgement [*sic*], is a characteristic of Luke's recasting of eschatology. In this general assertion the time of the judgement [*sic*] is no longer of vital importance. It is not its nearness, but the fact that it is inevitable, that constitutes the summons." Idem, 111. See also Conzelmann's reading of Luke 13:23ff., 109.

<sup>28</sup> Unless otherwise noted, biblical quotations are taken from the NRSV.

<sup>29</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 16.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 22-23. For additional comparisons between Luke and the other Synoptic gospels regarding their respective treatment of the kingdom of God and John's role, see idem, 24-27, 101-120.



To press this point further, Conzelmann also declares that this verse “provides the key to the topography of redemptive history.”<sup>31</sup>

Against the backdrop of the passages referenced above, Conzelmann applies his epochal template in order to explain Luke’s theology. Conzelmann describes the implications of the historical demarcations as follows: “Here at the Last Supper, when the time of security is past, Jesus discloses the redemptive significance of the directions which were then given.”<sup>32</sup> Consequently, according to Conzelmann, Luke 22:36 marks the point in time when everything changed. During Jesus’ life the disciples lived under his full protection, free from temptations and Satan’s schemes. But now Satan has returned. The “opportune time” is at hand, since Satan has “entered Judas.” Jesus’ previous instructions to them (i.e., Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-20) are therefore no longer valid, which Jesus made clear with his words, “But now (ἀλλὰ νῦν).”<sup>33</sup>

In sum, Conzelmann postulates that Luke 22:35-38 inaugurated the third phase of Luke’s chronological ordering of the story of salvation. Specifically, ἀλλὰ νῦν (“but now,” v. 36) signaled the start of the third epoch (i.e., “the period of the Church”—a time of trial, temptation, and conflict), and that the two swords function as a metaphoric marker of the beginning of this age.<sup>34</sup> On this basis Conzelmann makes the case that vv. 35-36 appear to contrast the former experience of the disciples with startling new circumstances. Indeed, Conzelmann’s theological proposal is so deeply vested in his global framework of three periods, he unequivocally declares that “the best example [of Luke’s ethical teaching] is the connection between the mission charge

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 22-23. Cf. 16, 20ff., 25f., 101, 112, 160.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 82. For more on Conzelmann’s views concerning this matter and how form criticism informs his three stage view of redemption history, idem, 50, 80-83, 170, 232-33.

<sup>33</sup> Thomas J. Lane maintains that Luke 10:1-20 is part of Luke’s programmatic effort validate the gentile mission that he presents in Acts. In the introduction, Lane states, “Luke has re-written the history of salvation (e.g. the mission of the Seventy[-two]) with a certain openness not so obvious in the other Gospels, shaping his Gospel in such a way so as to make his task of describing the mission to the Gentiles in Acts easier.” Thomas J. Lane, *Luke and the Gentile Mission: Gospel Anticipates Acts* (European University Studies, Series 23, Theology, Vol. 571; Frankfurt am Main—Berlin—Bern—New York—Paris—Wien: Peter Lang, 1996), 19. For Lane’s complete discussion of Luke 10:1-20, op. cit., 85-130.

<sup>34</sup> Evans, *Saint Luke*, 805-06, has some reservations about Conzelmann’s symbolic interpretation of the sword-logion.

and Luke xxii, 35f.: ἀλλὰ νῦν—other rules are in force.”<sup>35</sup> Finally, Conzelmann suggests a figurative or spiritual interpretation of the two swords in v. 38 designating it as “the Christian’s daily battle against temptation, particularly in times of persecution.”<sup>36</sup> In short, Conzelmann significantly shaped the subsequent interpretative landscape concerning Luke 22:35-38 by stressing ἀλλὰ νῦν and viewing the sword as a spiritual metaphor.<sup>37</sup>

Though Conzelmann’s reading of Luke is persuasive at times, his work does not lack detractors. A number of writers have rightly criticized Conzelmann’s theological scheme for being too neat and tidy, particularly in its failure to address contradictory passages within Luke’s gospel. For example, can such a momentous change of circumstances be derived from Luke 22:35-36, especially in light of other stories during Jesus’ earthly ministry that highlight the conflicted nature of following Jesus (cf. 10:8-16; 11:14-26; 12:49-53)?<sup>38</sup> In addition, when Luke narrates this exchange, is the referent Luke 9:1-6 or 10:1-12 or both?

---

<sup>35</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 232-33. As Minear astutely notes regarding Conzelmann’s emphasis upon Luke 22:36, “Probably no other recent scholar has dared to place so much weight upon this logion.” Minear, “Note,” 128.

<sup>36</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 81. The issues discussed above demonstrate Conzelmann’s influence on later Lukan research. Indeed, even when scholars disagree with Conzelmann, they generally tend to incorporate his ideas. E.g., although I. Howard Marshall questions Conzelmann’s hypothetical epochs based on ἀλλὰ νῦν, he nonetheless agrees with Conzelmann’s general sense of v. 36 when he says, “But now conditions are different.” Like Conzelmann, Marshall also adopts a spiritual approach to the sword-logion when he says, “...the saying is a call to be ready for hardship and self-sacrifice.” I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 823, 825. Other authors who question Conzelmann, but ultimately find themselves in agreement with Conzelmann’s stress on ἀλλὰ νῦν and his spiritualizing of the sword-logion include: Scott Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 142; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 150-153; John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53* (WBC 35c; Dallas: Word, 1993), 1074-1078; William Hendricksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978), 975-977; Schmithals, 212-213, and Mineshige, 116-117. Conzelmann’s influence is so pervasive that it is virtually impossible to find anyone who does not reflect his views to some degree.

<sup>37</sup> I agree with Nelson who warns about exaggerating the impending adversity, persecution, and conflict the church will face based on ἀλλὰ νῦν. He astutely cautions, “Note the role of ἀλλὰ νῦν (v 36) in drawing a sharp contrast between the disciples’ earlier mission (10:4) with its positive results (10:17-19), and the new, different period which is to follow in Jesus’ absence. The contrast, however, must not be overstated; Peter will be able to turn and strengthen his brothers (22:32), and the Acts account reveals many mission successes amidst ongoing adversity.” Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 228n.

<sup>38</sup> Robert Maddox observes, “In fact, Luke 22:35-38 is an obscure and difficult passage, and in our present state of knowledge cannot by any means carry the heavy weight put on it by Conzelmann.” Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 154-155, n. 136.

One author, for example, who meticulously scrutinizes Conzelmann's theory is Schuyler Brown, S. J.<sup>39</sup> After presenting a brief summary of Conzelmann's proposal, Brown immediately challenges one of Conzelmann's foundational claims, namely, "the 'Satan-free' Age of Jesus."

Brown astutely observes:

The untenability of Conzelmann's position that the period between Lk 4,13 and 22,3 is free from all Satanic activity is shown by the fact that the majority of the Lucan sayings concerning Satan are found within this very section of the gospel...The devil's "departure" in 4,13 cannot be understood then as a suspension of all diabolical activity. The temptation scene is the beginning of a violent struggle between Jesus and Satan; it does not lead to a temporary suspension of hostilities, as Conzelmann supposes.<sup>40</sup>

Following this Brown proceeds to question Conzelmann's exegetical skill and concludes that "the passion [is] not a renewed πειρασμός [testing, temptation] for Jesus... [or]...for the apostles...[and furthermore that]... "the Age of the Church [is] not a time of πειρασμός."<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Schuyler Brown, S. J., *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (AnBib 36; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1969), 5-19.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 6-7. In support of his claims, Brown notes, for example, that Luke 10:17 "appears to contradict his [i.e., Conzelmann's] later statement that prior to the episode of the two swords there have been no references in the gospel to battles waged by disciples (74-75)." Idem, 6. Joseph B. Tyson would in all probability concur with Brown on this point against Conzelmann. With exacting precision, Tyson convincingly establishes his claim that "[t]he gospel of Luke is filled with scenes of conflict between Jesus and various groups." According to Tyson, this conflict is: anticipated in the infancy narratives; predicted by Jesus about himself and his disciples (Luke 9:22, 23-27, 44; 12:4-12, 49-53; 17:25; 18:31-34); "spoken of as periasmos" (Luke 4:13; 8:13; 11:4; 22:28, 40, 46); pervades the apocalyptic discourse (Luke 21:5-36); and found in "the narrative of the last supper" (Luke 22:7-38). Tyson further asserts that: "Luke uses images and similes to suggest it (i.e., conflict);" "[m]any of the pericopes in Luke's gospel take the form of the controversy dialogue;" "Luke also sets conflict in a cosmic dimension;" and "conflict with the devil sets the stage for additional conflicts on the nonhuman level." Joseph B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986), 48-61.

<sup>41</sup> Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance*, 9-11. Brown contends, "The fact that Acts offers not one single instance of πειρασμός/πειράζω with the meaning of 'temptation' or 'tempt' is the most serious objection to Conzelmann's theory that the Age of the Church is 'a new period of temptation' (186), beginning with the passion and continuing right down to Luke's own day...[t]he Age of the Church is characterized neither by the activity of Satan (who was active in the Age of Jesus—and not just during the passion) nor by πειρασμός (which is used neither of the passion nor of the Age of the Church as described in Acts)." Idem, 11-12. Vincent Taylor also has a broader view of πειρασμός than Conzelmann. He writes, "The πειρασμοί, through which the disciples have 'continued with' Jesus, may be the trials preceding the Messianic Age, but are better explained as *the conflicts and struggles of His ministry*, especially those connected with the prospect of His Messianic suffering and death." Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1937), 188 (italics added). Regarding πειρασμοί, Arthur Vööbus states (with Conzelmann but against Taylor), "The thought that the ministry of Jesus was a succession of trials is nowhere found in the gospel tradition...The term does not mean this but something else (i.e., 'hardships and difficulties in Christian work'). Furthermore, Luke himself does not give an account of Jesus' ministry and life in this way." Vööbus, *The Prelude to the Lukan Passion Narrative: Tradition-, Redaction-, Cult-, Motif-Historical and Source-Critical Studies* (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1968), 34.

After his critique of Conzelmann's theoretical "age" framework and exegetical competence regarding specific passages concerning Satan's activity or lack thereof, Brown then raises doubts about the viability of Conzelmann's understanding of *πειρασμός* as used in Luke. According to Brown, "*πειρασμός* is not part of Luke's own vocabulary," but is derived from Luke's sources (Mark and Q) and is used only of "apostates" not "*faithful* Christians." For Brown, "the *πειρασμός* of Jesus [i.e., both the temptations in Luke 4 and 'the renewed attack of the devil against Jesus...(are)...the unique experience of the son of God (Lk 4,3)'] has no continuation in the *vita christiana*."<sup>42</sup>

In sum, although Conzelmann's theory holds out enticing theological possibilities, in the final analysis it fails to explain satisfactorily the meaning of Luke 22:35-38. His tripartite division of the history of salvation is untenable primarily because it hangs on the fragile threads of four verses (i.e., Luke 4:13; 16:16; 22:3, 36) and, in particular, one minuscule expression—*ἀλλὰ νῦν*—as well. Consequently, when this theoretical model is subjected to a methodical analysis—like that of Brown—fissures in Conzelmann's theoretical framework appear. Despite this deficiency,

---

<sup>42</sup> Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance*, 12-19, esp. 16-17. Joseph Benjamin Modica also questions Conzelmann's Satan-free "Age of Jesus." Modica, "The Function and Purpose of Suffering, Persecution and Martyrdom in Luke-Acts: An Exegetical and Theological Inquiry" (Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1995), 80-147, esp. 92-108. Other scholars who critique Conzelmann's proposal include: Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History* (trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), 83-84; Fearghus Ó Fearghail, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Lk 1,1-4,44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991), 118-122; Anders E. Nielsen, *Until it is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts 20* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 110-113; and Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 133-135, 145. In contrast to the foregoing scholars, Bovon is deeply sympathetic to Conzelmann because "he put his finger on an important redactional particularity: between Luke 4:13 and Luke 22:3 Satan no longer attacks Jesus." In addition, Bovon finds Brown's book "not entirely satisfying, for it often lingers on the polemic with Conzelmann to no great profit...[and the fluctuation between]...the philological to theological level...is tiring." Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years*, 439-442. I concur with Bovon that Conzelmann did "put his finger on an important redactional particularity." Nevertheless, Conzelmann's thesis concerning the Satan-free period is not without inherent weaknesses, which Brown's analysis points out. Vööbus, too, holds some reservations about Conzelmann's view of Satan's role in Luke's theological scheme. Vööbus (*Prelude*, 61) notes well, "Also whether the role assigned to Satan really occupied such a place in the theological reflection of the evangelist, so that this action inaugurated a new period, must be taken *cum grano salis*." For concise reviews and reactions both to Flender and Jervell (especially regarding Jervell's thesis that proclamation of the Christian message divided Israel into two groups: the repentant/faithful and the unrepentant/unfaithful), see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years*, 46-48, 377-381, 404-406, and 490-494. For further discussion on the relationship of Christianity, anti-Semitism, and Judaism in the NT, see Joseph B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1992).

Conzelmann's emphasis on ἀλλὰ νῦν was an important contribution for research on Luke 22:35-38 that demands further investigation.

#### 1.2.4 Literary Criticism: Paul S. Minear

Despite its diminutive size when compared to other studies on Luke's sword-logion, Paul S. Minear's "A Note on Luke xxii 36" made an inestimable impact on subsequent research after its publication. And though this short essay could aptly be classified as theological criticism, it seems more appropriate to designate it as literary criticism for at least two reasons. First, Minear's literary critical approach is detected by his use of terms that are commonly associated with literary criticism. For instance, Minear states that "[t]he act of eating together provides a highly *dramatic* background for both gestures and words, especially when we recall the covenantal significance of food in Semitic traditions." Other terms and expressions that further indicate Minear's use of literary criticism include: "stage-setting," "Luke's artistic and dramatic touch," "climax," "actor," "motif," "scene," "literary device," and "vignette." Second, Minear identifies "common elements" found in the units and analyzes the participants (i.e., "the personnel") in order to reveal their "complex relationships." In addition, he speaks of "the mood and movement" of the four "dialogues."<sup>43</sup>

Minear's essay opens with a concise review of Conzelmann's study of Lukan theology, which Minear commends for "recognizing the importance of this final and climactic 'table-talk' of Jesus."<sup>44</sup> Based on his sense of "Luke's artistic and dramatic touch," Minear then posits that "the center of gravity in Luke's story has shifted from the Supper to the sayings after the Supper."<sup>45</sup> Minear's evidence for this shift comes chiefly from redaction criticism, which suggests that Luke has inserted "eighteen verses, comprising at least four units of dialogue." These four dialogues are centered on five principal characters: Judas, the twelve, Peter, Jesus and Satan. In addition,

---

<sup>43</sup> Minear, "A Note on Luke xxii 36," *NovT* 7 (1964): 128-134, italics added.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 129.

“the editor” has relocated to Luke 22:21-38 two traditions from Mark, “at least one from Q,” and “cites his own earlier record” (i.e., Luke 9:3; 10:4). After highlighting these editorial changes, Minear attempts to determine “whether there are common elements binding the four units together, and whether this unique setting helps to indicate Luke’s accent upon those common elements.”<sup>46</sup>

According to Minear, several common features emerge from the first three units (i.e., Luke 22:21-34). These common elements include: (1) a very palpable “distance” between Jesus and the apostles, due in no small part to their lack of understanding and “their present or impending acts of treachery;” (2) “a common span of time,” namely, “what is to happen in the immediate future;” and (3) in each unit “Jesus remains in control of the developing situation.”<sup>47</sup>

Minear contends that the common features described above are also found in the fourth dialogue (i.e., Luke 22:35-38). In support of the first element, Minear notes the obtuse exchange between Jesus and his apostles in v. 38.<sup>48</sup> Confirmation of the second element is found in the immediate fulfillment of the v. 37, both “in the Passion Story” and “the use of the sword by [the] apostles.”<sup>49</sup> Minear detects further support for immediacy in that “nowhere after xxii 52 does Luke refer to disciples as bearing or using the μάχαира [i.e., sword].”<sup>50</sup> As to the third element, Minear offers his own translation of three phrases to indicate that Jesus “would permit this much by way

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 129.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 130-131.

<sup>48</sup> Evans criticizes Minear’s first element “as unduly minimizing the extent to which, in vv. 14-38, the apostles and Jesus, despite the distance between them, are closely associated, and as ignoring the entirely favourable [*sic*] judgment in vv. 28-30.” Evans then proposes, “It may be suggested, alternatively, that vv. 35-38 are governed by a grim but playful irony.” Evans, *Saint Luke*, 807.

<sup>49</sup> Minear, “Note,” 130-131.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 131. Susan R. Garrett also perceives immediacy in Jesus’ words to buy a sword—words which refer to the proximate events surrounding Jesus’ arrest, trial, suffering, and death. There is, “a period of danger,” but it is near, temporary, and short-lived. Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke’s Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 54-55. For a brief review of Garrett’s analysis of “magic” in Luke-Acts, see Dale B. Martin, “Social-Scientific Criticism,” in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 132-134.

of concession to their treachery, but no more.”<sup>51</sup> Finally, Minear uses the preceding observations and a theologically-based reading of Luke 22:35-38 to challenge two commonly held viewpoints: (1) the proposition that Luke associates ἄνομοι (i.e., “lawless ones”) with “the two thieves” (κακοῦργοι) crucified with Jesus; and (2) Conzelmann’s interpretation of ἀλλὰ νῦν.

Since Luke neither explicitly nor implicitly identifies ἄνομοι with κακοῦργοι, Minear appeals to an earlier passage in Luke and invokes the double witness requirement from Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 17:6, 7; 19:15) in order to understand Luke’s use of Isa 53:12. For Minear, this scripture reveals “the thoughts of many hearts (ii 35) and discloses the fact that they [i.e., the apostles] had already secured the swords, secretly, fearfully, disobediently.”<sup>52</sup> In addition, “[t]he possession at the covenant table of *two* swords provides the *double* witness required by Deuteronomy and insisted upon by Luke, a witness to the fulfillment of Isa. liii 12.”<sup>53</sup> For Minear, the two swords witness to “their treachery.” Therefore, “*Now*, it is clear that the apostles without exception are the ἄνομοι with whom Jesus is to be ‘reckoned’ in his arrest, trial, and death.”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Specifically, τέλος ἔχει (“What is written about me here and now is finding its fulfillment”), ἱκανόν ἐστίν (“This is quite enough to fulfill the prophecy”), and ἐὰτε ἕως τούτου (“You are permitted to go this far but no farther”)—found in vv. 37, 38, 51, respectively. Minear, “Note,” 131.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 132.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 133. It is interesting to note that Minear does not mention that Deuteronomy requires two or three witnesses. Given that condition, could Luke have had the disciples answer, “Lord, look, here are three swords”? Or, does their statement suggest that some historical event stands behind Luke’s sword-logion which Luke did not feel free to revise?

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 133. Minear also states that “the citation of Isaiah 53:12 in vs. 37 is rightly located if Luke intended to identify the apostles with the ἀνόμων.” Idem, 132. Other scholars who follow Minear’s hypothesis about the identity of the ἄνομοι include: Nielsen, 118-119; Robert J. Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian: Luke’s Passion Account as Literature* (New York: Paulist, 1985), 69-70; John Paul Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach* (SBLMS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 194-197; Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 20; Vol. 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 736-739; and David L. Tiede, *Luke* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 388-390. Two authors who are lukewarm about Minear’s hypothesis include: Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 1:265-268; and Eben Scheffler, *Suffering in Luke’s Gospel* (ATANT 81; Zürich: Theologischer, 1993), 131-147. Concerning the identity of the ἄνομοι, Tannehill observes, “Indeed, the conversation with the apostles in 22:35-38 discloses their failure whether they are to be identified with the ‘lawless’ or not.” Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 268. In a later publication, however, Tannehill sets aside his qualified position and fully embraces Minear’s position when he says, “The near context suggests that these [i.e., ‘the lawless’] are the apostles. Tannehill, *Luke* (ANTC: 3; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 323. Scheffler thinks that the identity of the ἄνομοι—whether the disciples or two criminals—is immaterial.” He also suggests that Pilate should be considered a lawless man on the basis of Acts 2:23. Scheffler, *Suffering*, 136-138.

Having established the identity of the ἄνομοι, Minear concludes his essay with a different understanding of ἀλλὰ νῦν when compared with Conzelmann's. Rather than anticipating "the period of the Church," ἀλλὰ νῦν points to "the tragic denouement in the Garden, and that in this denouement he [i.e., Luke] saw fulfilled the Isaianic picture both of the righteous Servant and of the lawless people."<sup>55</sup>

I suspect that Minear did not anticipate the interest his "Note" would generate. Yet paradoxically, before stating his variance with Conzelmann, Minear planted the seeds for what would subsequently occur with the following qualification regarding his own work: "These reflections do not achieve a satisfactory degree of certainty. Much in the story remains problematic."<sup>56</sup> Offering more of an understatement than he probably realized at the time, a number of scholars wholeheartedly agreed and took the liberty to address what was "problematic" in his "reflections."

One author who differs noticeably with Minear's conclusion—i.e., the apostles are the ἄνομοι—is Joel B. Green. In his commentary on Luke, Green agrees with Minear—and Conzelmann—when he observes that "the times are changing" and the apostles "must prepare themselves for hostility."<sup>57</sup> But Green—unlike Minear—has doubts about equating the ἄνομοι with the κακοῦργοι. Green writes:

Many readers of Luke assume that this [i.e., the citation of Isa 53:12] is a prediction fulfilled in the manner of Jesus' execution, crucified alongside two "criminals" ([κακοῦργοι] 23:43-33, 39). Because this is the only appearance of the term "lawless" [i.e., ἄνομοι in 22:37] in the Third Gospel, this interpretation cannot be ruled out, even though Luke provides no linguistic basis for this association.<sup>58</sup>

Thus while Minear identifies the apostles as the ἄνομοι, Green makes the case for a different understanding of the ἄνομοι. His argument begins with the following proposition: "Given the use

---

<sup>55</sup> Minear, "Note," 133.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 133.

<sup>57</sup> Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 774-775.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 775.



of 'lawless' for a person who transgresses the law—that is, a 'sinner,'—a more arresting interpretation seems likely."<sup>59</sup> After reminding his readers of passages in Luke's gospel where "Jesus' friendship with sinners" produced hostility (e.g., Luke 7:34, 39; 15:1-2; 19:7-10), Green concludes, "It is more probably in this sense that Jesus is 'numbered with the lawless.'"<sup>60</sup>

Minear's "Note" was undoubtedly an important contribution to the research on Luke's sword-logion. Not only did Minear challenge Conzelmann's theoretical epochs of salvation history, but he also set forth a new claim—that is, "the lawless" in Luke 22:37 were the apostles—that was and remains a debatable matter (as Green's commentary illustrates). In sum, Minear's brief theological essay raised two significant questions: (1) who are the *ἀνομοί*? and (2) how does one understand Luke's citation of Isaiah 53:12? These vital questions emerged from Minear's analysis and call for further consideration in chapter four.

### 1.2.5 Source and Redaction Criticism: G. W. H. Lampe and Joan Frances Gormley

Conzelmann examined Luke 22:35-38 largely from a theological perspective, that is, from Luke's theological perspective as Conzelmann understood it. For him, the sword-logion looked forward to the inauguration of Luke's third epoch of salvation history (i.e., the period of the

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 775.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 775-76. Green further comments that his "view is supported not only by the importance of this motif for Luke, but also by the probability that, as in the case in the Isaianic co-text, so here it is Jesus' adversaries who do the reckoning (cf. v 52; 23:1-5)." Idem, 776. Additional authors who reject Minear's thesis regarding the identity of the *ἀνομοί* include: Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 326-327; Darrel L. Bock, *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1987), 137-139; Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 73, n. 107; Tyson, *Images*, 89; Christoph W. Stenschke, *Luke's Portrait of Gentiles Prior to their Coming to Faith* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 140 n. 179; Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 352-353; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke* (trans. David E. Green; Atlanta: Knox, 1984), 341-342; and Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 132-138. Various suggestions for the identity of the *ἀνομοί* include: the two criminals crucified with Jesus (Strauss, Bock, Nelson, Tyson); the criminals and/or Pilate (Stenschke); the Romans (Danker); symbolic for a changed time (Schweizer); and "the events of the passion as a whole, which picture the sinless Messiah rejected, mocked and crucified by his own people—in a phrase, 'treated as a transgressor'" (Moo, *Old Testament*, 137). Thoralf Gilbrant and Tor Inge Gilbrant offer an odd and virtually all-inclusive amalgam for the identity of the *ἀνομοί*; they are "the Jewish leaders, Judas, Peter, and the other disciples who argued over greatness." Thoralf Gilbrant and Tor Inge Gilbrant, *The Complete Biblical Library*, (Study Bible, Luke; Vol. 4; ed. Ralph W. Harris; Springfield: The Complete Biblical Library, 1986; repr. 1991), 643.

Church). Hence, Conzelmann's stress on ἀλλὰ νῦν and the changed situation that necessitates the apostles obtain swords.

Though not averse to theological criticism, Minear primarily employed literary criticism in order to scrutinize this pericope. For him, the sword-logion was embedded in one of Luke's "table talks" (cf. Luke 5:29-39; 7:36-50; 10:38-42; 11:37-52; 14:1-24) and shared a number of common elements with the preceding three dialogues (i.e., Luke 22:21-34). Minear further sensed Luke's literary acumen via the insertion of Isaiah 53:12 and subtle allusion to the double witness requirement in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 17:6-7; 19:15). These associations—both within and outside the Gospel of Luke—and other literary devices indicated to Minear that Luke portrayed: (1) Jesus as Isaiah's "righteous Servant;" and (2) the apostles as the ἄνομοι. Moreover, these biblical associations explain why there were two swords and no more.

Even though Conzelmann and Minear made use of theological and literary criticism, respectively, to analyze Jesus' sword-logion, they were, as is so often the case, somewhat eclectic in their critical methodology. Conzelmann readily admitted his reliance on form criticism in the opening pages of his tome.<sup>61</sup> Minear used common literary analytical techniques as well as source and redaction criticism.<sup>62</sup> But in order to address how a deliberate application of source and redaction criticism furthers research on this pericope, I turn now to consider the contributions of G. W. H. Lampe and Joan Frances Gormley.

In his opening paragraph Lampe candidly acknowledges that: (1) "commentators have floundered in a morass of perplexity;" (2) "exegetes...have tried rather desperately to establish the meaning...of this strange pericope;" and (3) they "make discouraging reading."<sup>63</sup> Yet Lampe is not so discouraged that he disavows any further attempt to interpret the passage. On the contrary, he confidently posits that "any attempt to elucidate Luke 22:38...[must consider]...the

---

<sup>61</sup> Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 9ff.

<sup>62</sup> See, e.g., Minear's comments about "Luke's artistic and dramatic touch" and the essay's concluding note. Minear, "Note," 129 and 134, respectively.

<sup>63</sup> Lampe, "Two Swords," 335.

relation of this verse...to...verses 35 to 37, and...to Luke's version (verses 49 to 51) of...the assault...on the servant of the high priest (Mark 14:47)."<sup>64</sup> After he states that verse 38 "does not appear to be logically connected" to the preceding material (specifically, vv. 35-37, but also, more broadly, the entire Supper narrative), Lampe stipulates the following: "[Verse 38] is a clumsy attempt to establish a connection between the dialogue (verses 35 to 37) and the episode of the attack on the high priest's servant."<sup>65</sup> Based on his assumption, Lampe then succinctly states his objective: "Our task is to examine the question why Luke...composed and inserted verse 38."<sup>66</sup>

Building on the work of H. Schürmann<sup>67</sup> and Vincent Taylor<sup>68</sup> *inter alia*, Lampe puts forward the following conjecture:

It appears probable that verses 35 to 37, and conceivably even verse 38 as well, are a Lukan redaction of source-material and were already, in the pre-Lukan stage of the tradition, linked with 10:3-4 as well as the preceding "farewell discourses" of Jesus to the disciples at the Last Supper (22:12-34).<sup>69</sup>

Lampe also suggests that "[t]he starting point, it would seem...is the incident recorded in Mark 14:47 which [Luke] reproduces at verse 50 and to which...he gives an interpretation of his own...[and]...sees...in quite a different light from Mark."<sup>70</sup> Moreover, Luke 22:35-38 is an

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 335.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 335.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 335.

<sup>67</sup> Heinz Schürmann, *Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk. 22:21-38* (Münster, 1953).

<sup>68</sup> In *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation* (ed. Owen E. Evans; Cambridge: University Press, 1972), Vincent Taylor assesses then current scholarship regarding the Proto-Luke hypothesis and subsequently applies the Proto-Lukan hypothesis in his examination of Luke's passion narrative. Concerning Luke 22:35-38, Taylor concludes that it "is derived from a pre-Lukan source and that it is only lightly edited by Luke." Op. cit., 68. On Taylor's Proto-Luke hypothesis and his source critical analysis of Luke, see his *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926). For details on Taylor's views concerning Luke's passion and resurrection narratives, including Luke 22:35-38, see Taylor's *Passion Narrative*, 33-75, 175-181, esp. 43. For a concise summary regarding Luke's sources for his gospel, see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years*, 482-485. For a brief, source and redaction critical analysis of Luke 22:35-38, see Vööbus, 132-136. For an even briefer source and critical analysis of this pericope, see Mark A. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke* (SBLDS 178; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 287-288. Cf. George Augustin, « Tradition et rédaction chez Luc: la construction du troisième Évangile, » *ETL* 25 (1967): 100-129.

<sup>69</sup> Lampe, "Two Swords," 336.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 338, 342.

eschatological passage that warns of future tribulation for the disciples, which therefore justifies the use of “the violent language.”<sup>71</sup> Thus Lampe posits, “In this saying the idea of a ‘sword’ serves to express...the total hostility which the disciples would encounter; every man’s hand would be against them.”<sup>72</sup>

Lampe detects two mutually dependent reasons “for the drastic change in the situation of his [i.e., Jesus’] followers.” First, Jesus is ready “to suffer the fate prophesied in Isa. 53:12, ‘He was reckoned with transgressors.’” Second, the ambiguous phrase—specifically, τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει (“what is written about me is being fulfilled”)—seems to point to a pre-Lukan tradition that Luke attempts to explain via his citation of Isaiah 53:12, which “produced the rather clumsy and ambiguous juxtaposition of δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί (“it must be fulfilled in me”) and τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.”<sup>73</sup>

The final rationale for Lampe’s theory is based on Minear’s proposition that the four dialogues found in Luke 22:21-38 are not only homogeneous in “content, mood, and implications,” but also concern “events that are to occur in the immediate future...”<sup>74</sup> And those events demonstrate unequivocally that:

Luke...understands it [i.e., Isa 53:12] to mean that the disciples have become lawbreakers and Jesus is to be numbered with them...All of them [i.e., the apostles] are ἄνομοι because they, or some of them, are armed, or are going to arm themselves, with swords and resort to the use of the sword in the garden.

Luke has thus imposed a quite new meaning on the old saying about the need to buy a sword. He has done this, first, by either introducing the citation of Isa. 53:12, or if this was already there by placing it in a new setting and giving it a new application; secondly, by adding the dialogue about the two swords (verse 38); thirdly, by relating the whole pericope both to the preceding warnings

---

<sup>71</sup> Henry J. Cadbury identifies Luke 22:35-38 as one of Luke’s apocalyptic texts that uses “different terms for the terrors of the end.” Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts with a New Introduction by Paul N. Anderson* (New York: Macmillan, 1927; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 289 n. 8.

<sup>72</sup> Lampe, “Two Swords,” 338. While Lampe agrees with Conzelmann that ἀλλὰ νῦν signifies “a dramatic change,” Lampe does not believe that “this saying, or the similar ‘epochal’ turning-points on which Conzelmann’s exegesis of Luke depends, will bear the weight which his theory places on them.” Idem, 337.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 339-340.

<sup>74</sup> Lampe, “Two Swords,” 340. Contra Lampe, Minear and Tannehill, Cunningham (*Through Many Tribulations*, 150-51 n. 356) does not think it is necessary to limit Jesus’ sword-logion to the immediate future, that is, to the time of the passion.

and prophecies of treachery and failure on the disciples' part and also to the episode of the assault on the high priest's servant which is to be narrated in verses 49 to 51.<sup>75</sup>

In sum, Lampe identifies Luke's sources and then proceeds to explain how Luke reshaped them to support his own theological objectives.

Yet Lampe failed to justify one major claim that is foundational to his analysis, specifically, that each disciple "must be prepared for a lonely struggle to survive in a bitterly hostile world; no one henceforth will provide him with food or shelter, and he will be in constant danger of attack."<sup>76</sup> It is notable that a greater part of exegetes and commentators—including Conzelmann, Minear, Lampe, *inter alia*—support the notion that the disciples experienced a relatively peaceful time during Jesus' earthly ministry and that their circumstances changed radically after his death based principally on the presence of ἀλλὰ νῦν. In contrast to this simplistic delineation, my own reading of Luke and Acts indicates a mixture of acceptance and rejection, benevolence and persecution, both during and after Jesus' earthly ministry.<sup>77</sup> Consequently, I cannot accept this portrayal without significant qualifications. I suspect Luke knew, firsthand and anecdotally from others, that a disciple's life is a blend of both hospitality and hostility. And if he understood and experienced such an amalgamation himself, I doubt he would have crafted a passage that points only to hostility—that is, to what many exegetes claim is the case.<sup>78</sup>

Although Lampe ultimately reached the same conclusion as Minear regarding the identity of the ἄνομοι, Lampe's thoughtful and thorough application of source and redaction criticism made a significant contribution to research on this pericope, especially his conclusions regarding

---

<sup>75</sup> Lampe, "Two Swords," 341.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 338. Contra both Conzelmann and Lampe, Pallis questions any suggestion that vv. 36, 38 adumbrate future tribulations that the apostles would face on their missions. See p. 2, n. 6 above.

<sup>77</sup> E.g., when Jesus sent the twelve to heal and "proclaim the kingdom of God" he spoke of them being welcomed and not welcomed (Luke 9:1-5). For more on Jesus' acceptance and rejection in Luke, see Tyson, *Death of Jesus*, 29-38.

<sup>78</sup> For an opposing view that challenges the supposition of a period free from tribulation and temptation, see Schuyler Brown's *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*, which I discussed previously in this chapter (section 1.2.3). In addition, during the so-called "Satan-free" period, the Pharisees clashed with Jesus and his disciples on many occasions, there were frequent contests with demons, and the Samaritans rejected Jesus as well (cf. Luke 4:31-37; 5:17-6:11; 8:26-39; 9:37-43a, 51-56).

verse 38—namely, that it “is Luke’s own composition, for the vocabulary and style are strikingly characteristic of Luke” and that by it Luke explains Mark 14:47, which he narrates in verses 49-51. Finally, at the conclusion of the essay Lampe surveys “the many attempts to explain verse 38 as a literal record of an actual dialogue that took place between Jesus and the disciples,” an aim that for Lampe is “irrelevant...if Luke has constructed his story in the light of that prophecy [i.e., Isa 53:12].”<sup>79</sup> There remains, however, at least one nagging and underlying problem: did Luke actually compose the sword-logion in order to indicate the “lonely struggle” of the disciples “in a bitterly hostile world”?<sup>80</sup> If that had been Luke’s intent, it seems he failed miserably, since the passage is extremely opaque.

Each of the previous exegetes and their investigations—as well as the ones to follow—are relatively well-known, a fact that is corroborated by their frequent attestation in peer publications. Yet despite its anonymity and four innocuous conclusions that are not decisive for my project, Joan Frances Gormley’s dissertation is a valuable study that highlights several puzzling features of Luke 22:35-38. Like Lampe, Gormley uses redaction criticism to investigate Luke’s sword logion. However, unlike Lampe whose research focused on Luke’s use of Mark and other sources, Gormley is more concerned—though not entirely—with the relationship of Luke 22:35-38 to its immediate context (Luke 22:15-38), the missionary instructions of Luke 10, the subsequent Passion Narrative (Luke 22-23), and the “total Lucan Gospel.” (Regarding this aspect, she resembles Minear.) Finally, besides utilizing redaction criticism, Gormley also employs grammatical criticism during her initial analysis in which she identifies and explains the “principal problems of Luke 22:35-38.”<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Lampe, “Two Swords,” 342-351, esp. 342, 348. For interpretations that are more sympathetic to a literal reading of this pericope, see Jonathan Knight, *Luke’s Gospel* (New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1998), 139-140; Hobbs, *Exposition*, 307-09; and to a lesser degree, Nolland, *Luke*, 1076.

<sup>80</sup> Lampe, “Two Swords,” 338. After making his case for Luke’s redaction of Mark 14:47, Lampe acknowledges that “[t]he complex and subtle structure which Luke has built on the Markan incident raises problems from which the simpler interpretations offered by Matthew and John are free.” For further discussion on this point, idem, 347-348.

<sup>81</sup> “The Final Passion Prediction: A Study of Lk. 22:35-38” (Ph.D. diss., Fordham, 1974), 1-30. Specifically, Gormley applies Quentin Quesnell’s redaction critical method to Luke 22:35-38 (Quentin Quesnell, *The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6*, 52 [AnBib 38; Rome: Pontifical Biblical

Gormley postulates that this pericope is the result of Luke's editorial activity, because "it lacks internal cohesion and cannot be understood apart from its wider context...[i]t is...the product of a compositional process."<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, in view of the fact that "[o]nly one detail in Lk. 22:35-38 might possibly be traced to Mark, namely, that the apostles were armed...[a]n examination of Luke 22:35-38 must conclude, then, that signs of Luke's activity pervade the passage."<sup>83</sup>

On the basis of this premise, specifically, that the sword-logion is Luke's construct, Gormley theorizes that Luke 22:35-38 is "a deliberate substitute for Mk. 14:27-28," which refers to the scattering of the disciples as fulfillment of Zech 13:7.<sup>84</sup> She believes Luke had to craft a different narrative for two reasons: (1) Luke's gospel never mentions that the disciples flee; and (2) while Mark "adds a prediction of Jesus' going before the disciples into Galilee after the resurrection," Jerusalem and not Galilee is "the geographical center of activity after the resurrection" in Luke.<sup>85</sup>

As mentioned above, Gormley examines Luke 22:35-38 systematically in order to identify the "principal problems." The principal issues in verses 35-36 are: (1) the identity of the direct objects of ὁ ἔχων and ὁ μὴ ἔχων; and (2) the meaning of ἀλλὰ νῦν. Regarding the first issue, Gormley argues that the direct object is βαλλάντιον (i.e., purse) on the basis of antithetic parallelism. As a result, she thinks that Jesus' instruction is two-pronged: whoever has a purse is

---

Institute, 1969], 56ff.). According to Gormley, Quesnell's approach is first "to study [both grammatical and philological aspects of the pericope] thoroughly the smallest unit of material before moving beyond it;" and then to "move...into increasingly wider contexts of the gospel." Gormley, 29. For a recent, highly technical linguistic and grammatical analysis of Luke, see Ivan Shing Chung Kwong, *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages* (LNTS [formerly JSNTSup] 298; New York: T & T Clark, 2005). Kwong investigates "the word order of all the clauses in the Gospel of Luke and some of its foregrounded messages" via a "functional" approach. The constituents of the clauses are: "Subject, Predicate, Complement, and Adjunct." Op. cit., 1.

<sup>82</sup> Gormley, "Final Passion," 34. My own judgment of Luke 22:35-38 is that no matter what context is applied as a frame for this pericope—whether immediate, intermediate, or broad—the passage makes little sense.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 34, 43.

<sup>84</sup> Mark 14:27 says, "And Jesus said to them, 'You will all become deserters; for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd, / and the sheep will be scattered.'" The full text of Zech 13:7 says, "'Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, / against the man who is my associate,' / says the Lord of hosts. / 'Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered; / I will turn my hand against the little ones.'"

<sup>85</sup> Gormley, "Final Passion," 44.

to take it; whoever does not have one should buy a sword. All of the disciples are to prepare for a journey, but one's "course of action" depends on one's circumstance—i.e., having or not having a purse.<sup>86</sup>

Regarding the second issue, Gormley does not believe that ἀλλὰ νῦν "indicates the beginning of a new period stretching forth into the future," *pace* Conzelmann. On the contrary, she believes that had this been Luke's intention, he would have used "the unambiguous expression ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ['from now on' (cf. Luke 1:48; 5:10; 12:52; 22:18, 69)]." Moreover, since Luke "contrasted νῦν with the previously mentioned mission of the disciples (ὅτε)...[Gormley concludes that]...the logion applies to a particular and immediate situation."<sup>87</sup>

Gormley parses verse 37 into four elements (i.e., the introductory expression [v. 37a], two inter-related elements [vv.37b, d], and the citation from Isaiah 53:12 [v. 37c]), all of which justify Jesus' instructions in verse 36. The use of γάρ in the introductory formula (i.e., λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι; ["For I tell you,"])—and in verse 37d as well—suggests an authoritative quality for what Jesus says.<sup>88</sup> Two expressions, in verse 37b (i.e., τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί ["this scripture must be fulfilled in me"]) and in verse 37d (i.e., καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐποῦ τέλος ἔχει ["and indeed what is written about me is being fulfilled"]), indicate—as did ἀλλὰ νῦν in v. 36—that "the necessary fulfillment is presently taking place."<sup>89</sup> In verse 37c (i.e., τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη ["And he was counted among the lawless"]) Gormley notes in passing—as many commentators do—that Luke more closely adheres to the MT rather than the LXX. Then, in contrast to Minear, she does not dwell on the identity of the ἄνομοι. Instead, she sees this term as a synonym of

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 49-58. Nolland favors "sword" as the object of ὁ ἔχων and ὁ μὴ ἔχων. Nolland, *Luke*, 1076. I agree with Evans who thinks this is "grammatically very awkward...and it destroys the antithesis with v. 35 in making the possession of a sword the primary requirement." Evans, *Saint Luke*, 805. Marshall agrees with Evans and Gormley against Nolland. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 825. In my estimation, the object(s) of both ὁ ἔχων and ὁ μὴ ἔχων is (are) "purse" (and "bag" as well), not "sword."

<sup>87</sup> Gormley, "Final Passion," 68. I concur with Gormley's assessment that ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is less ambiguous than ἀλλὰ νῦν.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 69-71.

<sup>89</sup> Although the expression τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ in v. 37d can be translated as: "the things written about me," "the things that refer to me," or "my earthly life," the key point for Gormley is the occurrence of the present tense τέλος ἔχει, which points to imminent fulfillment. Gormley, "Final Passion," 11 n. 13, 71-75, 168.



ἄμαρτωλός (i.e., “sinner”). The most notable feature of verse 37c for Gormley, however, is the term ἐλογίσθη (i.e., “counted” or “reckoned”). Here, she detects an ironic twist that the reckoning is “a judgment which is subjective on the part of those making it: he is classed with criminals but he is not a criminal.”<sup>90</sup>

Gormley’s analysis of verse 38 yields two hackneyed conclusions. First, the disciples do not understand Jesus’ instruction. Second, the expression, ἱκανόν ἐστιν, can mean: “two swords are enough,” “enough has been said,” or “enough of this!” Gormley is more favorably inclined to one of the last two options.<sup>91</sup>

After conducting a “detailed examination of Lk. 22:35-38,” Gormley explores the relationships between this pericope and wider Lukan contexts (i.e., the Supper, the missionary instructions, the Passion, and the entire Gospel). Upon the completion of this task, Gormley offers four conclusions: (1) Luke wrote and inserted the sword-logion; (2) Luke 22:35-38 instructs “the apostles to prepare themselves to follow him in the journey of his passion;” (3) this pericope “contains Luke’s final, most immediate prediction of the passion (vs. 37),<sup>92</sup> and it sets the theme for the passion narrative which follows it (vs. 37c);” and (4) the apostles fail to understand Jesus’ instruction to prepare.<sup>93</sup>

On the one hand, Gormley’s conclusions are rather prosaic and stem from the project’s chief drawback: its methodical, but tedious, application of grammatical criticism. On the other hand, the grammatical analysis does highlight a number of important topics.<sup>94</sup> Yet the steady

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 76-77.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 79-81. Both Cunningham (*Through Many Tribulations*, 151) and Nolland (*Luke*, 1077) favor the last option, which entails a rebuke.

<sup>92</sup> Kwong notes that few commentaries “have made a connection between the three passion predictions [i.e., Luke 9:22, 44; 18:31-33] and this incident in 22.37.” According to Kwong, all four passion predictions conform to a “Given-New Structure” [i.e., what is “New” in the preceding prediction is taken as a “Given” in the subsequent prediction] that moves from a “Less-Specific” to “More-Specific” disclosure in each subsequent prediction. Kwong, *Word Order*, 184-194.

<sup>93</sup> Gormley, “Final Passion,” 166-172.

<sup>94</sup> E.g., the direct objects of ὁ ἔχων and ὁ μὴ ἔχων, Luke’s use of ἀλλὰ νῦν and ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, and the meaning of the cryptic phrase καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.

scrutiny of expression after expression is wearisome because the syntactical details obscure one of the project's more interesting subjects. In my estimation, addressing the question as to why Luke found it necessary to modify Mark 14:27-28 so radically—especially as it relates to Zech 13:7, which surprisingly uses the word “sword” though not quoted by Mark—would have enhanced Gormley's redaction critical investigation significantly. Gormley's justification for Luke's sweeping adaptation of Mark 14:27-28—that is, a total excision and replacement—is not convincing. To claim that Luke altered Mark's account because Luke chose to omit the disciples' flight at Jesus' arrest and Luke focused on Jesus' post-resurrection appearances near Jerusalem rather than Galilee seems flimsy justification for such a radical recension.

As I see it, Gormley's investigation would have more probative value had she asked, “Why didn't Luke retain Mark's report of the disciples' flight along with his reference to Zech 13:7 and expand the citation to include the reference to ‘the sword.’?” If Luke had chosen this option, the sword-logion might make more sense, at least from an intertextual and theological perspective. To state it differently, if, as Gormley claims, Luke is redacting Mark 14:27-28, which includes the citation from Zech 13:7, why did Luke find it necessary to drop Zech 13:7—which mentions a sword being raised against the “shepherd”—and insert Isa 53:12, which makes no allusion to a sword?<sup>95</sup> Despite the project's deficiency noted above, it is arguably its best feature, since it revealed—in a roundabout way—a fascinating question worth consideration.

Relying on source and redaction criticism, both Lampe and Gormley conclude that Luke is the principal author/editor of Luke's sword-logion. They also agree that Mark 14 is one of Luke's sources. But whereas Lampe views the sword-logion as Luke's editorial effort to explain his inclusion of Mark 14:47 in Luke 22:49-51, Gormley claims that the sword-logion is Luke's “deliberate substitution” for Mark 14:27-28, since Luke omits the disciples' flight and focuses on

---

<sup>95</sup> According to Moo (*Old Testament*, 357), Luke shows an “almost total lack of interest in Zechariah 9-14.” Perhaps, Luke's revision of Mark 14:27-28 was due to a “lack of interest,” his unfamiliarity with Zechariah, or lack of access to the book. For Moo's complete analysis of Zech 13:7 in the gospel narratives, idem, 182-187.

Jerusalem instead of Galilee.<sup>96</sup> One final observation is worth mentioning before moving on. If Luke did indeed redact the sword-logion with a deliberate point in mind, Gerd Petze is right when he wistfully opines, „Aber warum bleibt dann so Vieles unklar?“ (“Then why does so much remain unclear?”)<sup>97</sup>

### 1.2.6 Form Criticism: R. Heiligenthal, H.-W. Bartsch, and A. Vööbus

Conzelmann and Minear focused on different, but related critical methods: theological criticism and literary criticism, respectively. In contrast to these relatively artistic analytical methods, Lampe and Gormley employed more standard historical critical techniques: source and redaction criticism. At this point, I move on to appraise scholars who made use of form criticism, a method that is closely related to and dependent on both source and redaction criticism.

Exegetes who use form criticism attempt to decipher the sword-logion by projecting the pericope against an historical context or an assumed Lukan audience in the ancient church. In this approach the passage is placed in a particular milieu or *Sitz im Leben* in order to extract its meaning. Three scholars who employ this critical method—along with their proposed historical settings—are: (1) Roman Heiligenthal who posits the reign of Agrippa I (41-44 C.E.) as the likely

---

<sup>96</sup> Additional writers who address source and redaction critical matters include: Ernst, *Das Evangelium*, 601-604; Gerd Petze, *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas* (Zürich: Theologischer, 1990), 182-184; and Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Luke: A Critical Study* (Schleiermacher: Studies and Translations, vol. 13; trans. Connop Thirlwall; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1993), 299. Without offering any substantive support, Schleiermacher suggests that “the connexion [of vv. 35-38, sic] is easily restored, by combining what Jesus says at v. 35 with verse 30, and inserting the whole supplement between that and the following verse.” Op. cit., 299. Regrettably, he does not develop this hypothesis and I am unaware of any textual evidence to warrant such a claim. Mark A. Matson’s relatively recent work on the relationship of Luke and John is also worth mentioning. Matson considers the following question: “Is it reasonable to suppose that Luke knew and used John, either its final form or some earlier recognizable form, in the composition of the Third Gospel?” After identifying how Luke departs from both Mark and Matthew but displays “points of contact with John,” especially in the Passion and Resurrection narratives (i.e., Luke 22-24), Matson concludes—with a proper measure of equivocation—that “Luke’s use of John serve[s], at least in part, as a reasonable explanation both for Luke’s deviation from Mark and for the presence of features in the Third Gospel common also to John.” Mark A. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 18, 444. For an author who thinks John is dependent on Luke’s Passion narrative, see John Amedee Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John* (NovTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 32-46. For Bailey’s comments on Luke 22:35-38, op. cit., 43, n. 3, and 45, n. 2.

<sup>97</sup> Petze, *Das Sondergut*, 183. Note also Schmithals’ similar observation, „Rätselhaft bleibt freilich, warum Lukas diese Aussage so dunkel und vieldeutig macht.“ (“Admittedly, it remains mysterious why Luke made this statement so dark and ambiguous.”) Schmithals, *Das Evangelium*, 213.

historical context;<sup>98</sup> (2) Hans-Werner Bartsch who puts forward the Jewish Wars (66-70 C.E.) as the setting;<sup>99</sup> and (3) Arthur Vööbus who avers that the prelude to the passion narrative, which includes the sword-logion, reflects Luke's contemporary community and its liturgical practices.<sup>100</sup>

Heiligenthal begins with a concise and exceptional overview of the history of interpretation in order to identify the pesky interpretative questions often associated with Luke's sword-logion. Yet before he traces the development of this valuable background information, Heiligenthal presages the outcome of his historical survey when he asserts that many of the solutions previously offered tend to reflect the zeitgeist or religious point of view of the interpreter.<sup>101</sup> Heiligenthal further posits that Luke 22:35-38 bears little connection either to Jesus' instructions when he previously sent out the disciples or to the directions for mission work.<sup>102</sup> Heiligenthal then asks appropriately, „Doch wie soll man Jesu Wort vom Schwertkauf verstehen?“ (“But, how should one understand Jesus' word about buying a sword?”)<sup>103</sup>

After completing his survey of prior interpretations in order to demonstrate their tendentious nature and discussing the apparent disconnect between Luke's sword-logion and earlier directives in the gospel (i.e., Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-20), Heiligenthal begins to address his primary thesis: a concrete historical context provides a better interpretive framework for

---

<sup>98</sup> Roman Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz? Aspekte zum Verständnis des lukanischen Schwertwortes,“ *NTS* 41 (1995): 39-58.

<sup>99</sup> Hans-Werner Bartsch, “The Sword-Word of Jesus (Luke 22:35-38),” *Brethren Life and Thought* 19 (1974): 149-155; and idem, „Jesu Schwertwort, Lukas XXII.35-38: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien,“ *NTS* 20 (1974): 190-203.

<sup>100</sup> Arthur Vööbus, *The Prelude to the Lukan Passion Narrative: Tradition-, Redaction-, Cult-, Motif-Historical and Source-Critical Studies* (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1968).

<sup>101</sup> Specifically, Heiligenthal asserts at the outset, „Im Rückblick auf die bisherige Auslegungsgeschichte drängt sich hierbei der Verdacht auf, daß manchmal Lösungsansätze auch durch zeitgeschichtliche Hintergründe oder durch die religiöse Interessenlage der Ausleger stärker als sonst üblich mitbeeinflusst worden sind.“ (“In looking back on the previous history of interpretation, the hunch imposes itself on this occasion that solutions have sometimes been more strongly influenced than usual either by an era's milieu or by the interpreter's religious bias.”) Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 39.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

understanding Luke 22:35-38.<sup>104</sup> Heiligenthal raises two important questions. First he asks, „Läßt sich Lk 22:35-8 aus dem historischen Entstehungskontext der Passionsgeschichte als einer großen synoptischen Einheit heraus verständlich machen?“ Secondly he inquires, „Und hat die Perikope unter Umständen auch aktuelle Transparenz für die Situation der lukanischen Christenheit?“<sup>105</sup>

In order to address his own query, Heiligenthal conducts a brief exegetical analysis of Luke 22:35-38 and concludes that Luke 22:36 preserves instructions to two different Christian groups that existed during Luke's time: (1) those with possessions or means („die Besitzenden“); and (2) those without („die Mittellosen“). Heiligenthal then asks, „Wann könnten ortsansässige Christen in eine Lage geraten sein, die entweder Flucht und/oder Verteidigung des Lebens erforderlich gemacht hat?“<sup>106</sup> In response, he proposes two promising situations “in the history of early Christianity” („in der Geschichte des Frühchristentums“<sup>107</sup>) that reflect reasonable contexts for understanding Luke 22:35-38. Heiligenthal finds these two moments attractive, since they have the potential to explain Luke's inclusion of the sword-logion and justify the disciples' taking up weapons as well.

The first event Heiligenthal suggests is the Jewish Wars (66-74 C.E.). However, he swiftly eliminates this proposition on one simple ground („aus einem einfachen Grund“): „zu dieser Zeit hatte der größte Teil der (juden)christlichen Gemeinde Jerusalem bereits verlassen und war u.a. nach Pella geflohen.“<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> „Im folgenden soll die Frage nach einer möglichen historischen Situation als Hintergrund von Lk 22:35-8 gestellt werden. Es könnte unter Umständen sein, daß es durch eine Verortung unseres Textes in einem konkreten geschichtlichen Kontext erleichtert wird, exegetische Schwierigkeiten zu beheben.“ (“In what follows the question about a likely historical situation as background for Luke 22:35-38 should be considered. It could possibly be, in order to remove exegetical difficulties, that it is easier to locate our text in a concrete historical context.”) Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 45.

<sup>105</sup> „Does Luke 22:35-38 make itself intelligible out of the original historical context of the Passion narrative as part of the larger synoptic unit? And is the pericope possibly as well as actually transparent [lucid] for the situation of the Lukan Christendom?“ Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 46.

<sup>106</sup> „When could local Christians have encountered a situation in which either flight and/or defense of life was made necessary?“ Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 47-48.

<sup>107</sup> *ibid.*, 46.

<sup>108</sup> „At this time the largest part of the (Judeo)-Christian community had already left Jerusalem and fled to Pella among other [places].“ Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“, 48-49, refers to Saint Cyril of Alexandria (ca. 377-440 C.E.) in order to verify this claim and to support his conclusion. In Homily 145 Cyril

Having dismissed the Jewish Wars as the pericope's background, Heiligenthal marshals evidence for the second proposed historical occasion: the reign of Agrippa I (41-44 C.E.). Relying on Josephus' *Antiquities* (*Altertümern*), Heiligenthal makes his case that Agrippa's reign is the most likely *Sitz im Leben* for Luke's sword-logion. Specifically, Heiligenthal contends that the violence which Christians experienced at the hands of Jewish leaders (e.g., Stephen's stoning, *inter alia*)—that is, a general persecution that was sanctioned by Agrippa I—is the contextual key that explains Luke's sword-logion.<sup>109</sup> In short, Jesus' apostles—as Jesus before them had been—“were numbered among the lawless” („Sie wurden...unter die 'Gesetzlosen' [Luke 22:37] gerechnet.“)<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, this “life-threatening, situation of persecution” („lebesbedrohende Verfolgungssituation“) also illuminates the crisis that a wandering charismatic leader („Wandercharismatiker“) such as Peter—as well as James and John—faced in Jerusalem.<sup>111</sup>

Before Heiligenthal completes his argument, he pauses briefly to consider the reign of Agrippa II (62 C.E.), which was immediately prior to the Jewish Wars. During Agrippa II's reign Ananos the high priest was authorized by Agrippa II to persecute Christians, including the execution of James, the Lord's brother. Even though Christians were persecuted during this time period, Heiligenthal quickly removes it from consideration, since this persecution prompted Christians to flee to Pella rather than fight. In other words, this event does not explain Luke's *Schwertwort* (“sword-word”) that permits Jesus' disciples to take up arms.<sup>112</sup>

For final confirmation of his thesis, Heiligenthal relies on Wolfgang Stegemann who suggests that Luke 12:1-12 is a “key text” („Schlüsseltext“) for interpreting Luke-Acts

---

declared that Jesus' order to take a purse and bag and buy a sword, if necessary, was directed not to the apostles, but to the Jews. According to Cyril, the Jews needed to prepare for the suffering and destruction that was about to come upon them because they had rejected Jesus. Saint Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (trans. R. Payne Smith; Monastery of Saint John of Stoudios [Istanbul]: Studion Publishers, 1983), 578-580.

<sup>109</sup> Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“, 50-51.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 53-54.

(„lukkanischen Doppelwerks“). Based on Stegemann’s analysis of the diverse reactions of Jewish (i.e., Synagogue) and heathen authorities against Christians—especially as seen in Acts—Heiligenthal concludes that Luke intends to prevent another martyrdom by means of the sword-  
logion.<sup>113</sup>

As Heiligenthal previously observed, the disciples’ “fate” („Schicksal“) was already seen in the fate of Jesus.<sup>114</sup> In short, they will suffer as he suffered, since they—like him—are numbered among the lawless. Although Luke does not issue a call to war or mandate open revolt, he does permit the taking up of arms for self-defense to prevent unnecessary martyrdom, especially of the kind seen during Agrippa I’s reign when his policies permitted Jewish leaders to persecute Christians.<sup>115</sup>

On the one hand, Heiligenthal rightly points out in the opening pages of his essay that interpreters are susceptible to being unduly influenced by their own cultural milieu or theological perspectives. On the other hand, his reservation about the connection between Luke 22:35-38 and Jesus’ prior instructions to his disciples (cf. Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-20) is less convincing, especially in light of Conzelmann’s analysis.

---

<sup>113</sup> Heiligenthal states, „Mit dem Schwertwort beabsichtigt Lukas, seinen Gemeinden einen Weg aufzuzeigen, der weitere Martyrien verhindert, denn in ihm ist für die Zeit nach Jesus eine Änderung der ethischen Maßstäbe signalisiert.“ (“Luke intended with the sword-word to demonstrate a way for his communities to prevent additional martyrdoms and signaled for him a change in the ethical standards after the time of Jesus.”) Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 55-57, esp. 56. For more on Stegemann’s position, see footnote 139.

<sup>114</sup> Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 53.

<sup>115</sup> Heiligenthal’s last sentence reads: „Es geht schlicht um das geringstmögliche Maß an Vorsorge zum Schutz des eigenen Lebens in Zeiten der äußeren Bedrohung.“ (“This is simply about the slightest degree of precaution for the protection of one’s own life in times of extreme persecution.”) Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 58. Other authors who support a limited deployment of the sword for self-defense include: Ernst, *Das Evangelium*, 601-604, esp. 603; Flender, *St. Luke*, 84; and William Howard Van Doren, *A Suggestive Commentary on St. Luke: With Critical and Homiletical Notes* (New York: Funk & Co., 1881), 436-439. Compared with the very limited observations Van Doren makes on this pericope overall, it is amazing how frequently he endorses the use of the sword for self-defense. For example, he declares, “The Lord authorizes a sword for *defence* [*sic*], but not for *assault*...In times of danger, they must have recourse to the sword...The Lord forbids us from throwing away our lives undefended. Condemning the use of human means as ‘carnal’ is *fanaticism*...This [i.e., the two swords] implies the use of all lawful means, for self-protection.” After asserting the disciples’ right of self-defense, Van Doren makes an odd, paradoxical, and conflicted claim: “Henceforth they must protect themselves, trusting in God.” *Op. cit.*, 437, 439.

Although the remarks mentioned above are not particularly insightful—for example, would anyone argue with the first point? and even if the second point is established, what difference would it ultimately make?—Heiligenthal's proposal to set Luke's sword-logion against the backdrop of a concrete historical situation or *Sitz im Leben* in order to interpret it is notable. His suggestion for the bona fide existence of two Christian groups—that is, those who have possessions („die Besitzenden“) and those who do not („die Mittellosen“)—and his ensuing search for a credible, historical setting (i.e., the reign of Agrippa I) during which these two groups displayed alternative responses to persecution is an imaginative interpretative move. In short, by means of this adroit maneuver, Heiligenthal creates a believable scenario.

That being said, two matters weaken his position. First, Heiligenthal's treatment of Jesus' arrest on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:47-53) is principally used to explain why Jesus was numbered among the lawless. Heiligenthal, however, inadequately deals with Jesus' reprimand against one of his disciples when he used the sword—a point that seems to contravene any sanction for the use of the sword in self-defense.<sup>116</sup> Second, Heiligenthal's final conclusion that Luke permits the disciples to take up arms so as not to suffer the sort of martyrdom which was experienced during the reign of Agrippa I seems to stretch the pericope's scope beyond reasonable limits. While a case might be made for the use of force to defend the defenseless (e.g., the widow, the orphan, and the stranger in the gate), the right of self-defense is much more difficult, if not impossible, to establish. Indeed, if anything, Christians are to share in Christ's sufferings, endure persecution, and bless rather than retaliate (cf. Matt 5:10-12; Col 1:24; 1 Peter 2:18-25; 3:9, 14-18; 4:1, 12-19). In other words, Heiligenthal appears to suffer from the same malady as many other interpreters in that his own beliefs about self-defense might be directing his exegetical conclusions to a degree. In short, it appears that since he finds self-defense at least somewhat acceptable, he uses this pericope to confirm his presupposition.

In contrast to Heiligenthal who considered, but ultimately eliminated the Jewish Wars as the *Sitz im Leben* for Luke's sword-logion, Bartsch suggests that this is the pericope's most

---

<sup>116</sup> Heiligenthal, „Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz?“ 46-47.



probable setting. Like nearly all other authors—including Heiligenthal—Bartsch initially points out the difficulty of this passage. Unlike most exegetes, however, he frames the pericope’s conundrum as a potentially deadly moral crisis. Specifically, he asserts,

[T]his word gives the advice to buy a sword, and everybody knows that buying a sword has the intention to use it against one’s neighbor, because the enemy is our neighbor (Matthew 5:43). It is difficult to imagine that Jesus could have given such an advice.<sup>117</sup>

In other words, despite the difficulty of accepting such a hard teaching, Jesus authorizes his followers to use force.

Bartsch initially maintains that “interpreters try [unconvincingly and unsuccessfully] to evade this difficulty” by viewing it as a later scribal modification, assigning a “metaphoric meaning” to the pericope, explaining it is one of Luke’s literary creations to prepare his readers for Jesus’ arrest in the garden when a disciple brandishes a sword, or relegating it to the disciples’ inability to understand Jesus. Yet in the face of an imposing interpretive inertia, Bartsch asserts that “our understanding” is helped “if we try to take the word seriously and to understand it on the real background of life in Palestine at the time of Jesus and at the time of Luke (about A.D. 80).”<sup>118</sup>

Contrary to the evasive interpretations that garnered Bartsch’s scorn, he suggests that Luke uses Jesus’ sword-word to remind his readers that Jesus stands in solidarity with those who are forced to take up the sword such as happened during the First Jewish War (66-70 C.E.). Though some Christians (i.e., the “haves” of Luke 22:36) were able to flee to Pella when the Romans began their siege of Jerusalem, other Christians (i.e., the “have-nots” of Luke 22:36) were forced to take up the sword in order to defend their homes, families, and city.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Bartsch, “Sword-Word,” 149.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 149-150.

<sup>119</sup> Mineshige challenges Bartsch on this point. Mineshige, *Besitzverzicht und Almosen*, 110, n. 310.

This action by the “have-nots” during the First Jewish War should not, however, be construed as “a justification of violence in this word of Jesus.”<sup>120</sup> On the contrary, when the “have-nots” took up the sword, they became identified with the two criminals who were crucified along with Jesus and also became, as Bartsch says, “transgressors of the sword word.”<sup>121</sup> Yet despite their transgression:

Luke finds that Jesus shows them his solidarity [since he was willingly crucified with them]. Even the Christians—if we understand Luke correctly!—who have taken a sword in the Jewish War are not condemned. The criminal on the cross is their representative.<sup>122</sup>

Thus, according to Bartsch, “Luke has interpreted [Jesus’ *Schwertwurf*] correctly for the Christians of his time. He has applied it to the time during and after the war A.D. 66-70.”<sup>123</sup>

Bartsch also suggests that this text provides an answer to Luke’s “fellow Christians who asked whether they acted according to the will of their Lord when they flew to Pella, or when they stayed and became involved in the war.”<sup>124</sup>

After completing his exegesis, Bartsch concludes his essay with an ideologically-based exhortation and appropriates the text as a liberation theologian in order to call for solidarity with contemporary revolutionaries. He contends that even though Christians may disagree with some of the more violent methods that revolutionaries use to achieve their goals, Christians ought to stand alongside these modern day “have-nots” (i.e., sword-bearers) and refuse to condemn them just like Jesus did when he was crucified together with the two thieves.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Bartsch, “Sword-Word,” 152.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 152. Mineshige questions Bartsch’s claim on this point. Mineshige, *Besitzverzicht und Almosen*, 112, n. 322.

<sup>123</sup> Bartsch, “Sword-Word,” 154.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 154-155. Cf. Ephraim K. Mosothoane, “Violence in the Gospel Tradition,” in *Theology and Violence: The South African Debate* (ed. Charles Villa-Vicencio; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 111-131. Like Bartsch, Mosothoane (131) suggests that “there is no *one* Christian response to violence in our gospels. Responses seem in fact to vary in relation to the extent to which a writer and/or his community is exposed to and victim of violence. While the responses of evangelists may vary, a careful examination of relevant gospel passages suggests that Jesus himself never advocated, endorsed, nor condoned violence. At least

On the whole, Bartsch presents a fascinating form-critical interpretation of the sword-logion, especially Luke 22:36, but it is nonetheless problematic for at least three reasons. First, based primarily on what Bartsch describes as Josephus' admiration of "robber[s]," Bartsch assumes rather than establishes that the two robbers crucified with Jesus were Zealots—a conclusion that is certainly subject to debate. Second, Bartsch attempts to strengthen his case for Jesus' solidarity with the Zealots based on the premise that "Jesus has never condemned the Zealots." While it is true that Jesus never condemned the Zealots, neither did he praise them. Consequently, it seems terribly presumptuous for Bartsch to make inferences—*e silencio* of the scriptures—concerning Jesus' attitude toward the Zealots. Third, the ideological objectives entailed in Bartsch's commitment to liberation theology taint his interpretation. Jesus does, indeed, show his solidarity with the oppressed. And even though he did not condemn the two criminals who were crucified with him, it is inordinately difficult to extrapolate on the basis of that event that he (or Luke) would ever be supportive—even if only symbolically—of his disciples' or other revolutionaries' decision to use violence.

While both Heiligenthal and Bartsch put forward specific historical events in order to interpret Luke 22:35-38 (Agrippa I's reign or the Jewish Wars, respectively), Vööbus' proposal for the setting in life is more generic. Rather than identifying a precise moment in history, Vööbus asserts that Luke's purpose—at least as a prelude to the Passion—is paraenetic. In other words, Luke seeks to exhort his *Gemeinde* (community) about the meaning of the Eucharist.

---

that seems to be how the evangelists presented him." I find Mosothoane's conclusion baffling. Since "Jesus himself never advocated, endorsed, nor condoned violence" and Mosothoane is able to reach this conclusion via his analysis of the "relevant gospel passages," it seems preposterous for him to state that "there is no *one* Christian response to violence in our gospels." If Mosothoane knows that Jesus did not sanction violence, then it seems likely that the evangelists knew this as well. Consequently, I would argue that there is *one* Christian response to violence: neither to support nor participate in it. For a general survey of and introduction to liberation theology since the 1960s, with concentrated emphasis on Gustavo Gutiérrez, brothers Clodovis and Leonardo Boff, see David Tombs, "The Hermeneutics of Liberation," in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 310-355. See also Fernando F. Segovia, "Reading the Bible Ideologically: Socioeconomic Criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 283-306. Besides providing an historical overview of liberation theology, Segovia offers a balanced, thoughtful presentation on the strengths and weaknesses of socioeconomic criticism.

Although Vööbus' claims that his investigation "may be characterized as motif history," I include his analysis in the form criticism section of the literary survey contra his protests.<sup>126</sup> I arrived at this conclusion because throughout his study, Vööbus expends a great deal of effort attempting to convince his readers that Luke derives meaning about the significance of the Lord's Supper and its implications from their present circumstances. For example, Vööbus claims that "[w]e must get at the intention and the meaning of these texts [i.e., the texts of Luke 22 related to the preparation and institution of the Eucharist and the attendant discourses]."<sup>127</sup> How? By coming to understand that "[t]he scene is taken beyond the Upper Room and placed into a timeless perspective of christocentric orientation. Instead of Jesus in the Upper Room, the evangelist presents the Risen Lord...who speaks directly to the congregation."<sup>128</sup>

Further evidence that Vööbus draws on form criticism also occurs when he states, "Editorial operation, however, places the scene into the Christian community. The reshaped logion addresses the rôle [*sic*] of the believers in the apostolic church."<sup>129</sup> Any lingering doubt about the centrality of form critical methodology in Vööbus' analysis and his resolute aim to find the *Sitz im Leben* evaporates when he speaks of "a definite *mise-en-scène*...[in which]..the logion has been percolated through the milieu of the Christian community. It received its life and color from it."<sup>130</sup> Though Vööbus prefers to call his critical method "motif history," it is simply a masquerade. His clear form critical objective is to tease out an actual, historical life setting, whether it is called a *Sitz im Leben* or *mise-en-scène*.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Vööbus (*Prelude*, 29-30) states, "Form-critical research does not help us out at all. It speaks of the 'looseness of the design' but it does not give us any explanation about these puzzling phenomena. The redaction-historical approach passes over this section with brief remarks. Thus, left without any help and assistance, we must undertake our own exploration. Our approach naturally must go beyond the form-criticism and redaction-history. It may be characterized as motif history."

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 36. Vööbus also states that these texts "reflect the concrete liturgical situation." *Idem*, 37.

<sup>131</sup> Further evidence of Vööbus' affinity for form criticism is seen in the following excerpt: "In the discussion on these texts, the treatment has been determined by a certain premise. It supposes that in the so-called

To that end, Vööbus contends that Luke's Passion prelude is "a composition which was meant to be paraenetical...[and]...is framed to serve the interests of contemporaneity...[T]he historical Jesus is replaced by the Risen Lord who is now the speaker...[T]he contemporary congregation is brought to the fore."<sup>132</sup> Consequently, the tradition that Luke received was not "static," but could be reshaped and "recast" as needed. Luke could rightly "apply his material to his own time as the need arose and modify it in the interest of the kerygmatic task and evangelistic witness."<sup>133</sup>

Specifically about Luke 22:35-38, Vööbus says that "[t]he situation depicted here is not the situation in which the disciples during Jesus' lifetime were living. What is portrayed is a scene from contemporary Christianity [i.e., Luke's congregation]."<sup>134</sup> During Jesus' ministry, the disciples were cared for and they enjoyed their time with him. However, "the present time [i.e., Luke's time] is quite different in complexion...Troubles have erupted; struggles, even heavy battle have engulfed believers."<sup>135</sup> Their suffering reminds them of Jesus, the Suffering Servant. All who follow Jesus "must now go down the same path," including members of Luke's congregation.<sup>136</sup>

Though Jesus' instruction to buy a sword is "so striking" and "has posed a conundrum for students,"<sup>137</sup> Luke's exhortation is unmistakable provided one understands the text metaphorically and the terminology in light of early Church tradition (e.g., Origen). On this basis, Vööbus concludes that:

---

fare-well speech the idea of the testament lies in the background. That is, this *mise-en-scène* has been found very appropriate for such instruction. Furthermore, models for this construction have been discovered in hellenistic biographical writings. It is assumed that Luke followed these paradigms in constructing his scene. In this way Luke has built into Jesus' last will, instruction on the order of worship, congregation and life." Vööbus, *Prelude*, 48.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 38. Vööbus further states, "Pieces of tradition which originally had a different *Sitz im Leben* could be made subservient to more vital perspectives...An examination of all these operations shows us that that which the evangelist did was to invest his own viewpoint in his treatment of the Lord's Supper." Idem, 38-39.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 46.

[T]he term is employed as a graphic synonym for courage. Thus the injunction speaks of the courage required to face trial and tribulation...[T]he inner logic of the paraenesis espouses bravery in witnessing for Christ in the midst of conflict and strife [*sic*, I assume the intended word is 'strife'].<sup>138</sup>

In sum, Luke has modified an early Jesus' tradition with the purpose of inspiring courage in his own contemporary community of the late first century C.E.

To be sure, Vööbus' form critical analysis is both creative and insightful. He uses a variety of critical methods as the subtitle suggests and presents an interpretation of Luke 22 that moves the hermeneutical discussion beyond matters so often dominated by a concern to disclose the "historical Jesus." Nevertheless, the rapid movement from a generic *Sitz im Leben* (i.e., Luke's community) to kerygmatic and paraenetic (or, evangelistic and homiletic) concerns also reflects a modern preoccupation with pragmatic issues, which in the long run decreases the likelihood that Luke's prelude—especially the sword-logion—has been as thoroughly scrutinized as warranted.

In sum, Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus each proposed an historical setting or *Sitz im Leben* that attempted to illuminate the dialogue of Luke 22:35-38. For Heiligenthal, the urgent situation was the reign of Agrippa I (41-44 C.E.). For Bartsch, the pressing circumstance was the First Jewish War (66-70 C.E.). But whether the historical backdrop is Agrippa I's reign or the First Jewish War, both Heiligenthal and Bartsch suggested that Christians are permitted in some fashion to take up arms and resist the Jews, Romans, or other contemporary oppressors.<sup>139</sup> For

---

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, 46-47.

<sup>139</sup> Other writers who analyze the sword-logion with Luke's later and presumed audience in view—and how later circumstances affect Luke's understanding of earlier Jesus traditions—include: Wolfgang Stegemann, *Zwischen Synagoge und Obrigkeit: Zur historischen Situation der lukanischen Christen* (FRLANT 152; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 36-39; Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Glaube und Handeln in der Theologie des Lukas* (GTA 26; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 197-98; Manfred Korn, *Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit: Studien zur bleibenden Bedeutung Jesu im lukanischen Doppelwerk* (WUNT 51; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 90-92, 112-13, 124-25. Stegemann maintains that Luke 22:36 anticipates future conflict between Luke's Christendom and imperial as well as Jewish authorities. Horn's tome addresses the place of wealth and possessions in Luke's community and the ethical consternation that arose due to the apparent conflict between Luke 9:1ff; 10:1ff (when the disciples were to take nothing) and Luke 22:35ff (when the disciples were to take purse, bag, and sword with them). Since these texts demonstrate that circumstances change, Horn concludes that it was not necessary for disciples in Luke's time to adopt radical abject poverty. Along similar lines, Korn suggests that it is dubious to transfer the ethical demands that were in force during Jesus' journey to Jerusalem to the time of the church.

Vööbus, the setting was Luke's contemporary *Gemeinde*. It was a community, from Luke's perspective, that required further instruction about its liturgical practices and whose courage must be fortified because of the opposition it was encountering.

### 1.2.7 Ideological Readings: S. G. F. Brandon and R. M. Price

In stark contrast to the preceding methodologies (i.e., Conzelmann's theological thematic analysis, Minear's stress on the literary features and Supper dialogues, Lampe's and Gormley's efforts to probe into Luke's sources and redactional skills, and the form critical investigations of Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus in order to posit a plausible historical setting for Luke's inclusion of the sword-logion), this section of the literature survey examines two scholars who display a prominent, shameless ideological bias. To that end, Bartsch serves as an apt transition, since his article delves briefly into ideological considerations after analyzing Luke 22:35-38. Arguably, his essay could have been included here. Yet the ideological aspects of Bartsch's analysis seem to be a secondary concern and derived subsequent to the form critical investigation that he primarily conducts. Consequently, this section is reserved for authors whose overarching purpose is to demonstrate from an ideological stance that Jesus either was highly sympathetic to the Zealots or approved the use of force so as to achieve God's aims.

One key proponent who conjectures that Jesus' approved and encouraged the use of violence is Samuel George Frederick Brandon. This thesis, however, is not immediately apparent, since Brandon describes what he calls an "ambiguity of evaluation" about "the true character and intention" of Jesus in the NT.<sup>140</sup> For example, Brandon asserts in a rather balanced and non-polemical way, "Apart from Mark's manifest desire to explain away the significance of the Roman execution, the tradition is curiously ambivalent about the attitude of Jesus to the use of force: his recorded sayings and actions signify variously both pacifism and violence."<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> Samuel George Frederick Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), 20-21.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 20. Brandon's underlying objective is readily seen during his survey of the NT. For example, he tendentiously asserts that "behind Mark's presentation there lies a somewhat different tradition of Jesus as

After highlighting the inconsistent testimony in the NT regarding Jesus—especially as it relates to his beliefs about the use of force—Brandon moves on to describe the origin of the Zealots in chapter two. According to him, the census ordered by the Romans in 6 C.E. is of particular importance, because this act by the Roman government, “struck at the very roots of Yahweh’s sovereignty over Israel.”<sup>142</sup> The offense generated by the census was of such a magnitude that it resulted in a revolt led by Judas the Galilean and Saddok. These two leaders invoked the example and tradition of Phinehas (cf. Num. 25:6-13) and like him acted zealously when they resisted the Romans. Even though the Romans quashed the revolt—killing both Judas and Saddok—Brandon conjectures that their heroic and well-known actions surely must have influenced Jesus while he was growing up in Galilee. In other words, Jesus was likely impressed by the courage and zeal of both Judas and Saddok.<sup>143</sup>

Having described a pivotal moment in Jewish history, which undoubtedly would have had quite an effect on the young Jesus, Brandon next offers additional evidence for the influence of the Zealot ideal on Jesus and Jewish Christians. In the third chapter entitled “Israel’s Cause Against Rome,” Brandon traces Jewish-Roman history during the first century (i.e., 6-73 C.E.). He undertakes this objective in order to demonstrate the impact of the Zealot ideal on Jesus. For instance, Brandon makes the following claim as he concludes chapter three: “When Jesus of Nazareth called upon his disciples to take up their cross, he uttered a grim challenge that every

---

the Messiah” (i.e., a Messiah who calls for violent revolt in order to restore the kingdom to Israel). Brandon also points out in passing that Paul is of no help when attempting to discover what sort of Messiah Jesus represents. Brandon further conjectures that Mark suppressed the fact that Jesus armed his disciples because political expediency necessitated it, since the Gospel of Mark was written for believers in Rome. In addition, Brandon mildly reprimands Christian orthodoxy for its dismissive attitude toward any interpretation that suggests Jesus might have encouraged the use of violence in order to achieve his objectives. In order to bolster his claim of ambivalence, Brandon lists the following passages in footnote 4 on page 20: Matt 5:9, 39; 26:52; Luke 6:27-29; Matt 10:34f.; 21:12-13; Luke 12:51f.; 19:45-46; 22:36; Mark 11:15-16; John 2:13-17. Predictably, Brandon includes Luke 22:36 in order to support his claim about the “ambiguity of evaluation.” Op. cit., 10-23.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 62. It is important to note that the exact relationship of this census to the NT is problematic. Luke reports that this census—which occurred in 6-7 C.E.—is what prompted Joseph and Mary to travel to Bethlehem prior to Jesus’ birth. Herod the Great died in 4 B.C.E. shortly after Jesus’ birth. In other words, this census and Jesus’ birth cannot have happened at the same time even though the Gospel of Luke indicates otherwise.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid., 26-64, with 62-64 offering a concise summary of the chapter.



Zealot had to face for himself. The cross was the symbol of Zealot sacrifice before it was transformed into the sign of Christian salvation.”<sup>144</sup>

In the fourth chapter entitled, “Jewish Christians and the Zealot Ideal,” Brandon attempts to extract potential parallels between Jewish Christians and the Zealot movement from the NT. For example, Brandon suggests that there are similarities between the succession of Menahem (son of Judas and leader during the early days of the Jewish revolt) and Eleazar (a descendant of Judas and leader of the Sicarii at Masada) after Judas the Galilean (the Ur-Zealot) and the succession of James (the Lord’s brother) after Jesus as the leader of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem.<sup>145</sup> To press his point that Jewish Christians and the Zealots shared many beliefs, Brandon maintains that the story of Jesus and Syro-Phoenician woman (Mark 7:24-30; cf. Matt. 15:21-28)—whom Jesus calls a “dog”—illustrates the common attitude both groups held toward outsiders, especially the Romans.<sup>146</sup>

Brandon then discusses the ideological conflict between competing Christian groups, specifically, Jewish vis-à-vis Pauline. Brandon acknowledges that Paul’s vision ultimately surpassed that of the Jewish Christians and in the process the image of Jesus was transformed from the eschatological “Messiah of Israel” for both the Zealots and Jewish Christians into the “divine Savior of all mankind.”<sup>147</sup> Yet despite this setback for Jewish Christians, Brandon conjectures they continued to proclaim the “lost ‘gospel’ of the Jerusalem Church”—that is, the expectant hope that Jesus would return as the Messiah of Israel—throughout the Mediterranean world. Brandon also contends that Jewish Christians did not flee to Pella when Jerusalem was

---

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 65-145, esp. 145. Cf. discussion and explanation for Mark 13:14-20 (an oracle preserved from the time of Gaius [i.e., 39-40 C.E.] when he attempted to set up a statue of Zeus in the temple) and Mark 8:34 (a Zealot saying). Idem, 83-92 and 57, respectively. As with chapter two, Brandon is heavily dependent—indeed, almost exclusively—on the Jewish Historian Josephus throughout this endeavor. Idem, 57, n. 1.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., 165-169.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., 171-172. Along a similar line of thought, Brandon briefly examines Jesus’ sending out of the Twelve (but only to the Jews) and the parable of the Wedding Feast (Matt. 10:1-6; 22:1-4, respectively). According to Brandon, these passages add further support for his notion that Jewish Christians—like the Zealots—felt a large measure of disdain for all gentiles. Idem, 173-74.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., 175-184.

destroyed (contra Eusebius), but rather stayed in the city and fought alongside their Zealot comrades. And the few who survived, offered their witness to the Zealot-inspired “lost gospel” of Jerusalem church wherever they journeyed.<sup>148</sup>

Brandon expounds on one of his major premises in the fifth chapter, which is entitled “The Markan Gospel: An *Apologia Ad Christianos Romanos*.” In particular, Brandon considers what might have been the extenuating circumstances that called for the suppression of Jesus’ association with the Zealots. In order to make his case, Brandon first questions the traditional date of the Gospel of Mark (i.e., prior to 70 C.E.). According to Brandon, a date of origin shortly after the triumphal procession of 71 C.E. in Rome, which celebrated the defeat and subjugation of Jerusalem, is justified. This is because it better explains the conspicuous authorial emendations (see paragraph below) that Mark displays when alluding to the recent Judean insurgency that could possibly incite further retaliations against any who were perceived as Zealot sympathizers. In other words, Mark’s literary strategy was necessary so as not to antagonize the Roman government and thereby jeopardize the Christian community in Rome.<sup>149</sup>

Though by no means entirely convincing, Mark accomplished this remarkable feat by: (1) describing Titus’ sacrilegious entry into the Holy of Holies, his soldiers’ blasphemous sacrifices within the Temple grounds and/or their idolatrous declarations of him as “Imperator” as “when you see desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be” (Mark 13:14); (2) “masking” the fact that one of the Twelve was a Zealot by using and not explaining the transliteration of an obscure Aramaic word for Zealot (i.e., “Cananaean;” קנאנא—Mark 3:18; cf. Matt. 10:4; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13); (3) showing Jesus’ willingness to pay taxes to Caesar (Mark 12:13-17); and (4) transferring responsibility for Jesus’ death from the Romans to the Jewish leaders despite the Romans

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 184-220.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 221-229.

having reasonable cause for finding him guilty of sedition (i.e., Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, "his attack on the Temple trading system, and armed resistance in Gethsemane").<sup>150</sup>

In the sixth chapter entitled "The Concept of the Pacific Christ: Its Origin and Development," Brandon begins with a summary of why Mark presents Jesus as loyal Roman subject. Immediately thereafter Brandon leads his readers through Matthew, Luke, and John in order to show how each gospel made emendations to Mark's gospel and transformed Jesus from a leader who sympathized with the Zealots—though not one himself—into "the pacific Christ."

Near the end of his presentation, Brandon reaches the following conclusion:

We see, then, that the authors of Matthew, Luke and John, each in his own way and for his own purpose, elaborated the Markan portrait of Jesus, as one innocent of sedition against Rome, into that of the pacific Christ, who taught his followers to love their enemies and rejected all resort to armed violence. This conception, once presented, had its own obvious appeal to Christians, who were intent on dissociating themselves from any imputation of Jewish nationalism and on assuring the Roman government that their disposition was essentially pacific...Accordingly, the representation of him as living aloof or insulated from the political realities of first-century Judaea [*sic*] which the Evangelists fabricated for their own particular apologetic needs, confirmed and sanctioned an evaluation that became doctrinally imperative.<sup>151</sup>

At this point, then, Brandon's initial equivocation concerning the NT traditions about Jesus' attitude toward violence seems disingenuous and looks more like authorial misdirection than anything else. For, there can be little doubt now that Brandon believes that Jesus' endorsed the use of violence.

Indeed, Brandon's bias for establishing Jesus' approval of armed resistance is unrelenting and reaches its climax in the seventh chapter, which is entitled "Jesus and the Zealots." In this final chapter, Brandon no longer finds it necessary to speak of "the ambiguity of evaluation," but of "the Christian sources" which "give a tendentious presentation," are "unreliable," and cannot ultimately be trusted since they construe events for their own

---

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 230-256. For additional ways in which Mark achieved this clandestine literary objective—that is, to defame the Jews and honor the Romans—and a complete summary of Brandon's chapter, idem, 257-282.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 320.

purposes.<sup>152</sup> The full force of Brandon's characterization of the gospels is particularly egregious when he addresses Luke's sword-logion. As the following excerpt illustrates, Brandon impugns Luke's integrity and his literary skill with his comments about the principal pericope of this project:

If the Gospel narrative is to be trusted, for some unexplained and not obvious reason, after the Supper within the city, Jesus and a number of his disciples passed out in the dark through one of the gates into the country beyond. The movement must have been prearranged, since Judas Iscariot knew of it and was able to inform the Jewish leaders in time to allow their organisation [*sic*] of an arresting force. What the intention of Jesus was in going to Gethsemane and remaining there is unknown. The fact that he made sure that his disciples were armed is significant. Luke, who records this fact, endeavors to reduce its significance by saying that Jesus did so in order to fulfil [*sic*] a prophecy, and that he considered two swords enough for this purpose. The ascription of such an artificial fulfilment [*sic*] of an obscure passage of Isaiah to Jesus on such an occasion does no credit to Jesus and lowers our estimation of the sensibility of Luke. With how many swords the disciples were armed is immaterial; it is scarcely likely that it was only two, and the armament of the party sent to arrest Jesus suggests that Judas had given warning that the disciples were well armed and that armed resistance was to be expected.<sup>153</sup>

Besides exhibiting a condescending attitude toward Luke as an author, it is also clear that Brandon finds it necessary to impose his own thesis—that is, Jesus encouraged his disciples to take up arms—on this pericope as the last sentence quoted above demonstrates. Despite a modest claim that “the intention of Jesus...is unknown,” Brandon's language reveals his predisposition. For this reason, readers are left with only one possible conclusion: Jesus supported armed resistance and also encouraged his disciples to take up weapons.

This lengthy review of Brandon's monograph was necessary, because the argument is, as he himself says, “so tortuous and involved due to a complex of causes.”<sup>154</sup> I wholeheartedly concur with Brandon's own self-assessment; but I also add that only by means of such an extensive overview can one fully appreciate and fairly critique Brandon's thesis to which I now

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 322, 335.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 340-341.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 322.

turn. And even though Brandon raised a plethora of issues that legitimately call for a response, I will simply highlight a few significant matters in order to keep the torture to a minimum.

On a global scale, Brandon is just as guilty of being tendentious as the gospel writers, and perhaps even more so than them. For example, he claims—without corroboration—that “*it may be safely inferred* that the significance of the Temple veil was made known to the populace of Rome.”<sup>155</sup> He subjectively speaks of—but does not objectively establish—a “*preoccupation with the Temple*” in Mark.<sup>156</sup> He also frequently fails to differentiate between his hypothetical conjectures and indisputable fact. For instance, Brandon’s supposition that Mark “deemed it unwise to record the fact, for a Roman public, that one of the Twelve had actually been a member of the execrable sect,” is shortly thereafter morphed into an indisputable fact which “had to be concealed.”<sup>157</sup> In addition, he posits the existence of a “lost gospel” tradition by Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, but offers only what I would designate as circumstantial evidence for its existence.<sup>158</sup> In similar fashion, Brandon accepts as factual whatever supports his thesis and rejects as fabrication whatever does not.<sup>159</sup> It is also important to note that Brandon’s mistrust of the gospel authors is so pervasive that he views them as nothing more than fabricators.<sup>160</sup> Amazingly, but in light of his unswerving predilection, perhaps not, Brandon will even go so far as to claim that “the argument from silence is certainly valid.”<sup>161</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 229 (italics added).

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 235 (italics added).

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, 244-245. Frankly, if this “fact” would have been so inflammatory, why would Mark not omit the signifier altogether rather than “masking” it with an Aramaic expression?

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*, 175-220, esp. 175-190.

<sup>159</sup> E.g., consider Brandon’s analysis of Luke 22:35-38: “Although he [i.e., Luke] reveals the very significant *fact* that Jesus saw that his disciples were armed before they went to Gethsemane, Luke *represents* Jesus as intervening to stop the resistance offered to his arrest.” Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 317 (italics added). N.B., when Jesus arms his disciples, it is a “fact.” When Jesus stops his disciples from using the weapons, it is Luke’s representation. In addition, Brandon suggests that Luke attempts to explain [away] Jesus’ arming of his disciples as fulfillment of prophecy. *Idem*, 317, n. 3.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 320.

<sup>161</sup> The full citation reads: “The possibility that he [i.e., Jesus] was so disposed [i.e., to be sympathetic with the Zealots] is, moreover, confirmed by the fact that he chose a Zealot to be one of his inner band of disciples. It is also reinforced by the absence of any record of his condemnation of the Zealots. As we have

Specifically about Luke 22:35-38, Brandon has little regard for one of Isaiah's Servant passages, since he labels it "an obscure passage." Even if one discounts the significance that later NT exegetes have placed on Isaiah's Servant poems and their importance for NT hermeneutics, the Servant Songs of Second Isaiah cannot be characterized in any way as "obscure."<sup>162</sup> In addition, Brandon's language regarding Luke's writing ability is pejorative. For example, Luke's motives take on an almost sinister quality when he "endeavors to reduce its significance [i.e., the arming of the disciples]."<sup>163</sup> Furthermore, Luke's use of Isaiah 53:12 is "artificial."<sup>164</sup> To state it differently, Brandon's depiction of Luke as an author borders on character assassination. Finally, if the gospel writers were such creative and literary inventors and fabricators, why did the authors not emend or excise all traces of zealotry, especially ones as blatant as Luke 22:35-38? Though I hold no objections against speculation—how could I, since my own thesis is highly speculative?—I think it vital and a matter of intellectual integrity that an author always keep the hypothetical as hypothetical. In sum, Brandon's ideological premises have so tainted his objectivity that they undermine any confidence one might have regarding his claims about Jesus and his specific conclusions about Luke's sword-logion.

A second exegete to champion Jesus as "a revolutionary" is Robert M. Price. He ponders whether Jesus was part of the first century revolutionary movement or "an apocalyptic visionary who awaited a *deus ex machina* salvation for Israel."<sup>165</sup> Though Price initially claims that "the evidence is hardly univocal" regarding these two options, he builds a case that appears to favor

---

seen, the argument from silence is certainly valid here, because Mark, followed by the other Evangelists, has recorded the condemnatory attitude of Jesus to other Jewish parties, namely, the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Herodians." Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 327.

<sup>162</sup> On the significance of Isaiah's Servant Songs in the HB, see Bernhard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament* (Abridged 4<sup>th</sup> ed.; Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1998), 442-447; John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 385-389; and Moo, 87-112. In stark contrast to Brandon, Collins (385) begins his discussion of Isaiah's Servant Songs as follows: "One of the best-known features of the prophecy of Second Isaiah concerns the figure of 'the servant of the Lord.'"

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 340.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, 341.

<sup>165</sup> Robert M. Price, "Numbered Among the Transgressors?" *DrewG* 52 (1981): 33.

the former.<sup>166</sup> For example, he references Brandon's unconfirmed supposition that Christians did not flee to Pella, but stayed in Jerusalem and fought alongside the Zealots. Price further speculates that the "nicknames" of several disciples are "suggestive" of revolutionary predispositions (e.g., Simon *Bar-jona* "might mean Simon 'the terrorist;'" "'Simon the Zealot' is often...interpreted as denoting membership in the radical Zealot Party;"; "Judas' epithet 'Iscariot'...is interpreted with some plausibility as 'member of the *sicarii*,'" and "James and John are given the title 'Boanerges,' allegedly meaning 'Sons of Thunder'...[a name that]...could perhaps refer to revolutionary leanings").<sup>167</sup>

Price admits that "some of the most strikingly attractive evidence for the Zealot hypothesis [i.e., the items referenced above] turns out to be ambiguous."<sup>168</sup> Nonetheless, he continues to bolster his thesis by highlighting additional data that supports "the meat of the theory."<sup>169</sup> Three compelling evidentiary items for Price are: (1) Jesus' "form of execution," which indicates that he "died the death of a rebel against Rome;"; (2) the "Triumphal Entry" narrative where Jesus is "hailed as the Messiah who will restore 'the kingdom of our father David' (Mark 11:10);" and (3) the "whitewashing of Pilate" by the gospel writers—"notably Luke"—"as an attempt to shift the blame for Jesus' death from the Romans to the Jews."<sup>170</sup>

Price goes on to observe that Jesus was "remembered as a rebel" by his enemies. In particular, "Luke is keenly aware that Jesus is remembered as being one of a group of religious revolutionaries" (e.g., Acts 5:36-39).<sup>171</sup> Other passages in the gospels furnish additional evidence that Jesus encouraged acts of sedition, which distressed both Jewish and Roman authorities

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., 34.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid., 34.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., 34.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid., 34-35. Price labels this last piece of evidence "indirect" and "even more intriguing." He also designates the gospel narrative about Barabbas as "evidence of Christian tampering." Idem, 35, 38.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 36.

(e.g., Matt 17:24-27; Luke 23:2; John 11:48).<sup>172</sup> Price further contends that Jesus was not only viewed as a political subversive by the authorities, but also by the populace. For example, the crowd once wanted to make him king (John 6:15). Moreover, when Jesus approached Jerusalem, some people thought the kingdom of God was about to appear (Luke 19:11; cf. Luke 24:21).

Price brings his argument to a close when he considers “a few ‘hard sayings’ that have always proven baffling to exegetes, but which take on new meaning in light of the preceding.”<sup>173</sup> For example, in what is nothing more than an aside and certainly not an informed comment, Price—via Clifford Wilson—briefly pauses to observe that Matt 11:12 (“From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence and the violent take it by force.”) might possibly refer to the Zealots and Sicarii.<sup>174</sup>

More critical for this project, however, are Price’s comments regarding Luke’s sword-logion. Though he does not mandate that this pericope must be read as a text that supports the belief that Jesus was a revolutionary, Price’s comments leave little doubt that that is his position. To that end, he labels any attempt “to spiritualize this text” as “unconvincing” (e.g., Martin Hengel). He also asserts that Luke’s reference to Isa 53:12 “has all the artificiality of Schonfield’s scheming Jesus in *The Passover Plot*...[and]...represents Luke’s tendency to attribute the Passion with all its details to the letter of predictive prophecy.”<sup>175</sup>

Given the escalating confidence that Price exudes as he makes his case, it is surprising that he concludes his essay more modestly when he admits that “the picture is not so simple.”<sup>176</sup> He also circles back to affirm both aspects of his initial riddle that “Jesus could have been an

---

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, 36-37.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.



apocalyptic visionary awaiting the *deus ex machina* ending of history, and a revolutionary”<sup>177</sup>—though Price’s argument is heavily weighted toward the latter.

Price is neither as pejorative nor tendentious as Brandon. Nonetheless, Price displays similar proclivities, especially with his dismissive remark about anyone who might attempt “to spiritualize” Luke 22:35-38. In addition, a few final comments seem apposite for Brandon, Price, and any ideological reading that seeks to promote the use of violence via Luke’s sword-logion. G. J. Heering once labeled Luke 22:35-38 “one of the dark passages of the New Testament,”<sup>178</sup> which in some measure is attributable to those who seek to justify the use of force in order to achieve what they believe are God’s objectives. Yet in spite of the imaginative machinations of the foregoing interpreters to tease out of this pericope some rationalization for the use of violence, Heering correctly opined, “No, only ‘war-exegesis’, which unhappily has flourished freely, can make war-capital out of the Gospel record...Whoever brings the spirit of Christ into alliance with force has surely failed to understand him.”<sup>179</sup> Martin Hengel, too, aligns himself with this sentiment when he regards any proposed alliance between Jesus and the Zealots as nothing more than what I would call lame conjecture—Price’s chagrin notwithstanding.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 39. Also of note is Price’s final comment: “So Jesus may have been an ‘apocalyptic revolutionary,’ neither a pacifistic quietist nor a freedom-fighter in today’s sense.” Idem, 40.

<sup>178</sup> G. J. Heering, *The Fall of Christianity: A Study of Christianity, the State, and War* (trans. J. W. Thompson; London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1930), 24; trans. of *De Zondeval van het Christendom*, 1928.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>180</sup> To quote Hengel, “His [i.e., Jesus’] proclamation of the kingdom of God and his guidance about behaviour [*sic*], as outlined, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount, contains enough to show quite clearly how very sharply his message differs from the ideas of the Zealots...[Furthermore,]...Jesus’ proclamation likely contains certain statements which, even though the Zealots are not named explicitly, are undoubtedly directed against views that were widespread in Zealot circles.” Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (trans. David Smith; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), 340, 378; trans. of *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur Jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* (Leiden/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1961). Wilfrey Eckey, declares even more succinctly, „Die Annahme, er hätte zeitweise mit den Zeloten sympathisiert, ist absurd.“ (“The assumption that he had sympathized at times with the Zealots is absurd.”) Wilfrey Eckey, *Das Lukasevangelium: Unter Berücksichtigung seiner Parallelen* (Teilband II: 11,1-24,53; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004), 901. J. Massyngbaerde Ford—who follows Minear’s interpretation—finds no justification for violence in Luke 22:35-38. In fact, he claims that “[t]he purpose of this pericope is the conversion of the violent revolutionary.” J. Massyngbaerde Ford, *My Enemy is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984.), 113-116, esp. 116. Mark Allan Powell also concurs with Ford. Based on André Trocmé’s work, *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution*, Luke’s Jesus—according to Powell—calls for peaceful, non-violent revolution,

### 1.2.8 Traditio-Historical Criticism: H. A. J. Kruger

Up to this point the literature survey has examined Conzelmann's understanding of Luke 22:35-38 and its relationship to Luke's overall theological scheme, Minear's literary study and his attempt to identify "the lawless ones," Lampe's and Gormley's appraisal of Luke as a redactor of Isa 53:12 and Mark 14:47, the form critical assessments of Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus so as to identify a credible *Sitz im Leben* for an historical provenance of the sword-logion, and the ideological-based manifestoes of Brandon and Price which proffer Jesus as an advocate for the use of violence in appropriate circumstances. All of the preceding scholars are relatively well-known (Gormley being the exception) and their respective critical approaches are recognized, established methodologies.

In contrast to the foregoing, however, H. A. J. Kruger's brief analysis of Luke 22:35-38 appears to have languished in relative obscurity, probably due in part to the essay's inclusion in an edited tome. Yet despite its unfamiliarity, it is essential to review his brief article for two reasons. First, it is a fine example of traditio-historical criticism. Second, his investigative method adumbrates some of the techniques that I will use in my analysis of Luke's sword-logion.

At the outset, Kruger describes the apparent contradiction of the sword-logion as "a discrepancy between what Jesus taught elsewhere and what he probably commanded his followers to do according to this passage,...[whose reality]...appears to resist harmonisation [*sic*]." <sup>181</sup> After noting this "discrepancy," Kruger proposes to scrutinize two passages—specifically,

---

perhaps along the lines of Jubilee theology, which "would instigate a social and political upheaval." Mark Allen Powell, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* (New York; Mahwah: Paulist, 1989), 86. Agreeing with Hengel, Ford, and Powell, but against Brandon and Price, Ray Summers avers that verse 36 "seems much more to fit the outlook of Jesus if his statement is understood as irony—gentle irony, but none the less irony...The entire matter is so out of character that it seems unlikely that Jesus spoke literally." In short, Jesus spoke sarcastically when he instructed the disciples to buy a sword. Before Summers ends his analysis of Luke 22:35-38, he includes a brief, but wacky discussion about the various ways exegetes have explained the swords (e.g., some of the disciples were already carrying swords; the swords were property of the host on display in the upper room; the swords are actually butcher knives used for slaughtering animals) and concludes that the final explanation (i.e., butcher knives) "appears to be the most probable of all the suggested theories for the presence of the two 'swords.'" Why this is "the most probable of all the suggested theories" is unfortunately not addressed. Ray Summers, *Commentary on Luke: Jesus, the Universal Savior* (Waco: Word, 1972), 281-283.

<sup>181</sup> H. A. J. Kruger, "A Sword over His Head or in His Hand? (Luke 22, 35-38)," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; Leuven: University Press, 1997), 597; cf. 601.

Jesus' sword-logion and his subsequent rejection of the sword in the garden—in light of two HB motifs: the “Divine Warrior” and the “Suffering Servant.” He further conjectures that “Luke 22,39-46 holds a key to the understanding of the passage running from Luke 22 verse 35 to 53.”<sup>182</sup>

Specifically, Kruger spells out his thesis and critical method as follows:

It is proposed that Jesus' instruction to his followers to buy weapons can be dealt with by bringing the Old Testament into play in a particular way. Via two indicators, the reference to swords (Lk 22,36b.38), and the citation of a passage from Isaiah (Lk 22,37 < Isa 53,12), the exegete can focus on two Old Testament *traditions* which have a bearing on the present passages. The passages (Lk 22,35-38.39-46.47-53) also reveal a tension between these two Old Testament *traditions*.<sup>183</sup>

In other words, if one is to understand Luke's sword-logion, it is necessary to look back to two traditions found in Israel's scriptures.

Forthwith Kruger briefly outlines the prevalence of the “Divine Warrior” imagery in the OT. He then postulates, “It is quite possible that Jesus considered his future action on the basis of this [well-known] tradition of Yahweh as Divine Warrior.”<sup>184</sup> This hypothesis, according to Kruger, becomes even more compelling if Jesus' instruction to buy a sword and the pronouncements in Luke 21 are viewed as indicators of imminent eschatological intervention by Yahweh's Divine Warrior.<sup>185</sup>

On the basis of this HB imagery, Kruger believes that it is reasonable to suppose that Jesus entertains—at least momentarily—the idea of taking up the sword in order to punish “God's people because of their sins (Lk 21,9.11.20.22.24).”<sup>186</sup> Kruger summarizes his line of reasoning as follows:

---

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 597-598.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., 598 (italics added).

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 599.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid., 599-601. On topics related to the “Divine Warrior” image—namely, Holy War beliefs, messianic expectations, eschatological concepts, and the prospect of Israel's rule of the world—prior to, during, and after the first century C.E. among the Zealots, see Hengel, *The Zealots*, 271-310.

<sup>186</sup> Kruger, “A Sword,” 601.

Although Jesus adhered to a non-violent standpoint before and after the sword incident of Lk 22,35-38, at that particular point in time, he looked beyond the mundane, recognized God the Father in the image of the Divine Warrior, considered the sword, and thus extending the role of Yahweh the Divine Warrior, the God of Israel, to his own time and situation.<sup>187</sup>

Ultimately, though, Jesus rejects such a course and “opts for undergoing violence, instead of encouraging it” when he is arrested in the garden and orders his disciples to put away their swords (cf. Luke 22:47-53, esp. v. 51).<sup>188</sup>

But why would Jesus refuse to embrace the image of Yahweh’s Divine Warrior?

According to Kruger, Luke provides the key for unraveling this dilemma with his citation of Isa 53:12. Relying on Minear’s proposition that the apostles are the *ἀνομοί*, Kruger claims that the swords which the apostles carry allow Jesus “to be caught red-handed, that is, in possession of weapons...[and]...subsequently judged as a criminal.” *In nuce*, “Luke applies the plight of the Servant to Jesus.”<sup>189</sup>

To bolster his case, Kruger reexamines Luke 22:39-46 in light of these two images (i.e., the Divine Warrior and Suffering Servant). He argues that Jesus faces a temptation on the Mount of Olives that entails unimaginable consequences: he is caught between two visions of life: the violent way of humans or the servant way of God. Kruger contends that Luke presents a Jesus who is tempted by both of these OT motifs. Ultimately, though, Jesus turns away from the Divine Warrior, identifies himself with the Suffering Servant, and submits to God’s will in order “to die for the sins of the world (v. 42b).<sup>190</sup> The disciples also face “this temptation, namely, to take up the

---

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., 602.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., 602.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., 602. For further explanation of Minear’s position, see section 1.2.4.

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., 602-603. Agreeing with Kruger concerning Jesus’ contemplation of the Suffering Servant, Taylor postulates that “Jesus had deeply pondered the description of the Suffering Servant, and saw it as a foreshadowing of His own experience of suffering and death.” Taylor further comments, “At the same time it must be agreed that the quotation is not an obvious selection from the Servant-poem...[but reflects Jesus’ preoccupation]...with the thought that He is to be treated by hostile men as a wrong-doer.” Taylor, *Sacrifice*, 194. E. V. and K. G. Barrell base Jesus’ repudiation of violence on Jesus’ identification with the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53. E. V. and K. G. Barrell, *St. Luke’s Gospel: An Introductory Study* (London: John Murray, 1982), 165.

sword, that [temptation which] Jesus commanded his disciples to resist in prayer (vv. 40, 46), the temptation that he himself overcame eventually (v. 42).”<sup>191</sup>

Arguably, Kruger’s exegesis is attractive because of the way he creatively links it with two familiar and accepted OT traditions. The tension evoked by these two competing images—i.e., between the Divine Warrior and Suffering Servant—is palpable, especially as it reaches its climax on the Mount of Olives. Furthermore, his case is even more compelling, since his analysis concentrates on the sword-logion and the subsequent narrative with few peripheral pursuits outside of the Gospel of Luke.

Nevertheless, Kruger’s explanation seems to succeed or fail primarily on the assumption “that Jesus considered his future action on the basis of this tradition of Yahweh as Divine Warrior”—a conclusion that is, in a word, inconclusive. Two factors, in particular, somewhat weaken Kruger’s thesis. First, other traditions besides “Yahweh as Divine Warrior” were common during the first century. For example, William Klassen mentions four models, the first and last of which correspond to the two that Kruger identifies: (1) “Yahweh as God of War” who intervenes on behalf of his people; (2) “The Messiah as God’s Warrior of the Word” who strikes down “the ruthless...with the rod of his mouth;” (3) “The Messiah as Son of Joseph who conquers by means of a war to end all wars and thus ushers in an endless era of peace;” and (4) “The Suffering Servant who Bears the Sin of the People.”<sup>192</sup> Second, it is impossible to know with certainty which traditions Jesus was familiar with as well as which ones resonated with him. Or, as Klassen inquires, “What part of [any these legacies] appealed to him [i.e., Jesus]?”<sup>193</sup>

Kruger’s claim, however, about his thesis (i.e., “[i]t is thus quite possible...”), though beguiling, is not the same as “it is quite necessary.” For instance, does Luke 22:35-38 in fact

---

<sup>191</sup> Kruger, “A Sword,” 604. For a similar approach, see John Gillman, “The Temptation to Violence: The Two Swords in Luke 22:35-38,” *LS 9* (1982): 142-153.

<sup>192</sup> William Klassen, “Jesus and the Messianic War,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (eds. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 155-176. Though I did not refer to Klassen until now, he thoroughly rejects Brandon’s suggestion that Jesus was sympathetic to the Zealots. N.B., op. cit., 170-174.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, 156.

insinuate that Jesus is going to take up the sword and act as Yahweh's Divine Warrior? Or, is it rather the case that Kruger is imposing this OT image on the pericope? Besides, it is the disciples who take up the sword, is it not? And even though Klassen ultimately concurs with Kruger's conclusion that Jesus chose to align himself with the Suffering Servant model, Klassen does not restrict Jesus' tête-à-tête like Kruger. In other words, Klassen would not restrict Jesus' temptation to two options: between that of the Divine Warrior and Suffering Servant.<sup>194</sup>

Besides the preceding objections, if the Divine Warrior image is so ubiquitous and is also a tradition that Luke felt compelled to incorporate into the fabric of his gospel, should there not be hints of it elsewhere in Luke? In other words, does Luke ever indicate that the disciples thought of Jesus as Yahweh's Divine Warrior? If this moniker was an important feature in Luke's theology, there are appropriate circumstances in Luke's gospel that appear useful for including such a motif, (e.g., when Jesus asks his disciples, "Who do the crowds say that I am?" [Luke 9:18-22]).

It is also important to note that the religious authorities never used the apostles' possession of weapons as evidence against Jesus in order to condemn him as a criminal. Indeed, the sword is not mentioned again in Luke after Jesus' arrest. In addition, just as Jesus' temptation probably involved more than opting to take up or reject the sword, so, too, for the disciples. Though they may have been tempted to take up the sword, they were also tempted to

---

<sup>194</sup> Both Bovon and Vööbus raise doubts about the identification of Jesus as the embodiment of Isaiah's "Suffering Servant" in Luke. In addition, they are skeptical of an expiatory meaning for Jesus' death in Luke's gospel based on the citation of Isaiah 53:12. Bovon astutely observes, "In the only two instances where Isaiah 53 is cited in the Lukan corpus (Luke 22:37 and Acts 8:32f.) the term παῖς [i.e., 'servant'] does not appear." For additional comments on this issue and the meaning of Jesus' death in Luke, see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years*, 183-190, 206-208. Vööbus expresses similar reservations when he says, "The Suffering Servant idea is not something in which he [i.e., Luke] shows any noticeable interest and in his free creation he would not have moved along this line. To repeat, it is probable that Luke has borrowed this element from the tradition...The logion [i.e., Luke 22:37] does not allude to the suffering and its redemptive significance but has been cast to suit a different purpose...It is designed rather to tell about the fate of the followers of Christ and to give the explanation for their road of hardship." Vööbus, *Prelude*, 135-136. For a lengthy discussion on the use of the Isaianic Servant Songs in the gospel Passion narratives, see Moo, *The Old Testament*, 79-172. While Moo argues that the language found in Isaiah's Suffering Servant applies to Jesus, Moo (with Bovon and Vööbus, but against Kruger and Klassen) declares that "no concept of an 'atoning Servant' lay at hand in the time of Christ." Moo, *The Old Testament*, 86. Bart J. Koet (agreeing with Moo and against Bovon and Vööbus) acknowledges that "[t]he influence of this song [i.e., Isa 52:13-53:12] in the NT is hotly debated...[That being said]...[t]hrough the reference to Isa 53,12 is short, we can probably assume that not only it does apply to Jesus, but that also Isa 53 is presupposed as a model for Jesus' fate in Jerusalem." Bart J. Koet, "Isaiah in Luke-Acts" in *Dreams and Scripture in Luke-Acts: Collected Essays* (CBET 42; Leuven—Paris—Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2006), 51-79, esp. 63-64, 75-78.

deny him and to abandon him. Finally, I would say that Kruger's analysis smacks—though only mildly—of a latent-Marcionism that puts Jesus in a crucible between two gods: a vengeful, warring god and an innocent suffering god.

In sum, Kruger uses OT themes—or, more broadly, “OT traditions”—in order to generate an explanation for Jesus' *Schwertwort*. More specifically, Kruger asserts that the sword-logion and the subsequent narrative in Luke 22 are best understood when seen as a clash between two competing HB traditions—that of the Divine Warrior and the Suffering Servant—identities that Jesus agonized over in Gethsemane.

Though I have some reservations about the Divine Warrior being the HB tradition that unlocks the meaning of the sword-logion (but fewer regarding the Suffering Servant, in light of my own Christian indoctrination, since Isa 53:12 is quoted in Luke 22:37), Kruger's—as well as Klassen's—use of OT traditions as a means by which to unravel this obdurate passage is creative and, as will become apparent, similar in many ways to the hermeneutic that I will employ.<sup>195</sup>

### **1.2.9 An Entertaining, Eclectic Assortment of Scholars**

The preceding six critical methods are the dominant approaches. What follows, as the literature survey concludes, is a motley collection of exegetes whose interpretive efforts of the sword-logion have generally failed to gain much traction with other scholars even though many of them display quite a bit of imaginative genius, which, in and of itself, seems sufficient justification for including these explanations in the literature survey. And though they are not compelling in any broad sense, they illustrate the lengths to which interpreters have gone in order to diminish the maddening facets of Luke 22:35-38. In addition, these exegetical attempts are worth

---

<sup>195</sup> Krister Stendahl makes an astute observation concerning tradition-criticism, which he sees as being “closely related to the form-critical approach” and serves “as a critique of literary criticism of a book-minded, ‘scissors and paste’ type.” According to Stendahl, “It [i.e., tradition-criticism] emphasizes the organic growth of traditions, motivated by the needs and the functions of the ongoing religious life in cult and history.” Krister Stendahl, “Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 34. Kruger's approach to Luke's sword-logion exemplifies Stendahl's description of tradition-criticism, since Luke writes not only about Jesus who was tempted by these two OT images, but also for Luke's own contemporaries who were—from Kruger's perspective—likely tempted to take up the sword as was Jesus and his disciples.

mentioning because each one is distinctive in its own way. Finally, these bizarre, fantastic, or entertaining speculations are often amusing and thus provide some momentary comic relief for weary readers.

In a respectful exchange published in *Expository Times* during the first half of the twentieth century, three authors attempted to eradicate the strain of the sword-logion *completely* by means of creative, but dubious, exegetical methods. The dialogic triangulation begins with T. M. Napier's essay, "The Enigma of the Swords." In this essay, Napier cleverly posits that Jesus was saddened by his apostles' "defection of faith" and thus found it necessary to make them aware of their faithlessness via a tacit, but nonetheless implied question: "Have you forgotten my lesson [i.e., when I sent you without purse, bag, or sandals, did you lack anything?]" Though the apostles remember that they lacked nothing, they had not really learned the lesson. On the contrary, they thought—according to Jesus' implied question—that they were "in a situation...for which God is not sufficient." Since they could no longer trust God, they had to trust themselves, which mandated that they have swords. To quote Napier, "If that be so, and your safety, or mine, depends upon a *sword*, sell your cloak, if need be, and buy one." The apostles—"obtuse and dull of understanding"—then fail to grasp the meaning of Jesus' declaration of purpose in v. 37. In response to their dullness of hearing, Jesus utters "the brief and final word of sorrow, 'It is enough.'" Finally, Napier asks in his concluding paragraph, "Can we read it otherwise?" Amazingly, he retorts, "Not intelligibly, as I judge." For Napier, this explanation is self-confirming, because it removes the enigma of the passage, "relieves the narrator of any charge of untrustworthiness," and "vindicates Jesus, exonerating Him from the appearance or charge of inconsistency in word or action..."<sup>196</sup> Despite an exegetical desire for consistency, Napier's proposition must be rejected, if for no other reason than the artistic liberties it assumes. In other words, it relies on inventive interpolations for a text that is notoriously ambiguous to say the least.

---

<sup>196</sup> All quotes in this paragraph are from T. M. Napier, "The Enigma of the Swords," *ExpTim* 49 (1939): 467-470.



In his response to T. M. Napier's essay, W. Western used the first definition of μάχαιρα from his edition of Liddell & Scott to make sense of the passage. Since μάχαιρα is "a large knife" and "part of a fisherman's usual outfit," Western asks, "[M]ay it not have been that our Lord realized that the time was fast approaching when the disciples would need to return, for a time at any rate, to their former method of living?" Furthermore, as "Fishers of fish'...they would need their knives as in former times," though only temporarily "until the Holy Ghost" came and transformed them into "Fishers of men." Thus when Jesus said, "It is enough!" he meant, "That will do," "Those will do," or "Two are enough."<sup>197</sup> Again, relying on Liddell and Scott, Western also suggests that ἱκανόν ἐστίν may mean "'They [i.e., the fishing knives] are large enough' or perhaps, 'long enough.'"<sup>198</sup> Western presents a charming and quaint proposition, though it is not a convincing one, especially since most of the apostles were apparently not fishermen. In addition, his philological extrapolations are open to debate.

S. K. Finlayson challenges Western's fisherman's knife theory on the grounds that "there was an element of organized arming among them [i.e., the apostles]." Rather than encouraging the apostles to return to their ordinary life of fishing as Western claims, Finlayson suggests that Jesus, "as a *guru*," had "to win [the apostles'] consent by persuasion," which could only occur when he "by indirect means" was able to get them to reveal their "actual position," specifically, they already possessed swords. The wisdom of Jesus' teaching strategy is thus ultimately disclosed at his arrest when he declares—in a classic teachable moment—that "all who take the sword will perish by the sword."<sup>199</sup> Though Finlayson's proposition is appealing at first glance and more aligned with Napier's, it is undermined by the simple fact that Luke does not include the

---

<sup>197</sup> The preceding quotes in this paragraph are from W. Western, "The Enigma of the Swords," *ExpTim* 50 (1939): 377.

<sup>198</sup> W. Western, "The Enigma of the Swords, St. Luke xxii. 38," *ExpTim* 52 (1941): 357. Along somewhat similar lines, Eckey also seems to favor a petite weapon with his use of „Messer" ("knife") or „Dolch" ("stabbing weapon") rather „Schwert" ("sword"). Eckey, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 900-901. However, Joseph A. Fitzmyer points out that after Herodotus μάχαιρα "came to designate 'sword' generically and is used in the LXX of various types of swords." Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke 10-24* (AB 28a; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1985), 1433. Cf. W. Michaelis, "μάχαιρα," *TDNT* 4:524-527.

<sup>199</sup> All quotes are from S. K. Finlayson, "The Enigma of the Swords." *ExpTim* 50 (1939): 563.

proverb regarding those who take up the sword. Unfortunately, for Finlayson's theory, that detail is found in Matthew's gospel, not Luke.

### 1.2.10 Summary of Literature Survey

To summarize, earlier interpretive strategies analyzed the "two-sword" saying with traditional historical-critical methods, tended to reflect theological concerns (e.g., How does this pericope illuminate Lukan theology? Is the sword-logion literal or symbolic?), and brought to the fore a variety of issues. For Conzelmann, the sword-logion centered on the meaning of *ἀλλὰ νῦν* (Luke 22:36) and Luke's theological template of the three epochs of salvation. Using literary criticism, Minear challenged Conzelmann's theoretical divisions of salvation history and sought to ascertain the identity of the *ἄνομοι* with the hope of understanding Luke's use of Isa 53:12.

Along a similar line of thought, Lampe used source and redaction criticism to unravel the tacit objective behind Luke's use and redaction of Mark 14:47 in light of Isa 53:12. In whatever way Lampe succeeded in making his case, he believed that it revealed Luke's purpose that the Isaianic prophecy and the two swords bear witness to the fact that the apostles are the *ἄνομοι*. Yet Jesus' (Luke's) sword-word was meant to encourage the apostles in their "lonely struggle in a bitterly hostile world," since they will not be "abandoned without hope to the power of darkness (cp. 22:53)."<sup>200</sup> Gormley, too, employed source and redaction criticism—along with grammatical criticism—in order to probe Luke's recension of Mark 14:27-28. But her focus, unlike Lampe's, centered on Luke's wholesale excision of Zech 13:7 (quoted in Mark 14:28) with the intention of explaining Luke's omission of the disciples' flight after Jesus' arrest and Luke's emphasis on Jesus' post-resurrection appearances in Jerusalem.

Using aspects of form criticism, Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus proposed different historical settings with the aim of revealing Luke's paraenetic message for a hypothetical audience. The *Sitz im Leben* for Heiligenthal and Bartsch was either the reign of Agrippa I (41-44 C.E.) or the Jewish Wars (66-70 C.E.), respectively. In either scenario, both exegetes concluded

---

<sup>200</sup> Lampe, "Two Swords," 338, 348.

that Luke allowed Christians to take up arms and resist those who sought to harm them. The *Sitz im Leben* for Vööbus was Luke's contemporary community that needed further instruction about liturgical practices and exhortation in the face of opposition. However, unlike Heiligenthal and Bartsch, Vööbus did not see any authorization for the use of force in Luke's sword-logion.

In contrast to the more moderate and qualified positions of the preceding, both Brandon and Price understood Luke 22:35-38 as a call to arms, especially Brandon. They were critical of exegetes who attempted to interpret this difficult passage metaphorically. Rather than impose a spiritual meaning on the text, they read it literally and thus promoted an ideological reading that endorsed the use of force. Their downfall, however, was the thorough-going pejorative and tendentious way in which they constructed their arguments in order to corroborate their conclusions.

Finally, Kruger used traditio-historical criticism and drew on two HB traditions (i.e., Yahweh's Divine Warrior and Isaiah's Suffering Servant) in order to explain Jesus' excruciating temptation in the crucible of Gethsemane. The hypothetical question that Kruger projected onto Jesus with the aim of illuminating his struggle was: "Should I [i.e., Jesus] follow violent human ways and take up the sword or submit to the Father's will and succumb to the sword?" According to Kruger, Jesus rejected the former, violent identity and submitted to the latter, servant identity, the one to which he was appointed by God.

### **1.2.11 Excursus: Didactic Readings**

Most commentaries were excluded from the literature survey because this genre tended to lack wide-ranging, critical assessment of Luke's sword-logion on a level required for this project. In many ways the commentaries could not meet the threshold I had established, since more often than not they focused on teasing out didactic or paraenetic elements from the

pericope. For many commentaries, these elements were appropriate and undoubtedly a necessary concern for the author or publisher or both.<sup>201</sup>

That being said, the literature survey is deficient unless I talk about a few recent and noteworthy commentaries, especially those that strike a balance between exegesis and exhortation.<sup>202</sup> Furthermore, even though these commentaries did not warrant an extensive review in the literature survey, they are valuable resources, heavily imbued with theological reflections, and advanced my research in two ways. First, they mention a number of important bibliographic sources that otherwise might have been overlooked. Second, they occasionally point out an important position or raise a significant question. Therefore, it is appropriate to draw attention to some of the more constructive commentaries below.

William Hendrickson's commentary subdivides the gospel into coherent narrative units, which are further subdivided into their appropriate pericopes. Each pericope is quoted and immediately followed with Hendrickson's analysis. This examination is completed by means of a combination of limited reflections, observations, and brief outline notes. The blending of exegesis and exhortation continues at the conclusion of each narrative unit when Hendrickson presents "Practical Lessons Derived from Luke..." and his "Notes on Greek Words, Phrases, and Constructions in..."<sup>203</sup>

John Nolland's commentary is particularly notable in its attempt to offer both exegesis and exhortation. Each pericope is introduced with a caption that suggests the passage's meaning

---

<sup>201</sup> Four examples include: (1) Keith F. Nickle, *Preaching the Gospel of Luke: Proclaiming God's Royal Rule* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000); (2) Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); (3) Walter Russell Bowie, *The Compassionate Christ: Reflections from the Gospel of Luke* (New York; Nashville: Abingdon, 1965); and (4) Dorothy Yoder Nyce, *Jesus' Clear Call to Justice* (Waterloo, Ont.; Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald, 1990), 23-28. Both the book's title and the subheading for Luke 22:35-38, i.e., "Jesus warns them to prepare for hostility," are indicative of Nickle's homiletic focus. Op. cit., 237. According to Kingsbury, the disciples "must be prepared to endure persecution." Op. cit., 21, cf. 130. The heading of Luke 22:31-38 in Bowie's work is: "When Life is Critical." Op. cit., 282. Jesus' words in Luke 22:35-38, according to Nyce, exhort the disciples "to find their way within a hostile world. Therefore, he urges, be courageous, be determined, be like an armed fighter who continues to struggle." Op. cit., 26.

<sup>202</sup> For a concise review of leading older commentaries, see T. M. Napier, "The Enigma of the Swords," *ExpTim* 49 (1939): 467-470. For an excellent and concise review of later commentaries and more recent Lukan scholarly research by type of work, see Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 15-22.

<sup>203</sup> William Hendrickson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978), 975-980.

and message (e.g., the heading for Luke 22:35-38 is “New Rules for a Time of Crisis”). A rather extensive bibliography, original translation of the Greek text, notes on the Greek, and a section called “Form/Structure/Setting” precedes the author’s “comment.” The “comment” section balances exegesis, references to other scholarly works, and critical analysis. Though not exclusively, most of the exhortation is reserved for the final “explanation” section.<sup>204</sup>

Instead of dividing the analysis into subsections—as does Nolland’s commentary—I. Howard Marshall’s commentary brings all of the elements mentioned above into one continuous, well-articulated exploration of the pericope. With an economy of words, Marshall moves quickly as he exegetes the Greek, presents both complementary and opposing positions, and offers his understanding of the gospel narrative. Though his emphasis is certainly on exegesis, exhortation is not entirely absent. To cite one example, Marshall’s commentary on verse 36 concludes as follows: “Rather the saying is a call to be ready for hardship and self-sacrifice.” A point that is applicable both to the apostles and any disciple of Jesus, past and present.<sup>205</sup>

Though not as inclined to offer conventional exhortations as the commentaries cited above do, Charles H. Talbert’s *Reading Luke* is worth mentioning because of the analytical method he employs. Talbert sets aside source critical issues as he “investigates the third gospel with a type of redaction criticism heavily influenced by nonbiblical literary criticism.” Under the influence of this adopted literary criticism, Talbert attempts to understand “large thought units and their relationship to Lukan thought as a whole rather than focusing on individual pieces of the narrative.” The most interesting contribution, however, is Talbert’s assertion that Luke-Acts is most like a “cultic biography” whose function is to “legitimate the founder’s successors” and “legitimate the founder’s positions.”<sup>206</sup>

---

<sup>204</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53* (WBC 35c; Dallas: Word, 1993), 1074-1078.

<sup>205</sup> I Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 823-827.

<sup>206</sup> Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1-3. For a recent literary and narrative investigation of Luke that incorporates Talbert’s earlier study of correspondences in Luke-Acts (i.e., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974]), see Douglas S. McComiskey, *Lukan Theology in the Light of the Gospel’s Literary Structure* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Bletchley, UK and Waynesboro,

## 1.3 Thesis and Methodology

### 1.3.1 Thesis and Scope of the Study

Given the puzzling nature of Luke 22:35-38 and the angst interpreters experience apart from whatever critical method they apply, it is apposite once again to investigate Luke 22:35-38. This project is particularly germane because of the on-going difficulties associated with this passage. Lacking any full resolution for the conundrums that this pericope presents, a different strategy seems justified, since it might entail probative value in deciphering the text's enigmatic dialogue between Jesus and his apostles. In view of these realities, this investigation will therefore neither injudiciously dismiss the apostles' statement about having two swords nor fail to address what appears illogical about their claim.<sup>207</sup> Instead, this project will view Jesus' final remark—"It is enough"—neither as a sardonic reprimand nor move too quickly to suggest that a paraenetic purpose stands behind Luke's inclusion of this passage as many scholars propose.

My thesis is as follows: using tradition criticism<sup>208</sup> I will argue that a minor HB tradition, whose provenance begins in Gen 34 when two of Jacob's sons, Simeon and Levi, take up their swords to avenge the humiliation of their sister Dinah, stands behind Luke's sword-logion and that reading Luke 22:35-38 in light of that tradition illuminates Luke's enigmatic pericope. In other words, this HB tradition—that I will call the "two-sword" *traditum*—provides the religious and cultural milieu in which Luke 22:35-38 should be read and interpreted. In addition, as the Gen 34 episode is refracted in the Apocrypha (i.e., *Judith*, *4 Maccabees*, *Sirach*, *1 Esdras*), the Pseudepigrapha (i.e., *Jubilees*, *Aramaic Levi*, *Testament of Levi*, *Theodotus*, *Joseph and*

---

GA: Paternoster, 2004). After applying his eleven tests for intentionality, McComiskey concludes that "the degree of correspondence suggested by Talbert [for Luke 9:1-48 and 22:7-23:16] is doubtful. He [Talbert] has successfully demonstrated, however, Luke's concern to link in the reader's mind the Galilean and Jerusalem ministries of Jesus by using occasional striking parallels to provide continuity between textually distant sections." *Op. cit.*, 147. For McComiskey's complete analysis of Talbert's suggested correspondences between Luke 9:1-48 and 22:7-23:16, which includes Luke's sword-logion, see *op. cit.*, 135-147, 157-158.

<sup>207</sup> E.g., how can possessing two swords be a rational response to Jesus' instruction in v. 36?

<sup>208</sup> Other terms scholars use interchangeably with tradition criticism include: traditio-historical criticism, tradition history, and tradition history criticism.

*Aseneth, Testament of Simeon*), and other Jewish writings (i.e., Philo of Alexandria, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus), this ancestral story is celebrated by Israel's descendents, because these two brothers—who picked up the sword for the sake of righteousness—are afforded a renowned place in Jewish lore as their deed is retold, adapted, and amplified. In sum, when Luke reports that Jesus' apostles have two swords in their possession, Luke is obliquely alluding to this ancient hagiographic tale and simultaneously repudiating the ideals of the "two-sword" *traditum* by means of his sophisticated writing style.

Based on the preceding propositions and in contrast to prior methodological and interpretative approaches, I submit that the apostles' response—"Lord, look, here are two swords"—was neither a contradictory nor outrageous rejoinder. Their answer was coherent because sufficient evidence exists to sustain the proposition that, for Luke, both Jesus and his disciples were familiar with Israel's "two-sword" *traditum* about Simeon and Levi whose source goes back to Gen 34. In addition, I claim that Jesus' final reply, "It is enough," was not necessarily a rebuke. *Pace et contra* many interpreters, Jesus' rejoinder makes sense, because both he and his disciples were aware of the "two-sword" *traditum*.

Before moving on to describe this project's methodological approach, a few preliminary comments about nature of the thesis are appropriate. In the opening sentence of his outstanding tome on Paul's letter to the Romans, Stanley K. Stowers offered the following assessment of his endeavor, "The thesis of this book is easy to state but difficult to prove."<sup>209</sup> His words capture succinctly the nature of this endeavor. Indeed, they are extraordinarily apropos. For even though I will marshal as much evidence as possible to support my proposition that a "two-sword" *traditum*, whose provenance can be traced to the Gen 34 narrative about Simeon and Levi, is the implicit background for Luke's obscure sword-logion, it can never be proved beyond any doubt. I also acknowledge that the "two-sword" *traditum* is better classified as a "tradition" rather than a "Tradition" (e.g., like those about the migration of Abraham, the Jacob-cycle, Moses and the

---

<sup>209</sup> Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, & Gentiles* (New Haven & London: Yale, 1994), 1.

Exodus, the David kingdom, and Zion theology). As Walter Harrelson correctly observes, “[N]ot everything that the ancient Israelites passed along orally or in writing was felt to be of such significance. There was Tradition and there were traditions.”<sup>210</sup> But even though neither the HB nor other Jewish writings refer to this tradition as the “two-sword” *traditum*, I will not invent it *ex nihilo*. Rather, using the HB and subsequent refraction of that ancestral story, I will establish the likelihood that such a tradition existed and that that tradition provides an imaginative, insightful way to interpret this cagey pericope.<sup>211</sup>

As the literature survey established, previous attempts to elucidate the meaning of Luke’s sword-logion identified significant issues. For example, Conzelmann’s theological examination rightly pointed out the importance of ἀλλὰ νῦν. Minear’s literary critique highlighted the identity of “the lawless ones [οἱ ἄνομοι].” Both Lampe and Gormley stressed Luke’s editorial skill in their source-redaction investigations of his adaptation of Mark 14:47 and Mark 14:27-28, respectively, especially as it relates to the use of Isa 53:12. In their respective form critical studies, Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus sought to set the passage within a later historical context that would make sense of Jesus’ admonition to the apostles to buy a sword. Even the ideological slant displayed by Brandon and Price is not without merit, for it considered the possibility that Jesus’ exhortation was perhaps more literal than metaphorical, which dominated the interpretative landscape. And finally, Kruger’s imaginative analysis based on two well-known OT traditions was a clever maneuver that placed Jesus in a highly dramatic tête-à-tête.

Though all of the preceding scholars and their respective critical analyses are germane and evoke important questions, they do not address Luke 22:35-38 in the way I propose. For me, it is not a matter of simply applying a standard critical method or ideological perspective to the pericope. Adding to this project’s imprecision is the fact that Luke neither cites nor directly alludes

---

<sup>210</sup> Walter Harrelson, “Life, Faith, and the Emergence of Tradition,” in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament* (ed. Douglas A. Knight; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 17.

<sup>211</sup> Due to the utterly abstract nature of this project’s thesis (i.e., it is entirely a theoretical construct that originates outside the boundaries of any confirmed historical facts), it displays a number of correspondences with Mark A. Matson’s first-rate effort to demonstrate that Luke was in dialogue with the Gospel of John as he [i.e., Luke] wrote his gospel. Mark A. Matson, *In Dialogue with Another Gospel?* 18-19, 441-444.



to Simeon and Levi. If Luke had done so, then it might have been possible to make a stronger case—along similar lines as Pamela M. Eisenbaum does with Hebrews 11 in *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History*—that these two heroic brothers were being assimilated and used by Luke to “explain and legitimate the existence of the community,” besides the supplementary purpose of exhorting his community to faithful living.<sup>212</sup> However, since Luke neither mentions nor even appears to hint of them, my argument must necessarily be more subtle and nuanced than the one put forward by Eisenbaum.

In spite of that obstacle, this project will nevertheless attempt to identify, describe, and then apply a minor biblical tradition to Luke’s sword-logion in order to tease out the passage’s meaning. Although I will address many of the same issues highlighted in the literature survey, my approach will conjoin biblical intertextuality and cultural intertextuality in a fresh re-examination of Luke’s sword-logion.<sup>213</sup> In particular, my thesis corresponds in significant ways to Richard Valantasis’ understanding of “intertextuality as a cultural phenomenon” that goes beyond “the literal dependence of systems of language, or sequences of narratives, or correlations of scenes and characters” though not excluding the latter when relevant.<sup>214</sup> As Valantasis further explains:

---

<sup>212</sup> Eisenbaum’s full comment is: “To be sure, that the heroes are examples of an abstract principle, such as faith, is one function of a hero list. In my assessment, however, the primary function of a multi-dimensional hero list is to explain and legitimate the existence of the community which is being addressed, by grounding the members of that community in a significant genealogical history.” Pamela M. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (SBLDS 156; Atlanta; Scholars, 1997), 87.

<sup>213</sup> For a very helpful discussion on intertextuality and its inherent pitfalls, including a thorough review of many prominent theorists and critics (e.g., Mikhail Bakhtin, Harold Bloom, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva, Michael Riffaterre), see Thais E. Morgan, “Is There an Intertext in This Text? Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality,” *AJS* 3 (1985): 1-40. Morgan initially sets out the problematic nature of intertextual studies as he describes the counterbalance that exists between literary “influence” and “inspiration” and how an author “imitates or borrows features from an earlier text or set of texts, but in the process changes or transforms these features to suit the characteristics of his own previous work.” He then discusses the challenge of “steer[ing] between the Scylla of source-hunting and the Charybdis of personality worship” as he analyzes various intertextual theories, their relationship to semiotics, and their implications for cultural intertextuality. This version of the essay is from: <http://0-proquest.umi.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/pqdweb?index=3&did=797172891&SrchMode=3&sid=1&Fmt=3&Vinst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1240442997&clientId=48347&aid=1>. For a brief discussion on using intertextuality as an approach for biblical interpretation, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14-21.

<sup>214</sup> Richard Valantasis, “The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The *Acts of Thomas* and Cultural Intertextuality,” *Semeia* 80 (1997): 262-263. Cf. George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, “Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis,” *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7, who similarly state that “intertextuality is very much concerned with a range of social practices and cultural expressions, including but not limited to literary texts.” In my opinion,

“Texts materialize cultural systems of communication and discourse: a text, that is, may be construed as any cultural phenomenon which communicates discursively provided it has some material base.”<sup>215</sup> Relying on and extrapolating from the work of Averil Cameron, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Umberto Eco, Valantasis offers the following definition of intertextuality.

Intertextuality, therefore, is not limited merely to written or literary texts, but may revolve, in fact, about the invocation and interaction of cultural ‘texts’ which would include performances, concepts, images and metaphors, as well as literary texts and any number of other cultural phenomena interrelating materiality.<sup>216</sup>

Adapting Valantasis’ theory to my project results in the following rewording of my thesis: the sword-logion text (i.e., Luke 22:35-38) reflects the taken-for-granted (i.e., Jewish and early Christian) milieu of the first century in its use of a culturally popular, hagiographic tale of Simeon and Levi whose material base is derived from Gen 34 and refracted in later Jewish writings.<sup>217</sup>

In some ways my endeavor also corresponds with Calum M. Carmichael’s work that sought to show the influence of Genesis traditions on Deuteronomic law. In his opening sentence he asserts “that certain laws in the Deuteronomic legislation are about many of the women we

---

they also rightly assert that “texts acquire meaning to the extent that they are situated in relation to other texts [read expansively, since it includes not only written texts, but also societal, historical, and cultural texts] in a web of mutual interference and illumination.” Idem, 8. Of course, “intertextuality” is admittedly a challenging concept. Nevertheless, I think Valantasis and Aichele and Phillips offer a definition that is sufficiently bounded so as not to be widely misconstrued. In my estimation, they are using “intertextuality” more in the “broad” sense as Arie Troost defines it when he differentiates between two types of intertextuality: “Narrow intertextuality may be conceived of as the use of quotations, allusions, and the like...Broad intertextuality may be conceived of as the use of various codes, conventions, and interpretative schemes.” Arie Troost, “Reading for the Author’s Signature: Genesis 21.1-21 and Luke 15.11-32 as Intertexts,” in *A Feminist Companion to Genesis* (FCB<sup>2</sup>; ed. Athalya Brenner; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1993), 252. For further discussion on intertextuality, idem, 251-259, and Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. Leon S. Roudiez; trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez; New York: Columbia, 1980), 15 (definition), 36-63, esp. 36-38.

<sup>215</sup> Valantasis, “Nuptial Chamber,” 263. At the conclusion of his essay, Valantasis makes the following observation: “As Christianity developed during the second and third centuries CE, its texts became a part of this cultural fabric, and hence they became part of the intertextual fabric of the time. Cultural intertextuality seems simply to be a fact of life in a communicating culture.” Idem, 274. In a corresponding way, I contend that the legendary tale of Simeon and Levi from Gen 34, especially as it was celebrated in apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature was part of the “intertextual fabric” standing behind Luke’s gospel.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 264.

<sup>217</sup> Roger Lapointe, “Tradition and Language,” in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament* (ed. Douglas A. Knight; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 128, 140, concurs when he says, “Language does not operate in isolation from extra-linguistic circumstances. It is completely meaningful in the midst of the situation where it belongs...Since spoken language operates in the context of live and concrete situations, tradition was therefore related to situations.”

meet in the book of Genesis.”<sup>218</sup> Throughout his monograph he argues that the Genesis narratives were foundational in the formation of the Deuteronomic laws, particularly those related to women. To be sure, Carmichael’s thesis succeeds or fails on his ability to make plausible connections between Genesis and Deuteronomy even though the women (i.e., Sarah, Rachel, Leah, Dinah, Bilhah, and the daughters of Lot) are not explicitly named in Deuteronomy.<sup>219</sup> Yet in the face of this challenge, Carmichael makes a rational case for his thesis via a systematic analysis.

In a similar way, my challenge is to marshal sufficient evidence that demonstrates a sound way to interpret Luke’s sword-logion notwithstanding a clear, obvious reference to the “two-sword” *traditum* or allusion to the Gen 34 narrative.<sup>220</sup> Despite this challenge, since Luke

---

<sup>218</sup> Calum M. Carmichael, *Women, Law, and the Genesis Traditions* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, 1979), 1. In the process of describing his project, Carmichael further delineates his aim as follows: “The premise is that the source of the problems taken up in the Deuteronomic legislation is not, as is almost universally thought, matters that arose in the everyday life of the Israelites at various times and places, but matters that are found in the literary traditions available to the legislator in his time.” Then toward the close of the introductory overview, Carmichael specifically addresses the relationship between the book of Deuteronomy and women. He says, “The reason why in Deuteronomy awareness of nationhood goes hand in hand with sensitivity to raising the status of women is readily explained. Almost all of the laws involving them issue from reflection upon and response to the situations of women whose humiliating treatment was invariably at the hands of members of foreign groups. Moreover, the humiliation they experienced was traceable not just to a foreign group but to the ancestors of the Israelite nation themselves.” Much later, Carmichael raises an important question. He asks, “What then has prompted the law? The answer is again the Deuteronomist’s reflection upon a Genesis tradition.” *Idem*, 4, 7, 39.

<sup>219</sup> For example, despite lacking any direct reference to Dinah in Deut 22:13-21, Carmichael suggests that “[t]he question thrown up by Dinah’s status, which is linked to the concern expressed by Simeon and Levi about Shechem’s having made her a harlot, has sparked the two-part law in Deut 22:13-21, especially the second part.” Then, as he continues to reflect on the Dinah tale, Carmichael also maintains that “[t]he lawgiver puts questions to the material in Genesis 34 as if it involved matters Israelite. Shechem’s seduction of Dinah raises, as we shall see in the law of Deut 22:28, 29, the issue of an Israelite’s seduction of an unbetrothed woman.” In the end, Carmichael concludes that the laws in Deut 22:13-21, 28-29 are “from reflection upon a common source—Genesis 34 (with the aid of Genesis 29).” *Op. cit.*, 37, 47.

<sup>220</sup> Even though I was not entirely convinced by all of Carmichael’s literary connections (e.g., “**Law: Exclusion of eunuchs from Yahweh’s assembly**” based on “*Background: The circumcision of the Hivites*,” *Law and Narrative*, 226-228; see book’s full citation below), in light of this similar challenge, I am sympathetic to his venture. Obviously, since many laws of Deuteronomy are casuistic (i.e., case-based)—as are vast numbers of laws everywhere (e.g., building codes)—I do not find Carmichael’s thesis that far-fetched. Conversely, since it is impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether or not the point of origin for many of the Deuteronomic laws can be traced back to the Genesis traditions, Carmichael’s conclusions remain in the realm of speculation, as will mine. For more discussion regarding the dependence of law on narrative, see *idem*, *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue* (Ithaca—London: Cornell, 1985). For specific comments on Gen 34, most of which are shortened representations of Carmichael’s thoughts found in *Women, Law, and Genesis Traditions*, see 193-197, 218-220, 226-228, 240-246, 270-276.

frequently uses or alludes to the OT in his gospel (and even cites a portion of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37)<sup>221</sup> and on the basis of Valantasis' cultural intertextual assertions and Carmichael's model, there is, arguably, a reasonable chance that Luke did so very subtly in his sword-logion.

At this point, prudence might demand that I opt to find more fertile soil to till. If there is no expectation of nothing more than establishing some probability that a secondary HB tradition lurks in the background of Luke's sword-logion, why bother with the task at all? Indeed, once all the evidence has been assembled and scrutinized, it may be necessary to conclude as follows: "It is impossible to confirm with any confidence that this tradition—though it exists—stands behind and helps explain this pericope." In other words, when all is said and done the thesis might ultimately fail to be established, since I cannot and should not affirm more than I can reasonably demonstrate.

Yet my prior scientific training compels me to press on even though the outcome is indeterminate and uncertain, because a disproved hypothesis has value; specifically, in this case it would eliminate from future consideration a previously untested, prospective strategy for interpreting Luke 22:35-38. However, if this thesis is confirmed—albeit with some reservations—then the thesis has some merit. It demonstrates an effective way to apply an accepted critical method and thus extend its application to other passages that might also be ingeniously constructed with a HB tradition in view.

I also find motivation for this project's research objective from two respected Lukan scholars. At the conclusion of his chapter entitled, "The Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel," Bovon proposes "two tasks for research." He writes:

The first, for which one can already feel the lure, would be to specify the Hellenistic Jewish and Christian exegetical milieu in which Luke swims and determine which type of exegesis most influenced him (the recent distinctions between targumic, midrashic, and haggadic, hermeneutic have little influenced Lukan studies so far). The second would be to analyze meticulously the literary function of the citations.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup> E.g., see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years*, 87-121.

<sup>222</sup> Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years*, 120.

Obviously, this project will not take on the first task, which I consider to be an encyclopedic endeavor far beyond the limited scope of my thesis. Nonetheless, I do think this project can contribute to Bovon's dream in a small way, since a clever and latent midrashic or haggadic hermeneutic by Luke may unlock the meaning of this pericope. In a similar way, though the primary aim of this dissertation is not "to analyze meticulously the literary function of the citations," I will certainly examine the literary function of one: Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 in light of the "two-sword" *traditum*.

Finally, Taylor—another prominent Lukan scholar who argued for a proto-Luke source—was likewise fascinated by OT traditions that furnish a necessary backdrop for anyone who hopes to acquire some sense of "the historical Jesus." To that end, Taylor astutely observed the following: "Step by step we have been driven back, behind the Apocalyptic Literature, to the Old Testament itself, and compelled to see Jesus in its light."<sup>223</sup> He rightly cautions, furthermore, that "[w]e do not possess the key to the mind of Jesus when we know the relevant Old Testament concepts; all we have gained is the right to approach the door."<sup>224</sup> While I will not attempt to discover the elusive "historical Jesus," I will, with Taylor's qualified objective in mind, engage the task that I have set out. In short, my aim is, to borrow Taylor's words loosely, "To see Jesus in its [i.e., the OT traditions'] light."

### 1.3.2 Theory Base and Methodological Approach

Let me first state what the project is not—a sort of *via negativa*. Whereas much gospel research frequently centers on the synoptic problem (i.e., what is the relationship of Mark, Q, Matt, and Luke?) and a search for the authentic words of Jesus (e.g., the Jesus Seminar), that is not a goal of this venture. Furthermore, as the literature survey indicated, many of the standard

---

<sup>223</sup> Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 4.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

methods of historical criticism (e.g., source, form, redaction, and grammatical),<sup>225</sup> have already been applied to Luke 22:35-38. For that reason they will not serve as foundational methodologies for this dissertation. I have also elected not to utilize rhetorical criticism. In my opinion, the narrative features of the Gospels make them less suitable to rhetorical analysis.<sup>226</sup> Finally, I will

---

<sup>225</sup> For an introductory survey of these critical methods, see John H. Hayes and Carl R. Holladay, *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook* (rev. ed., Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1987). For an overview of NT source, form, and redaction criticism, see Craig A. Evans, "Source, Form, and Redaction Criticism: The 'Traditional' Methods of Synoptic Interpretation," in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 17-45. See also J. Maxwell Miller, "Reading the Bible Historically: The Historian's Approach;" Pauline A. Viviano, "Source Criticism;" Marvin A. Sweeney, "Form Criticism;" and Gail P. C. Streete, "Redaction Criticism;" in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 17-89, 105-121. For an introductory, yet thorough, guide that focuses exclusively on the historical critical methods, see Odil Hannes Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology* (SBLRBS 39; trans. James D. Nogalski; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998). This book was a delightful and surprising discovery. At first, I was taken aback by Steck's initial claim—i.e., "Old Testament exegesis necessarily inquires into the past for the *original meaning* of the text"—because it seemed so rigid and presumptuous. I thought, "Is it really possible for an exegete to assert that s/he has found 'the *original meaning*?' " However, as I read further, it became apparent that Steck, though programmatic and regimented in his methodological approach, demands of himself and his students strict adherence to proper analytical procedures so that a rational case can be made for one's proposed interpretation. For Steck, acceptable interpretation incorporates two complementary poles. On the one hand, "This approach asks about the original meaning which maintains the outlook, character, and richness of an Old Testament text against any patronizing treatment of the biblical message through a later message." On the other hand, he exhorts exegetes to employ "fantasy and imagination" and to find "inconsistencies [that] aid in questioning and observing the *multiplicity of perceptions of God*." In my opinion, Steck presents a balanced approach that depends on necessary critical skills while still integrating the interpreter's creativity and imagination. Op. cit., 1-2, 6-14, 51.

<sup>226</sup> Dennis L. Stamps concurs with this assessment. He criticizes some rhetorical studies of the gospels because they "use a limited understanding of rhetoric: narrative rhetoric that is based primarily on an aesthetics of the imagination rather than on a concept of argumentation or persuasion" and others because they attempt to apply classic Greco-Roman rhetoric, which "is heuristic at best"—a broad charge that I suppose could be leveled against many methodologies, including my own. Stamps correctly—I think—perceives that smaller blocks of the gospels (e.g., didactic sections such as the Sermon on the Mount) and the application of an ancient form of argumentation known as the *chreia* to Jesus' teachings are more productive arenas for rhetorical criticism. I have no doubt that rhetorical criticism is appropriate for investigations of NT letters, which Stamps also notes. But my own sense of the gospels is that their features differ so markedly from the epistles that it is debatable whether rhetorical criticism is a fitting strategy. To state it differently, in light of the nature of the gospels, does rhetorical criticism yield enough fruit to warrant much investment? I think not. Undoubtedly, many will disagree with my position. Even Stamps points out that all discourse is rhetorical and that [r]hetorical criticism...seeks to lay bare both the means of power and the ways of the performance, in order to expose the kinds of effects a discourse produces and how they are produced." He also asserts that "all texts are rhetorical in that all texts are ideological." *Pace* Stamps, however, I remain unconvinced of this claim. I do not deny that any text can be read ideologically, especially one like Luke's sword-logion (e.g., Brandon and Price), but there are times when it appears to me that an anecdote or saying was included in the gospels for no particular purpose other than to ensure that it would not be lost. (E.g., how does Luke 16:18, which concerns divorce and adultery, fit into the surrounding context that addresses greed?) In other words, some stories have been handed down because someone thought it important enough to do so even though the rationale is now lost in the murky and unfathomable waters of the past. In sum, it is impossible at times—at least for me—to determine whether a specific gospel pericope is to inform, persuade, exhort, rebuke, or simply retain a story about Jesus for some indeterminate and irretrievable reason. For more on rhetorical criticism, including the excerpts and comments above, see Dennis L. Stamps, "Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament," in *Approaches to New Testament Study*

neither venture into patristic or later medieval interpretations that posit the existence of and argue about the relationship between the ecclesiastical and political swords,<sup>227</sup> nor will I present a broad, overarching history of interpretation of Luke 22:35-38.<sup>228</sup>

Yet before I describe the primary methodological approach of this investigation, three preliminary comments are warranted. First, since there will be occasions when a word's meaning is examined, philology is a component of this research. However, neither philology nor lexicography will dictate the final outcome of my analysis, since how words function in the wider linguistic framework is the determining factor for meaning or semantics. As James Barr astutely observed, "It is the sentence (and of course the still larger literary complex such as the complete speech or poem) which is the linguistic bearer of the usual theological statement, and not the word (the lexical unit) or the morphological and syntactical connection."<sup>229</sup>

---

(eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 129-169, esp. 148-154. At the close of his essay, Stamps further reveals his preference for viewing rhetorical criticism as "an interpretative perspective rather than a method based on the categories of Greco-Roman rhetorical theory," since it would permit the identification and assessment of "textually-embedded strategies that seek to persuade the reader" followed by an evaluation of "the ideological positions to which the reader(s) is being moved." Stamps, "Rhetorical Criticism," 167. For an additional overview of rhetorical criticism, see Patricia K. Tull, "Rhetorical Criticism and Intertextuality," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 156-80.

<sup>227</sup> For examples of such research see: Gerard E. Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and The Two Swords* (Berkeley: Univ. of California, 1979); Lester L. Field, Jr., *Liberty, Dominion, and the Two Swords: On the Origins of Western Political Theology, 180-398* (South Bend: Univ. of Notre Dame, 1998); and Donald Joseph Grimes, "The Papacy and the Petrine Texts: A Study in the History of Biblical Exegesis (A. D. 800-1300)" (Ph.D. diss., Fordham University, 1981).

<sup>228</sup> On this topic, see Norman Bruce Steen, "The Interpretation of Jesus' Sword-Saying in Luke 22:35-38" (M.Th. thesis; Calvin Theological Seminary, 1981). In his thesis Steen surveys the history of exegesis for Luke's sword-logion from Patristic, Medieval, Reformation, Post-Reformation, and Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Critical Scholarship perspectives (18-40, 50-72). In his own exegesis of the passage, Steen rejects a literal interpretation and adopts a figurative understanding of the sword. On this basis, he proposes that the text's aim is to exhort believers to evangelize. Steen, "Jesus' Sword-Saying," 73-86, esp. 78-86; also 87-126 to some degree.

<sup>229</sup> James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1961), 263. Of particular note is Barr's well-documented, thorough, and measured analysis of G. Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament (TWNT)*. In my estimation Barr rightly points out that: (1) "the etymology of a word is not a statement about its meaning but about its history;" (2) Kittel conflates the meaning of NT words and "the realities signified by them;" and (3) there is the need for placing words in "a related semantic field...[and]...marking off the semantic oppositions...[before one examines]...special contexts and word-combinations." Op. cit., 109, 211, 235. For more on Barr's review of Kittel's *TWNT*, op. cit., 206-62. For a more recent assessment of semantics and modern linguistic theory, see Jeffrey T. Reed, "Modern Linguistics and the New Testament: A Basic Guide to Theory, Terminology, and Literature," in *Approaches*

Second, even though I will not rely principally on standard historical critical methods, they will not be excluded altogether. On the contrary, I will make use of any method when appropriate. For example, if a significant question about which textual variant from the various recensions is preferred, I will not side-step that issue. In such situations I will pause to examine the variant readings in light of established text critical practices in order to adopt and defend a position before the exegetical work proceeds further.

Third, while newer literary approaches under the rubric of postmodernism have rightly stressed that any interpretation is provisional and that the discovery of an author's intent is suspect, I do not adhere to the notion that a text can mean anything despite any such claim to the contrary.<sup>230</sup> For instance, even as I write this sentence I hope and intend to convey some specific meaning to my readers. To achieve that goal and the larger one entailed in this project, I choose words, construct and arrange sentences and paragraphs, incorporate illustrations, restate my points, and summarize at key places. Why? To explain as clearly as possible what I mean with the expectation that the readers will understand what I have written. Undeniably, any reader's understanding will be partial, just as my presentation is partial, since I neither set out all of my thoughts nor explain them completely. Each reader—as well as every author—is also influenced by his or her personal experiences, especially as they relate to one's familiarity with a particular

---

*to New Testament Study* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 222-65, esp. 224-34.

<sup>230</sup> James Barr describes postmodern, new literary critical approaches in the following way: "To summarize the essentials: the past history, sources, and origins of texts are not important, for the meaning—or meanings, for there is not necessarily one right meaning—lies in the text itself. Even the intent of the author is not important. Dates and historical connections are of only minor interest, or none at all." Barr himself, though, is rather skeptical of those who have rejected standard historical criticism and fully embraced the more contemporary literary methods. According to him, [M]odern depictions of the 'theory' of historical criticism are generally inventions of its enemies of recent times." Though I would not go so far as to designate critics of historical criticism as "enemies," Barr presents a compelling and rigorous case for his claim. James Barr, *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of a Millennium* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University, 2000), 21, 24. For additional comments from Barr on the relationship of and tension between historical criticism, recent literary criticism, postmodernism and ideology, *op. cit.*, 16-58, 102-178.



field of study, language skill, general educational background, and cultural presuppositions.<sup>231</sup>

Furthermore, words are frequently clumsy carriers of meaning.

Yet despite all the challenges encountered in the dynamic world of communication, a text cannot mean anything and everything. It is prudent to be cautious about authorial intent and also reader response, recognizing the limitations of both participants.<sup>232</sup> Both author and reader are responsible parties in whatever way dialogue occurs and subsequent meaning is exchanged. As

---

<sup>231</sup> Robert Morgan aptly describes the intersection of the text and interpreter when he states, "But the interpretation chosen does not depend on the nature of the texts alone. Genre is normally important, but here takes second place. Interpretation depends more on the interests of the interpreters..."

"The aims and interests of the interpreters are decisive here. But these are not easy to pin down. They vary even more than the biblical material does. One and the same person may read different parts of the Bible with different aims, or even the same passage with different interests at different times. It seems impossible to generalize about 'what the Bible means', or even what a particular text means. It means different things to different people at different times. The threat of chaos is never far from the surface in biblical interpretation. It has forced theologians to look for ways of restricting interpretations, saying which are admissible and which are to be rejected. A Bible that can mean anything means nothing."

Morgan returns to this topic again when he observes the following: "The notion of a single correct interpretation, identifiable with the intention of authors who succeed in saying what they mean or with the meaning of the semantic conventions actually used by the authors, is sometimes within reach and remains a useful ideal norm for arguing about, and distinguishing between, valid and invalid interpretations. But when clearly invalid interpretations have been excluded there often remains a range of better or worse, more or less satisfying, interpretations. Historical and exegetical discussion still offers the clearest common ground for supporting and disputing all interpretations, but it is the aims of the interpreter or reader that determine which ones satisfy." Robert Morgan with John Barton, *Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University, 1988), 13, 197. For more on the challenges of interpretation and the evolving, dynamic relationship between theology, history, and literature, see op. cit. 1-43, 167-202, 269-296.

<sup>232</sup> For an overview of reader response criticism, see Edgar V. McKnight, "Reader-Response Criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 230-252. Barr characterizes reader-response criticism as an approach which asserts that "meaning is not in the author's intention, it is not even totally controlled by the text itself, it is to a large extent the construction of the reader." On the one hand, Barr puts an appropriate governor on reader-response criticism when he states, "Reader-response theories have to be qualified and limited by controls. For modern people just to read their own ideas and ideologies into the Bible is an invitation to folly and chaos." Barr, *History and Ideology*, 21, 156. On the other hand, if one "does not make allowance enough for difference of temper and situation" (to quote the character Jane Bennett in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* (Jane Austen, *Seven Novels* [New York: Barnes & Noble, 2006], 272), then the reader is entirely excluded even on those occasions when a defensible position can be articulated. David M. Gunn, then, offers an appropriate caution to Barr when he says, "I believe that most readers, at least those who are likely to be reading this essay, have a powerful drive to form interpretations that offer an encompassing, comprehensive, and coherent account of their text. Postmodernist theory, in particular deconstruction, helps me to see that the 'totalizing' drive is hardly inevitable or innocent. It places a premium on sameness (unity) and univocality and devalues difference (diversity) and multivocality. It leads to our ignoring or suppressing the very tensions and fractures in texts that may offer us enlivening insight or, indeed, escape from the tyranny of an interpretative tradition." See David M. Gunn, "Narrative Criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 201-229. In my estimation, both Barr and Gunn make valid points. An interpreter should neither read any and everything into a text nor fail to consider new insights based on "tensions and fractures in texts." The former is an idiot, the latter—though probably not a tyrant—is certainly short-sighted and lacking in imagination.

is hopefully evident by now, I hold to the view that: (1) texts involve authorial purpose though it is only partially comprehensible, but limited understanding is better than none at all; and (2) texts “come to life” when they are engaged by readers, but it is a life that is tenuous and provisional at best—yet some life is better than no life at all. To quote Nelson with one slight, but important modification as indicated by italics, I submit that “in the present study an effort will be made to consider the roles of both author and readers in the quest to establish *one possible* meaning of Luke’s finished text.”<sup>233</sup>

In contrast to the foregoing considerations and turning now to state positively this project’s methodology, my investigation will initially depend on the application of tradition history analysis like that suggested by Walter E. Rast.<sup>234</sup> Building on the seminal work of Hermann Gunkel, which concerned the transmission of oral traditions,<sup>235</sup> and Gerhard von Rad’s two-volume masterpiece on Old Testament Theology,<sup>236</sup> Rast offered plausible descriptions of the processes entailed in “the formation of Old Testament traditions” and the relationship of “tradition

---

<sup>233</sup> Nelson offers a similar point of view about the relationship of authors and readers. In my estimation, he correctly opines, “Texts do ‘come alive’ in the process of reading, and they come to mean many things to many different people. The point here is merely that most authors would not, in all likelihood, concede that every such ‘meaning’ could rightly be thought of as ‘the meaning’ of a text for which they bear responsibility...One who holds that an author’s role is at least of some importance in establishing meaning will see in this kind of subjectivity the deterioration or disintegration of such meaning. We may not choose to make the identification of authorial intent all-important in the quest for meaning, but neither should it be jettisoned...Therefore, in the present study an effort will be made to consider the roles of both author and readers in the quest to establish the meaning of Luke’s finished text.” Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 6, 8.

<sup>234</sup> Walter E. Rast, *Tradition History and the Old Testament* (GBS; ed. Gene M. Tucker; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972). Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis*, 124, defines tradition-historical criticism in the following way: “The tradition historical approach’s inquiry into the text’s traditional contents must be distinguished from the question of the history of the text itself (transmission history and redaction history) and from the linguistic shape of the text (form criticism). It must also be distinguished from the history of a text’s reception which originates with the statements of a text.”

<sup>235</sup> Hermann Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History* (trans. W. H. Carruth; New York: Schocken Books, 1964).

<sup>236</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel’s Historical Traditions* (vol. 1; trans. D. M. G. Stalker; New York—Hagerstown—San Francisco—London: Harper & Row, 1962); trans. of *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels* (BD 1; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1957) and idem, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel’s Historical Traditions* (vol. 2; trans. D. M. G. Stalker; New York—Hagerstown—San Francisco—London: Harper & Row, 1965); trans. of *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels* (BD 2; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1960). For a clearly written, concise summary of the contributions regarding the “history of traditions and Old Testament theology” from both Gunkel and von Rad, see Morgan, *Biblical Interpretation*, 96-104.

history and [the] Hebrew narrative.” Concerning “formation of Old Testament traditions,” Rast noted that tradition historians pursue “four directions” as they “attempt to explore the forces and influences behind the formation of the Old Testament.”<sup>237</sup> These directions relate to: (1) “the community or group that shaped and transmitted a tradition;” (2) “the particular geographical location or locations” associated with a tradition; (3) “social, political, and religious dynamics that are present in the origin and reformulation of a tradition;” and (4) “themes and motifs” entailed in a tradition.<sup>238</sup> Rast described the development of two prominent HB traditions, the Jacob cycle and Second Isaiah, as a way to illustrate the relationship of “tradition history and [the] Hebrew narrative.”<sup>239</sup>

Though Rast identified and described four directions for tradition historians in their attempt to understand the origin and transmission of OT traditions, I will concentrate on the last one, specifically, the themes and motifs embedded within a tradition. Since the first order of business is to establish the existence of a “two-sword” OT tradition—both in canonical and extracanonical sources—related to Simeon and Levi, Rast’s fourth “direction” is my primary concern. Undoubtedly, a “two-sword” *traditum* derived from Simeon and Levi is of minor importance when compared to the Jacob cycle, Sinai tradition, or such similar themes. But as Rast astutely observed,

[T]here is the role tradition plays in the formation and continuation of the Old Testament community. In its own way, tradition-historical examination shows how the continued recapitulation of testimony makes it possible for a community to move into new times and experiences which are still characterized by the power of revelation.<sup>240</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> Rast, *Tradition History*, 19.

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*, 19-29. Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis*, offers an analogous list of four questions: “Who are those responsible for transmitting these thoughts?” “What interest do they have in these thoughts?” “What is the historical setting of the carriers?” and “What experiential aspects of the world are characteristic for them?”

<sup>239</sup> Rast, *Tradition History*, 33-56.

<sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

Extrapolating from Rast's approach to tradition history in the OT, I will thus argue that Luke alludes to a familiar—though decidedly less significant—“two-sword” HB tradition that had been retold many times that informed and shaped the identity of his NT community.

Besides incorporating aspects of Rast's tradition critical approach, I will also mimic Kruger's application of tradition criticism to some degree. As noted earlier, Kruger analyzed the passage in the light of two competing HB motifs (i.e., “the Divine Warrior” and “the Suffering Servant”). According to Kruger, when Jesus approached his final days, he was vacillating between and tempted by these two divergent motifs, but ultimately rejected the former and chose the latter. In my examination of Luke's sword-logion, however, I will scrutinize this pericope via a different HB tradition—namely, the story about Simeon and Levi—and thus depart markedly from Kruger's analysis.

To recap briefly, this endeavor finds some common methodological ground with both Rast and Kruger, but it moves beyond Rast's general OT tradition history study and Kruger's specific application of two HB traditions to Luke 22:35-38 in that it identifies and applies a different HB tradition. I will also rely to a lesser extent on Valantasis' proposal regarding “intertextuality as a cultural phenomenon” and Carmichael's research method that sought to link many of the Genesis narratives with later Deuteronomic law. In sum, my investigation will focus on two principal methodological tasks: (1) to employ the research approach of tradition history criticism alongside the assumptions of Valantasis' cultural intertextuality in order to establish the existence and transmission of a “two-sword” *traditum* prior to and during the first century of the Common Era; and (2) to apply this “two-sword” *traditum* and its correlated ethos in an analysis and exegesis of Luke 22:35-38.

A few final comments are vital as I finish setting out my methodological program. Regarding the first task, it is important to recognize that tradition criticism is a dependent and derivative method. Robert A. Di Vito rightly observes that:

[T]radition criticism [when compared to textual, source, and form criticism] lacks any generally accepted techniques or evaluative criteria of its own. Tradition criticism is at once less and more than other types of criticism. Indeed, it cannot be viewed simply as one method among other methods of biblical criticism. It is

less because it is entirely dependent upon their procedures; but it is also more because it represents an approach to the biblical text that formulates investigative goals for synthesizing the manifold conclusions arrived at through “other” methods.<sup>241</sup>

Di Vito also notes that tradition criticism is particularly dependent on source and form criticism, since it “seeks to reconstruct the history of the transmission of the various individual traditions and tradition complexes that are to be found in the Old Testament.”<sup>242</sup> On the whole, I generally agree with this assessment of tradition history criticism. However, as was indicated in my discussion of Rast’s approach, I am more concerned with the transmission of a specific OT tradition than its pre-literary origin, which is more of a focal point for form-criticism. In other words, my chief interest is on the diachronic transmission of the tradition via canonical and extracanonical written sources.

As to the second task mentioned above, this venture will necessarily draw upon a basic form of literary criticism. Unfortunately, the term “literary criticism” is notoriously problematic, since it denotes a plethora of methods.<sup>243</sup> Yet for the sake of limited clarity, I offer the following

---

<sup>241</sup> Robert A. Di Vito, “Tradition-Historical Criticism,” in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 90.

<sup>242</sup> *Ibid.*, 91. Di Vito presses this point further when he says, “Indeed, it is largely only through form-critical work that the tradition historian is able to identify a textual unit as a piece of tradition as opposed to the free creation of an author.” *Op. cit.*, 92.

<sup>243</sup> For a survey on the varieties of literary criticism and their application to NT research, see Stanley E. Porter, “Literary Approaches to the New Testament: From Formalism to Deconstruction and Back,” in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 77-128. I found several points in Porter’s “Assessment of New Testament Literary Criticism” to be particularly relevant for my research. When speaking of the “strengths” and “limitations” of literary criticism, Porter mentions *inter alia*, the “[e]mphasis upon textual integrity,” placing the “[t]ext before theology,” freeing interpreters “from fear of failure” (an encouraging word for such a speculative enterprise as this), and the possibility of offering “[i]nteresting readings,” which I hope to accomplish and avoid what Porter describes as “[u]nennlightening and pedestrian readings.” I also want to sidestep a common aspect of literary criticism, specifically, the “[n]eglect of important questions.” *Op. cit.*, 112-120. Morgan, too, issues a similar caution associated with literary criticism. He writes, “But biblical scholars are free to remain at the first level of aesthetic criticism, just as they are free to restrict themselves to historical study. Even the majority who have [*sic*] theological interests usually allow the links between these and their biblical criticism to remain unstated. They make an indirect contribution to the theological task by using the rational methods available in their culture and so working on the interface between faith and reason, not by explicating in a theoretical way the links between religious faith and literary or historical criticism. They leave that philosophical task to fundamental theology and are rarely conscious of choosing a ‘theory’ about history or literature. They seldom discuss why they pursue some questions raised by the texts, and not others. Like good soldiers they get on with the job and do not reason why.” Morgan, *Biblical Interpretation*, 220. Morgan’s admonition is well-founded will hopefully furnish additional incentive for this present research. For a thorough survey on “the literary study of the Bible,” see Morgan, *Biblical Interpretation*, 203-268. For an

generic, somewhat imprecise, non-specialist explanation: by literary criticism, I mean the application of common literary analytical techniques that consider topics such as the immediate and extended context, characters, plot and genre.<sup>244</sup> To that end, the final form of Luke 22:35-38, including its situation within the broader literary landscape of the Gospel of Luke, is more critical than its provenance (i.e., form and source criticism are tangential concerns; as is redaction criticism but to a lesser degree). The literary analysis during the exegesis will therefore shift away from diachronic concerns related to the transmission of a specific HB tradition found in written sources to a synchronic focus on the literary characteristics of Luke 22:35-38. To draw upon the resources highlighted in this chapter's literature survey, I suggest that my literary approach is most similar to that used by Minear in his "Note."

My methodological strategy will also incorporate an intertextual dimension, since the "two-sword" *traditum* is found within canonical and extracanonical sources. By the preceding statement I mean that I will make use of some features associated with canonical criticism. For example, in his review of James A. Sanders' *Torah and Canon*,<sup>245</sup> Kent D. Clarke identifies several questions that canonical criticism addresses—questions that are pertinent for this study due to their probative value.<sup>246</sup> Some relevant questions include:

[W]hat...[was]...the function or authority of the ancient tradition in each context where it was cited? How was the ancient tradition used in its new context? To

---

overview of recent literary approaches that apply secular literary critical methods, see Daniel Patte, "Structural Criticism;" David M. Gunn, "Narrative Criticism;" and William A. Beardslee, "Poststructuralist Criticism;" in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 183-229, 253-267.

<sup>244</sup> Briefly and only for introductory purposes, the immediate context for Luke 22:35-38 is the Passover meal. The extended context is the Passion narrative and beyond that the entire Gospel of Luke. The characters are Jesus and his disciples. The plot centers on Jesus' final days in Jerusalem. The pericope's genre is that of a final testament.

<sup>245</sup> James A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972).

<sup>246</sup> For a thorough review and critique of canonical criticism, including its history and the contributions of Brevard S. Childs and James A. Sanders, see Kent D. Clarke, "Canonical Criticism: An Integrated Reading of Biblical Texts for the Community of Faith" in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 170-221. For a brief introduction to canonical criticism, see Mary C. Callaway, "Canonical Criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application* (eds. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes; rev. and exp. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 142-55.

what ends did the biblical writer put the story when he cited it? How did he apply it to the situation he describes? What were his hermeneutical rules? How did other biblical writers make use of the same tradition?<sup>247</sup>

Since Luke does not “cite” any “two-sword” *traditum* whose provenance is found in Gen 34, I will necessarily have to modify the conventional approach of canonical criticism when I begin to analyze Luke 22:25-38 in light of that tradition.<sup>248</sup> To describe it a bit differently, aspects of canonical criticism will play a role in this investigation, especially in chapters two and three when I attempt to establish the existence and transmission of a “two-sword” *traditum* in canonical and extracanonical literature.

To summarize, there is an eclectic or hybrid aspect in my research methodology. Though I will make use of standard historical criticism when helpful, this undertaking will mainly rely upon tradition criticism and literary criticism influenced by canonical criticism.

#### 1.4 Anticipating the Project: Chapter Outline

Chapter two—“*The Origin of the ‘Two-Sword’ Traditum in the Hebrew Bible*”—opens with an analysis and exegesis of Gen 34:1-31, which will establish the canonical provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum* and name four motifs embedded in the narrative. After examining the headwaters of the “two-sword” *traditum*, subsequent references to the Gen 34 narrative in the HB will be identified and evaluated. Priority will necessarily be given to passages that indicate a clear

---

<sup>247</sup> Clarke, “Canonical Criticism,” 187-88.

<sup>248</sup> On the difficulties associated with distinguishing “inner-biblical exegesis” and “inner-biblical allusion,” which is even more pronounced in my project, since no direct reference is indicated in Luke 22:35-38, see Lyle Eslinger, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category,” *VT* XLII, 1 (1992): 47-58. Of particular note and in response to Michael Fishbane, Eslinger highlights two assumptions about inner-biblical exegesis: “Alleged exegetical comments are always marked by two things: temporal distance and authorial differentiation between the exegetical comment and the text commented upon. The first assumption is that an author does not write an interpretative gloss on his own text. Exposition always comes from the pen of some other since an author has no need to reinterpret what he says. The second assumption is that if there is some interconnection of separate texts, say a prophetic book and a pentateuchal book, any discussion of the supposed exegesis presumes a demonstrable precedence. You cannot discuss the qualities of diachronic interpretation in the detailed way that Fishbane does if you are not sure which way the literary connection points.” Eslinger, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 49. The preceding excerpt illustrates well the challenges of this endeavor, which would fall under Eslinger’s category of inner-biblical allusion. While it will not be too difficult to establish the precedence of a “two-sword” (i.e., Simeon-Levi) tradition prior to Luke, it will not be easy to demonstrate the interconnection of Luke and the tradition, since the allusion, if present at all, is subtle.

association with that patriarchal story, especially when the two brothers are specifically referenced. Texts that solely concern Levi's priestly descendents will be relegated to a second tier status unless some connection to Gen 34 is seems apparent. The objective of this chapter is to demonstrate a credible basis for the claim that a "two-sword" *traditum* begins in Gen 34 and to trace its infrequent occurrence elsewhere in the HB via the tradition's four motifs: family identity and honor; vindication of an honored one; national identity and honor; and justified vengeance.

After identifying and tracing the "two-sword" *traditum* in canonical sources, chapter three—"The 'Two-Sword' Traditum in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Other Jewish Writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods"—will survey extracanonical writings in order to further corroborate the existence of a "two-sword" *traditum* and trace its continued refraction. More specifically, this chapter will describe expansions of the story about Levi and Simeon in a wide variety of writings (e.g., Judith, 4 Maccabees, *Jubilees*, *Testament of Levi*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, Philo, and Josephus). Some of the questions to be addressed are: "How does the tradition grow?" "What changes are detected as the tradition develops?" "Is the tradition embellished, and if so, to what extent?" "How frequently do the four motifs appear in these writings?" "Does the tradition come to entail a specific, recognizable theology?" "Is this theology *sui generis* or common to the HB?"<sup>249</sup>

Having established and confirmed the existence of the "two-sword" *traditum* and its ongoing transmission in both canonical and extracanonical Jewish writings in chapters two and three, chapter four—"Luke's Use of the 'Two-Sword' Traditum"—will analyze Luke 22:35-38 in light of that tradition. Stated briefly, this pivotal and climactic chapter will examine the following question: "How does the celebrated 'two-sword' *traditum* impact a reading of Luke 22:35-38?" The chapter will entail three major objectives.

First, I will make the case that Luke routinely used or alluded to Israel's scriptures and traditions. This evidence will demonstrate that Luke was a sophisticated writer whose utilization of

---

<sup>249</sup> Steck speaks of the text "conforming to tradition," "continuing the tradition," and "changing tradition." Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis*, 138-39.



the HB and extracanonical writings indicates that he knew Israel's scriptures and traditions and had internalized them sufficiently to make recurring allusions, often in an oblique manner. This attribute also points to Luke's belief that his community was sufficiently knowledgeable of these traditions so that they could grasp the references as well.

In the second part of chapter four, I will begin the investigation of Luke 22:35-38 by setting the pericope within the narrative landscape of the gospel and stress its relationship to the immediate context (i.e., the farewell address in chapter 22 as well as the broader Passion narrative in Luke 22-24). After that preliminary task, I will then analyze Jesus' *Schwerwort* in light of the "two-sword" *traditum*, which was part of broad intertextual heritage shared by Luke and his community. Operating under the inference previously corroborated (i.e., that Luke is a very literate gospel and so are his readers), I will argue during the exegesis that Luke used the sword-logion and exploited the "two-sword" *traditum* in order to subvert the ideals embedded within that tradition: preservation of identity and honor, defense of an honored one, and justified vengeance. In other words, I propose that Luke exhorted his community to adopt a belief system that stood in opposition to a renowned biblical tradition that was part of their culture's narrative universe.

Third, after the literary critical analysis, I will show how Luke repudiated the "two-sword" *traditum* using an erudite, furtive literary strategy that allowed the fiction of that HB tradition to coexist alongside his vision of God's community before he finally dismantled it with the sword-logion and the arrest scene on the Mount of Olives. To achieve that goal, I will trace the trajectory of the Gospel of Luke in light of the "two-sword" *traditum* via a brief survey of a representative texts (e.g., Luke 2:25; 9:1-6, 51-56; 10:1-16; 11:14-26; 12:49-53; 19:29-40). In each case, I will indicate how the passage adumbrates Luke's desire that members of his community abandon the ideals of the "two-sword" *traditum* and take up his vision of Jesus rather than swords.

In chapter five I will briefly review the project and summarize the main points of my argument. After that I will identify and assess the project strengths and weaknesses. Of course, a portion of the evaluation will entail an overall appraisal of the project's feasibility. Although I firmly believe at the outset that the "two-sword" *traditum* provides a provocative way to approach this

pericope, such a claim can only be sustained after the investigation is complete. Finally, and in view of this specific undertaking, I will offer reasons why I believe the use of tradition criticism is an appropriate, productive, and insightful way to interpret other perplexing NT texts as I consider the significance and contribution for this methodological approach.

## Chapter Two:

### The Origin of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Hebrew Bible

“The story before us is a tale of sharp contrasts: pastoral simplicity and grim violence, love and revenge, candor and duplicity...Hamor and Jacob are peace-loving and conciliatory; their sons are impetuous and heedless of the consequences that their acts must entail. The lovesick Shechem prevails on his father to extend to the Israelites the freedom of the land—with the requisite consent of his followers. But Dinah’s brothers refuse to be that far-sighted. After tricking the Shechemites into circumcising their males, and thus stripping the place of its potential defenders, they put the inhabitants to the sword. Jacob is mournful and apprehensive. But his sons remain defiant and oblivious of the future.”<sup>250</sup>

#### 2.1 Introduction

The provenance for the “two-sword” *traditum* goes back to the events of Gen 34, which thereafter is only occasionally and subtly alluded to in the HB. Yet despite being a relatively minor pericope in Genesis, this text has elicited some rather visceral reactions from interpreters as the excerpt above illustrates. Although neither the HB nor the NT directly refers to this *traditum* as the “two-sword” *traditum*, I will make use of that epithet as a way to signify it, since *two* brothers—Simeon and Levi—took up the *sword* to avenge the defilement and dishonoring of their sister Dinah. In the first part of this chapter, I will identify four motifs and other literary elements found in the initial narrative. Then, I will trace its subsequent reappearance in the HB. These thematic features will also provide the analytical vehicle by which I will follow the tradition as it is refracted in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings. In sum, after identifying this previously unnamed tradition and delineating its transmission in the HB and other writings

---

<sup>250</sup> E. A. Speiser, *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 1; Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), 268. Walter Russell Bowie’s précis about Gen 34 is even more melodramatic, full of unsubstantiated conclusions, exquisitely suggestive of highbrow condescension, and thus worth quoting: “A dark and turbulent old tale is this, with good and evil strangely mingled. There is the pathos of a girl’s betrayal; the wild passion of a young man who was not corrupt at heart; the fierce, unbridled vengeance let loose upon him. It is life in the raw, as it was lived in a primitive society; and yet its essential emotions are common to human beings always.” Walter Russell Bowie, “The Book of Genesis,” (*IB* 1; eds. G. A. Buttrick, et al.; New York: Abingdon/Cokesbury, 1952), 733.

(chapters two and three, respectively), I will make use of the “two-sword” *traditum* in order to interpret Luke 22:35-38 (chapter four).

Since the chief objective in this chapter is to establish the canonical provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum*,<sup>251</sup> I will begin with an exegesis of Gen 34:1-31 that emphasizes the story’s literary features. By examining its narrative traits, I will confirm the initial premise of this project that the “two-sword” *traditum* stems from in Gen 34. The analysis of this passage will highlight the text’s artistic qualities and point out how the author(s) and/or redactor(s) adeptly crafted an impressive, riveting, and memorable hagiographic story. Throughout the exegetical process I will marshal evidence from the text itself in order to corroborate my claim that Gen 34 is the written

---

<sup>251</sup> The aim of this chapter is not to conjecture about the oral traditions behind the “two-sword” *traditum*, which is a goal of form criticism, but to investigate the “two-sword” tradition’s provenance and its subsequent transmission in the HB. For source and redaction critical approaches to Gen 34, see: Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12-36* (CC; trans. John J. Scullion, S.J.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 532-545; Robert Davidson, *Genesis 12-50* (CBC; London—New York—Melbourne: Cambridge, 1979), 191-197; John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930), 417-422; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis: With Introduction and Notes* (WC; 9th ed.; London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1913), 302-308; Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. Bernhard W. Anderson; Chico: Scholars, 1981), 30 n. 99, 84-87, 151, 191, 221 n. 587; Samuel Sandmel, *The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to their Literature and Religious Ideas* (New York: Oxford University, 1978), 365-366; and Cuthert A. Simpson, “The Book of Genesis,” (*IB* 1; eds. G. A. Buttrick, et al.; New York: Abingdon/Cokesbury, 1952), 733-738. For a concise source/redaction analysis, see John Van Seters, “The Silence of Dinah (Genesis 34),” in *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Gen 25-36* (Mélanges offerts à Albert de Pury; *Le Monde De La Bible* 44; eds. Jean-Daniel Macchi et Thomas Römer; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2001), 239-247. Erhard Blum argues for extensive „D-Bearbeitung“ (“D-editing”) of the „Jakobgeschichte (Gen 25-50)” based in part on „der erzählerischen Rolle der handelnden Personen“ (“the narrative role of the acting characters”) in his *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Freudenstadt: Neukirchener, 1984), 204-223. Leslie Brisman, *The Voice of Jacob: On the Composition of Genesis* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1990), 92-98, conducts an unusual source and redaction critical analysis of Gen 34 with his Eisaacic (i.e., a source that resembles E with some P influence) and Jacobic (i.e., a source like J) versions. According to Brisman, the Jacobic narrative “undermines the gentle pathos of Eisaac’s story of Dinah by substituting for its decorous assessment of the dangers of assimilation a less decorous but more shockingly *šālēm* (whole, complete, ‘paid up’) story of iniquity and punishment.” In other words, whereas Eisaac’s story is about the rejection of the proposed marriage between Dinah and Shechem by Jacob’s sons, the Jacobic story is about morality, about rape and justified revenge. Brisman, *Voice of Jacob*, 96. In contrast to the preceding authors who adhere to some form of the Documentary Hypothesis, Yair Zakovitch, “Assimilation in Biblical Narrative,” in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985), 185-192, contends that the final form of Gen 34 is better explained as an original tale with interpolations via the assimilation of three other texts: (1) a hypothetical story, which is similar to the original tale, but seeks to justify the brothers’ behavior; (2) Gen 49:5-7; and (3) 2 Sam 13. For a survey of the history of interpretation of Gen 34, see Robin Allinson Parry, *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethics: The Rape of Dinah as a Case Study* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs; Bletchley, Milton Keynes, UK—Waynesboro, Ga.: Paternoster, 2004), 87-122. For an anthropological analysis of Gen 34, see Julian Alfred Pitt-Rivers, *The Fate of Shechem or The Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1977), 126-171. Though somewhat dated at this point, John S. Kselman’s essay, “The Book of Genesis: A Decade of Scholarly Research,” *Int* 45 (1991): 380-392, is a helpful essay that identifies and provides an overview of important research on Genesis.

provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum*, an ancient literary masterpiece situated within the Jacob-cycle stories of Genesis.

Even though the main task of this chapter is to identify the biblical source for the “two-sword” *traditum*, I will also refer to other important scholarship and highlight some of the more prominent issues associated with Gen 34 throughout the exegesis. This secondary task serves three purposes. First, it demonstrates an appropriate, though not exhaustive, awareness of some of the more notable issues raised by other exegetes. Second, the survey may indirectly uncover additional evidence for the “two-sword” *traditum*. Third, this review provides a way to scrutinize my own work and offers an opportunity to address any critical deficiencies that other research may reveal about my thesis and its underlying assumptions and assertions.

After conducting a thorough exegesis of Gen 34, which is the provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum*, subsequent references and/or allusions to that narrative in the HB will be identified and evaluated. Passages that clearly refer to the Dinah-Shechem episode or specifically name Simeon and Levi together will necessarily receive special attention. Texts that solely concern Levi’s priestly descendents (i.e., the Levites) will be noted but chiefly relegated to a second tier category unless a connection to Gen 34 seems likely or the text addresses a compelling issue related to this project.

To summarize, the objectives of this chapter are three-fold. First, I will demonstrate that the “two-sword” *traditum* comes from in Gen 34 by conducting an exegesis that identifies and accentuates four motifs and literary features of the narrative. Second, I will scrutinize my assertion concerning the provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum* by evaluating other scholarly research on Gen 34. During this assessment I will address any relevant issues discovered during the review and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of my proposal in light of these other studies. Third, I will identify and describe other references to this tradition stream in the HB in order to establish its *traditio* (i.e., transmission and refraction) in canonical literature so as to corroborate my claim that a noteworthy HB tradition began in Gen 34 and was refracted in other portions of the HB.

## 2.2 The Canonical Source for the Tradition

### 2.2.1 Preliminary Observations and a Brief Overview of the Story

Before I launch into a formal, detailed exegesis of the story, I think it is helpful to make a few introductory observations about the narrative's setting in Genesis and present a concise synopsis of the account. Both tasks are appropriate, since they not only provide important background information and furnish a general impression of the story, but also begin to highlight some of its more notable features.

Viewed from a broad perspective, the "two-sword" *traditum* is the last major component of the Jacob-cycle narratives found in Genesis.<sup>252</sup> As the Jacob-cycle (i.e., the stories found in Gen

---

<sup>252</sup> Gordon Wenham raises the question whether this story should even be included in the Jacob-cycle. He states, "Though chap. 34 is well constructed in itself, it is not immediately apparent why it should be included in the Jacob cycle at all; it does not seem to relate to the theme of Genesis...[C]hap. 34 seems to be a digression, contributing very little to the plot. What is its place and function within the Jacob cycle?" Nonetheless, when Wenham looks back, he asserts, "[C]hap. 34 makes an interesting and instructive sequel to chaps. 32-33. There we learned how the fearful and alienated Jacob was changed into the new Israel, who boldly returned to Canaan and made peace with his brother Esau, whom he had struggled with and cheated since birth. But this story shows Jacob's old nature reasserting itself, a man whose moral principles are weak, who is fearful of standing up for right when it may cost him dearly, who doubts God's power to protect, and who allows hatred to divide him from his children just as it had divided him from his brother...Looking ahead, this story provides an interesting backdrop to the story of Joseph and his brothers. There the same underlying division between Leah and her sons on the one side and Jacob and Rachel and her sons, Joseph and Benjamin, on the other is both the starting point and the conclusion of the story. It is Leah's sons' hatred of Joseph that leads them to sell him into Egyptian slavery. This almost breaks Jacob's heart, whereas Dinah's rape seems to have left him unmoved. And the Joseph story goes on to tell how this great gulf within Jacob's family is eventually spanned. As Jacob and Esau were eventually reconciled, so Joseph and his brothers eventually forgive each other." Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* (WBC 2; Dallas: Word, 1994), 308, 318. Westermann, *Genesis*, 537, thinks that Gen 34 "is closely linked with ch. 33, though separated by a lengthy period of time." Wenham, *Genesis*, 307, concurs when he says, "33:18-20 is the close of the preceding episode, which at the same time anticipates chap. 34." Michael Fishbane, "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Gen. 25:19-35:22)," *JJS* 26 (1975): 15-38, esp. 23-25, contends that Gen 34 is not connected to chapter 33 or chapter 35. Instead, he stipulates that chapters 26 and 34 are interludes and part of the chiasmic "compositional techniques of biblical narrative art" that is found in the Jacob cycle. J. P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis* (Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975), 238-241, also sees a relationship between chapters 26 and 34. He puts forward the thesis that Gen 26 and Gen 34 are positioned chiastically and exhibit marked coherence within the Jacob cycle, since "both passages are about people from other generations," and also "make the contents of the 'blessing of Abraham', viz. the promised land, thematic...[and]...show what a source of problems the land of Canaan is in itself." In particular, Gen 34 demonstrates that "[i]t is impossible for this God-blessed family to mix with a group of Canaanites." Taking a position between the preceding scholars is Walter Brueggemann. He regards Gen 33:18-34:31 as "one continuous unit...[that]...seems to have no relationship with anything before or after." He also thinks that "[w]e cannot be sure whether we are dealing with personal interactions or with disguised tribal history...[since]...[t]he narrative is a bit artificial for an actual event." Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (IBC; Atlanta: John Knox, 1982), 274-275. On the one hand, George W. Coats, *Genesis with an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (FOTL 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 233-234, agrees with Brueggemann about the pericope's lack of connection with its textual environs, since ch. 34 "is isolated from its context...[and]...shares at best a catchword contact on the basis of the role Shechem plays here and in both 33:18-20 and 35:1-7." On the other hand, Coats does not appear to share

25:19-34; 27:1-35:29) concludes, a number of significant events are mentioned, including, but not limited to the following: Jacob's return to Canaan; his second encounter with God; the death of his wife Rachel near Ephrath (i.e., Bethlehem) while giving birth to Benjamin; and the death of his father Isaac at Hebron (Gen 35:5-29). The "two-sword" *traditum* also precedes the Joseph novella, which includes the migration of Jacob's family to Egypt and the patriarch's subsequent death there.

Gen 34 is more narrowly framed by Jacob's return from his exile in Paddan-Aram and his ensuing departure from the city of Shechem<sup>253</sup> as he journeys to Bethel and beyond in Canaan.

---

Brueggemann's hypothesis concerning tribal history, since "the story does not display a tribal history accounting for the demise of Simeon and Levi." Noth, *Pentateuchal Traditions*, 87, however, detects some elements of tribal history in Gen 34, which "has been utilized to explain their disappearance from the circle of twelve tribes." In addition, he thinks this chapter is based on "an old farcical tale...[that]...originally celebrated the 'deed' of both [i.e., Simeon and Levi] as a successful feat of valor." K. Luke, *Studies on the Book of Genesis* (Pontifical Institute Publications 21; Alwaye, India: Pontifical Institute of Theology and Philosophy, 1975), 126-136, sees Gen 34 as an "ethnological saga" about tribal history. For a summary of this subject, see Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 130-136. My own view is that Gen 34 is linked both to chs. 33, 35, and the broader Jacob cycle though these conclusions are certainly debatable. In addition, even though the pericope may contain murky facets of tribal history, I am more inclined to see genetic tribal features in the narrative that adumbrate future tribal conduct, which I believe explain—at least in part—the retort of Jesus' disciples (i.e., "Lord, look, here are two swords!). In an interesting, but not particularly convincing essay, David Noel Freedman, "Dinah and Shechem, Tamar and Amnon," *Austin Seminary Bulletin: Faculty Edition* 105 (1990): 51-63, esp. 51, 57, 61, argues that the stories of Dinah and Shechem and Tamar and Amnon are the book-ends of "the story of Israel from the time of the patriarchs until the establishment of the united kingdoms by David (and Solomon)." Basing his argument primarily on shared "literary and linguistic" features, Freedman specifically concludes that "the story of Shechem and Dinah has been appropriated by Super-J [which runs from Genesis through Samuel and probably on into Kings] to explain how two sons (= tribes) were rejected by the patriarch leaving the way open for J's (and Jacob's) choice: Judah...[and his]...illustrious descendant, David." Robert B. Coote and David Robert Ord, *The Bible's First History* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 167-171, also view Gen 34 as part of the Yahwist's effort to establish "the primacy of Judah," which is narrated in "Genesis 33:18-35:22, parts." Susanne Scholz, *Rape Plots: A Feminist Cultural Study of Genesis 34* (Studies in Biblical Literature 13; New York: Peter Lang, 2000), 130, n. 7, sets aside the place of Gen 34 within the broader textual landscape and deliberately isolates Gen 34 "in order to focus on it and thus maximize its importance." For a brief overview of the relation of Gen 34 with other canonical traditions of early Israel, see J. A. Soggin, "Genesis Kapitel 34. Eros und Thanatos," in *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen* May 8<sup>th</sup> 1993 (VTSup 50; eds. Andre Lemaire and Benedikt Otzen; Leiden—New York--Köln: Brill, 1993), 133-135.

<sup>253</sup> Gen 33:18-20; 35:1-5. Shechem is referenced two other times in Genesis. In Gen 12:6-7, Abram set up an altar at Shechem after the LORD appeared to him there. Then, in Gen 37:12-14, Joseph's brothers were tending their flocks near Shechem. Other notable references to the city occur in the OT as well. Shechem is listed as a city of refuge for fugitive slayers and is one of the cities given to the Levites (Josh 20:7; 21:21; cf. 1 Chr 6:67). More importantly, Shechem is the place to which Joshua summons all the tribes of Israel so that the people might put away foreign gods and reconfirm their covenant with God. In addition, the city of Shechem is the final resting place for Joseph's bones (Josh 24:1-25, 32). In Judges, Shechem is the birthplace of Gideon's (a.k.a. Jerubbaal's) son Abimelech who slaughters his seventy brothers prior to his three-year reign over Israel (Judg 8:31; 9:1-57). Shechem gains additional notoriety in Israel's history when Rehoboam is thwarted in his attempt to solidify his reign over the Israel and Judah after the death of his father Solomon. Since Israel rejects Rehoboam as king under Jeroboam's leadership, Rehoboam plans to retaliate and attack Jeroboam and Israel. However, Shemaiah, "the man of God," warns Rehoboam to stand

After arriving at Shechem, Jacob purchases some land from Hamor, the father of Shechem, whose son is the city's eponymous ancestor. After buying a plot of ground from Hamor, Jacob pitches his tent before the city and builds an altar that he names "El-Elohe-Israel [אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל],"<sup>254</sup> that is, "God, the God of Israel" (Gen 33:19-20).

At the end of Gen 34 Jacob is apprehensive because he believes their neighbors will attack them once they learn of his sons' actions (Gen 34:30). Despite this presumed threat, Jacob does not leave the city of Shechem until God instructs him to go to Bethel and build an altar there. Yet prior to leaving Shechem, Jacob calls upon his family to "[p]ut away the foreign gods...and purify [them]selves." They comply with his request; the foreign gods along with their associated jewelry are buried under an oak tree near the city (Gen 35:1-4). God protects Jacob and his family as they travel from Shechem to Bethel. Once they arrive at Bethel, Jacob erects an altar and calls it "El-bethel [אֱלֹהֵי בֵּית־אֱלֹהִים]," that is, "God of the house of God" (Gen. 35:5-7).

The definitive "two-sword" account begins when Dinah, the daughter of Leah and Jacob, leaves the safe haven of her family's transitory homestead and goes out to visit some neighboring women. During her excursion, Shechem, the son of Hamor, sees her and compels her to have sexual relations with him.<sup>254</sup> Being smitten by her, Shechem asks his father, Hamor, to get Dinah as a wife for him. Although Jacob soon learns of the unseemly liaison between Dinah and Shechem, Jacob does not initially respond to the impropriety of their copulation.

---

down. The final result of this tête-à-tête at Shechem is a split kingdom with Rehoboam reigning over Judah and Jeroboam ruling Israel (1 Kgs 12:1-33; cf. 2 Chr 10:1-19). In Pss 60:6 and 108:7, God promises to "divide up Shechem." Jeremiah 41:1-18 records the insurrection of Ishmael against Gedaliah at Mizpah. Besides murdering Gedaliah for his apparent cooperation with the Babylonians, Ishmael also slaughters eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria. According to Hos 6:9, priests murder on the road to Shechem from Gilead. Finally, Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sirach of Jerusalem asserts that Shechem is where "foolish people" dwell (Sir 50:26). For more on Shechem and its history in light of archaeological discoveries, see Lawrence E. Stager, "The Shechem Temple: Where Abimelech Massacred a Thousand," *BAR* 29/4 (July/Aug 2003): 26-35, 66-69. For a summary of references to Shechem in ancient near eastern texts, see Luke, *Studies*, 130-133.

<sup>254</sup> I certainly think Shechem violated Dinah in some egregious way and tend to view it as rape when pressed. Nevertheless, I have intentionally described his actions less definitively so as to reflect both the ambiguity of the Hebrew text and the wide-ranging scholarly debate concerning his offense. For more on this question, see n. 264 and the excursus at the end of the chapter.



Following what seems to be customary protocol for conducting business transactions (e.g., cf. Gen 23:1-20), including marriage, Hamor approaches Jacob and seeks his consent for a marriage between Shechem, Hamor's son, and Jacob's daughter Dinah. During the negotiations Hamor not only hopes to obtain Dinah for Shechem but also proposes that these two clans intermarry, live together, and conduct routine trade. In addition, Shechem promises to give Jacob whatever marriage gift he wants in exchange for the right to marry Dinah. Sometime during these discussions, Jacob's sons return from the field. Though the exact moment when they learn of the foul tryst between their sister Dinah and Shechem is unclear, Dinah's brothers are incensed at the news. Accordingly, they cloak their vengeful motives and disguise their retaliatory scheme in a deceitful riposte to Hamor's proposal. In order to execute their sinister plot they agree to Hamor's proposal on one condition: that all the men of his city be circumcised. Hamor and Shechem accept the offer by Jacob's sons and all the men of the Shechem—including father and son—are circumcised.

While Hamor's men are recovering and still in pain, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brothers, kill all of the men and bring their sister out of the city. After this initial slaughter, her other brothers plunder the city and take all the animals, household possessions, women and children. Jacob, alarmed by the actions of Simeon and Levi, questions their judgment, especially since he believes the surrounding neighbors will band together and attack his clan. In response to their father, Simeon and Levi defend their aggressive actions because Shechem's abhorrent behavior was an egregious moral affront. From their perspective, Shechem got what he deserved, since he treated their sister as if she were a prostitute.

### **2.2.2 The Canonical Provenance of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum***

Placing the story within the boundaries of its wider literary context provides valuable background data, but the more critical task is to scrutinize the account by means of a thorough exegesis in order to derive a clearly traceable “two-sword” *traditum* from its canonical roots. In order to achieve that objective four motifs and other striking literary features of the narrative will

be highlighted via the close reading below. This methodical analysis is necessary because brief summaries—which are certainly helpful at times—are too often prone to misstatements, misrepresentations, omissions, unintended alterations, and other incongruent adaptations of a text due in large part to their brevity, over-zealous simplifications, and generalizations.<sup>255</sup>

---

<sup>255</sup> In my opinion, including an overview of the story is worthwhile before the customary exegesis ensues; but writing an objective, relatively unbiased summary of the narrative that would neither mislead readers nor misrepresent the story proved to be more challenging than I would have originally thought. Despite my overriding desire to avoid introducing inaccurate details, I repeatedly found myself revising and correcting my brief digest of the story. I suppose the tendency to project unintentional alterations onto a story is common and can be attributed, at least in part, to imperfect memory, but the ease with which imbedded biases or inculcated adaptations of a story imperceptibly worm their way into a pericope that results in a distorted and tendentious reading was and is startling. Narrative drift is further exacerbated because this story—as is true for many stories in the HB—is characterized by multiple gaps and ambiguities that readers tend to fill and explain (away). Along this line of thought, Ilona N. Rashkow, “Hebrew Bible Translation and the Fear of Judaization,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21/2 (1990): 224, appropriately describes the HB as “self-reflexive” and “infuse[d] with an indeterminacy of meaning...[whose]... language is frequently ambiguous, allowing for a multiplicity of meaning.” Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Women of Genesis: From Sarah to Potiphar’s Wife* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1990), 87-97, esp. 87-88, makes this same point when she specifically says of Gen 34, “Interpreting this narrative is fraught with difficulties. As the account unfolds, there is a rapid increase in violence and bloodshed, there are many ambiguities of motivation in the text, and the perspective of the victim is never given.” Not only do assumptions and taken-for-granted notions make their way into generic overviews, they are also found in detailed, critical analyses. E.g., Scholz (*Rape Plots*, 126) demonstrates with incisive skill how scholars are complicit in “obfuscating rape” in their analysis of Gen 34. When summarizing “interpretations from 1970 to 1997,” she justly states, “The interpreters make the silent text speak, bringing their assumption[s], their presuppositions, and their cultural understandings of rape to the text. Not the text itself speaks, but the interpreters speak with it.” To a degree Mishael Maswari Caspi concurs with Scholz’s observation in “The Story of the Rape of Dinah: The Narrator and the Reader,” *HS* 26 (1985): 25-45. Caspi contends that “interpretation [is] the unwritten portion of the text itself, or the gaps that the reader needs to fill in order that the story will be completely understood.” More importantly, he claims that “the narrator asks that the reader detect the missing elements of the tale, interpret them and bridge the gaps” in the story about Dinah’s rape. While I agree with Caspi’s premise that texts and readers often interact in constructive ways and that readers fill literary gaps, I do not share his confidence about discovering “the intention of the narrator” and “the narrator’s perspective.” Offering a plausible suggestion about what a narrator might have intended is acceptable, but any claim to have discerned the narrator’s intention moves beyond what any reader can assert with absolute certainty from any text. (Though Caspi is typically confident about his interpretive assertions, he will occasionally exhibit some interpretive reticence as he does, e.g., when he attempts to explain why Simeon and Levi were specifically mentioned. *Idem*, 39.) Meir Sternberg’s remarks about this gap-filling tendency by interpreters are also invaluable and offer an appropriate caution. For instance, he provides a particularly lucid description of this predicament when he says, “To emphasize the active role played by the reader in constructing the world of a literary work is by no means to imply that gap-filling is an arbitrary process. On the contrary, in this as in other operations of reading, literature is remarkable for its powers of control and validation. Of course, gap-filling may nevertheless be performed in a wild or misguided or tendentious fashion, and there is no lack of evidence for this in criticism ancient and modern. But to gain cogency, a hypothesis must be legitimated by the text.” Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1985), 188. (For Sternberg’s complete discussion, see “Gaps, Ambiguity and the Reading Process” in *Poetics*, 186-229.) My goal, in light of ubiquitous human limitations and HB narrative traits, is therefore to minimize as far as possible my own interpretative injections. To that end, the more challenging task is therefore to allow the ambiguities and gaps to remain rather than resolve or obliterate them—or, “to invent their own” facts in an attempt to answer questions that a text does not address, as Paul Noble put it—which inadvertently projects meaning onto the text. Paul Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading of the Rape of Dinah: Some Exegetical and Methodological Observations,” *BiblInt* 4 (1996): 198.

As previously mentioned, the exegetical objective is to identify the clever literary characteristics of the narrative and derive its motifs in order to establish the story's subsequent hagiographic value. The four motifs that will be documented include: (1) family identity and honor; (2) abuse and vindication of an honored one; (3) national identity and justice; and (4) vengeance or justified retaliation. By accentuating the story's artistic qualities and identifying these four narrative themes via a careful exegesis, I will establish that the story is a memorable tale and therefore worth retelling. In other words, the exegesis of this pericope initiates a process whose final outcome will define the "two-sword" *traditum* and produce a credible case for its existence and make it possible to trace its subsequent *tradio*.

While the chief goal of the exegesis is to establish the provenance of the "two-sword" *traditum*, there are several important secondary goals. For instance, throughout the exegesis, I will point out some of the more peculiar characteristics in the pericope (e.g., rare verb uses, idiosyncratic expressions, Hebrew idioms, unusual grammar structure) and highlight some of the more prominent variations between the MT and LXX. I will also pause occasionally to comment on some of the major issues addressed in recent research on this pericope, especially research driven by feminist theology. This discussion is necessary because it serves two constructive purposes. First, it demonstrates an apposite awareness of the wide-ranging topics and questions that arise from the study of Gen 34. By referencing a broad sampling of the scholarly work on Gen 34, I intend to show that the systematic discussion in this chapter—though neither exhaustive nor encyclopedic—is both representative and sufficient. Second, as will become apparent, the general lack of any dialogue about a "two-sword" *traditum* in other research underscores the pioneering work that this project is attempting.

Since my focus is to establish Gen 34 as the canonical source for the "two-sword" *traditum*, the exegesis will stress the narrative's broader literary traits as it examines specific textual details.<sup>256</sup> To that end, the exegetical analysis will examine Gen 34 as if it were a dramatic

---

<sup>256</sup> My exegetical method is more accurately called "narrative or literary criticism," though some aspects overlap with rhetorical criticism. For a concerted rhetorical critical analysis, see Scholz's "Accentuating Rape: A Feminist Interpretation of Dinah's Story" in *Rape Plots*, 129-169. Scholz employs an

production composed of six vignettes. The first scene (vv. 1-4) describes the circumstances surrounding the initial encounter between Shechem and Dinah, their subsequent sexual relations, and Shechem's request of his father. The reactions of both fathers and Dinah's brothers to the improper liaison are revealed in the second scene (vv. 5-7). This brief vignette opens with Jacob hearing about Shechem's misbehavior with Dinah and closes with her brothers apparently learning of the misdeed just as Hamor begins to present his offer for Dinah. During the third scene (vv. 8-19a), the narrative records the proposal made by Hamor and Shechem to get Dinah from Jacob. This lengthy scene ends as Jacob's sons listen to the offer and make their deceptive counter-proposal, which is accepted by Hamor and his son. In the fourth scene (vv. 19b-24) Hamor and Shechem present the proposal to male citizens of their city and obtain their approval. The fifth scene (vv. 25-29) describes how Dinah's brothers carry out their deceitful plan and take vengeance upon the people of Shechem. The denouement, specifically, Jacob's reaction to his sons' exploits and their rejoinder is reported in the story's sixth and final scene (vv. 30-31).<sup>257</sup>

---

interdisciplinary methodology that combines cultural studies on rape, intertextual readings, rhetorical criticism, and feminist scholarship in order to demonstrate the marginalization of rape in previous biblical interpretations of Gen 34 and to conduct "a sustained study of the textual details and the subject of rape." *Ibid.*, 130. Text critical issues are primarily addressed in the footnotes unless the matter appears to affect the stated objectives of the literary analysis. In addition, when *BHS* is cited, *JPS* and *LXX* translations are frequently included for comparative purposes.

<sup>257</sup> Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 274-275, divides the narrative into four scenes: (1) "33:18-20 introduction: settlement in Shechem;" (2) "34:1-12 seduction and negotiation by Shechem;" (3) "34:13-29 retaliation by the sons of Jacob;" and (4) "34:30-31 conclusion: dispute between Jacob and his sons." Wenham, *Genesis*, 307-308, divides Gen 34 into four scenes with the first and last scenes reflecting a narrative style while the second and third scenes emphasize dialogue. Accordingly, his scene divisions are: (1) "Shechem rapes Dinah and seeks to marry her (1-4);" (2) "Hamor and Shechem propose a marriage alliance with Jacob's family (5-19);" (3) "Hamor and Shechem put terms for marriage alliance to townsfolk (20-24);" and (4) "Jacob's sons rape the town [25-31]." Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 123-130, follows Wenham's scene divisions. Westermann believes that "the chapter as handed down has four parts: vv. 1-3, the violation of Dinah by Shechem; vv. 4-24, the negotiations; vv. 25-29, the attack (with the conclusion, 35:5); vv. 30-31, the reaction of Jacob." In addition, "the overall structure shows the division into a family narrative (A) and a tribal narrative (B)." According to Westermann, the family narrative "can have originated toward the end of the patriarchal period" and the tribal narrative "can come from the period of the occupation of the land precisely because it has been reworked in accordance with Deut. 7." These two narratives were then reworked into the present narrative, which "as a whole presupposes Deut 7 and is close to the language of P [i.e., the priestly writer]." Westermann, *Genesis*, 535-537. Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia—New York—Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 233-238, divides Gen 34 into six scenes as I do, but his scene partitions are slightly different. They are: (1) "The Assault (vv. 1-7);" (2) "The Speeches of Hamor and Shechem (vv. 8-12);" (3) "The Brothers' Response (vv. 13-17);" (4) "Response of the Shechemites (vv. 18-24);" (5) "The Punitive Action (vv. 25-29);" and (6) "Jacob's Reaction (vv. 30-31)." Though Sternberg speaks of scenes during his analysis, he chiefly looks at the pericope as a composition made up of three stages that reflect the narrator's "rhetorical strategy." The first stage is: "the *accumulation* of maximal sympathy for

In sum, during the ensuing exegesis I will not only identify and describe the account's thematic elements but also make the case that the story's four motifs as seen in the characters, their actions, and the unfolding plot are extremely captivating and exemplify the story's striking dramatic qualities. I further suggest, based on the pericope's remarkable literary qualities, that Gen 34 is the canonical source for what I call the "two-sword" *traditum*. After completing the exegesis, I will examine how this tradition is transmitted and refracted in other portions of the HB and contributes, at least in part, to Israel's later corporate religious heritage and identity—an identity that was handed down from generation to generation and eventually formed part of the religious cultural milieu or cultural intertextuality of the first century C.E.

*Scene One: Shechem's Deed with Dinah (vv. 1-4).*

As noted above, the story about Shechem, Dinah, and her brothers in Gen 34 is part of the Jacob cycle narratives. Its connection to this broader literary motif in Genesis is corroborated by two details at the beginning of the account. First, Dinah is identified as "the daughter of Leah, whom she [i.e., Leah] had borne to Jacob" (Gen 34:1; cf. Gen 30:21).<sup>258</sup> Second, when the narrator says that Dinah "went out to visit the women of the region...Shechem son of Hamor...saw her" (Gen 34:1b-2), he links this chapter with Jacob's purchase of land from "the sons of Hamor,

---

Jacob's sons" (vv. 1-12). The second stage is: "the *complication* of response, through a progressive balancing of two sides" (vv. 13-26). The third stage is: "the *stabilization* of the balanced attitude, with Simeon and Levi turned protagonists" (vv. 27-31). Sternberg, *Poetics*, 445-475, esp. 445-446. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 133, identifies five scenes based on character changes: (1) "The Rape (vv. 1-3);" (2) "The Reaction (vv. 4-7);" (3) "The Negotiations (vv. 8-24);" (4) "The Killing (vv. 25-29);" and (5) "Jacob and Simeon and Levi (vv. 30-31)."

<sup>258</sup> Unless otherwise stated, translations in this chapter are from the NRSV. Although I could have offered my own translation, I chose to use the NRSV for two reasons. First, as a matter of principle, I favor translations based on committee work, since this approach can mitigate—but not wholly eliminate—individual idiosyncrasies, tendencies, and presuppositions (though admittedly committee work displays these traits as well). Second, I believe I can make a stronger case for the pericope's literary artistic achievements by comparing the NRSV with the Hebrew text in order to highlight what Robert Alter calls "the art of biblical narrative" in his astute and award-winning book, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981). From my perspective, this method is a better way for me to point out the text's Hebrew idioms and nuances that are often lost in the translation process without subjecting the readers to my own "wooden" translations, which unfortunately would mask rather than emphasize the text's remarkable literary features.

Shechem's father" (Gen 33:19). Even without considering other details from Gen 34, these two statements appear to tie Dinah and Shechem's tale to the Jacob cycle.<sup>259</sup>

The first scene opens with Dinah going out "to visit [לְרַאוֹת] the women of the region" (v. 1b).<sup>260</sup> Even though the NRSV's rendering of לְרַאוֹת as "to visit" is acceptable, the word may also suggest that Dinah went out with the deliberate purpose of observing, watching, and learning from or about these other women and perhaps their practices as well.<sup>261</sup> In short, she went on a fact finding tour. Yet whatever motivated her to associate with or draw near to her new neighbors in order to observe them, was and remains a mystery to this day.<sup>262</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> For discussion on the relationship between Gen 34 and the Jacob cycle, see n. 252 above.

<sup>260</sup> Mp points out that similar language is used when Samson saw a woman in the Philistine city of Timnah and then proceeded to ask his parents to get her as a wife for him. Judg 14:1-3. Westermann, *Genesis*, 537, says that this language "indicates a rather long sojourn."

<sup>261</sup> The literal denotation of לְרַאוֹת is "to see." However, it also carries the connotation of "to learn about," "to observe," or "to watch." BDB, 907. LXX perceptively uses καταμαθεῖν, the aor. inf. act. of καταμανθάνω, which means "to observe well, to examine closely, to learn thoroughly, to perceive, to understand, to discover, to find." LSJ, 900; LEH, 239. John William Wevers prefers "to become acquainted." John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 557. Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 353, suggests a passive translation, namely, "to be seen among." According to him, "[t]he active sense is possible only if one understands b<sup>e</sup> partitively, that is, 'to see some of the women.'"

<sup>262</sup> Joseph Fleishman, "Shechem and Dinah—in the Light of Non-Biblical and Biblical Sources," *ZAW* 116 (2004): 12-32, esp. 25ff., suggests that "the words »to gaze at the daughters of the land« hint that what happened between Shechem and Dinah can be understood against the background of special festivities for girls that we learn about from biblical and other sources," though he admits that "[o]ne cannot be certain why Dinah went there." Jeansonne, *Women of Genesis*, 91, says that even though "the narrator might...be suggesting that her decision was not wise...it is important to note that Dinah was only visiting the women of the land—she was not trying to put herself in any position to encounter the men of the land or to marry a Canaanite. By giving us this detail, the narrator encourages the reader to be open-minded about her motivation." In view of the narrator's ambiguity at the beginning of this story, Sternberg's observation—i.e., "the biblical narrator does not make things easy for himself by minimizing in advance the rhetorical problems to be overcome"—seems apropos, since no one truly knows why Dinah went to see the women of the land. Sternberg, *Poetics*, 493. Relying on Alter's betrothal type-scene characterization, Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 131-132, argues that Gen 34 is possibly "a betrothal type-scene gone awry" or "an aborted version of a betrothal type-scene." Scholz's proposal is interesting, but not compelling, since the dissimilarities with the archetypal elements are so pronounced that it is difficult to view Gen 34 as a betrothal type-scene as Alter conceives it. In other words, because so many things go "awry" in Dinah's story (e.g., the male hero does not go out from his family, Dinah does; there is no meeting at the well; there is no festive meal; there are no initial gestures of hospitality [see Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 47-62, esp. 52]), the remaining points of correspondence (i.e., swift communication with the bride's family, betrothal agreement) seem too tenuous to validate Scholz's proposition. Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 153-154, allows for the possibility of a "Twisted 'Betrothal Type-Scene.'" Seth Daniel Kunin, *The Logic of Incest: A Structuralist Analysis of Hebrew Mythology* (JSOTSup 185; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995), 138, claims that "[t]he text implies that Dinah improperly joined the Canaanite women and thus created the situation of danger." Though Kunin's assertion is possible, it is nonetheless highly speculative and justly receives the reproof of Scholz (*Rape Plots*, 113-114) who points

At some point while Dinah is exploring, surveying, and observing “the women of the region,” Shechem sees her. Then, quite unexpectedly, the narrator quickly reports in precise

goose-stepping style that “[w]hen Shechem...saw her [וַיִּרְא אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה], he seized her [אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה]

וַיִּקַּח] and lay with her by force [וַיִּשְׁכַּב אִתָּהּ וַיַּעֲנֶהָ]<sup>263</sup> (v. 2b). Ironically, Dinah, “the daughter

---

out an underlying bias with the adverbial addition of “improperly.” Luke, *Studies*, 127, also draws the indignation of Scholz (*Rape Plots*, 106) when he states that “[f]eminine curiosity was the beginning of trouble for Jacob’s daughter,” and then says pejoratively, “During her promenades through the town...” Conversely, in a spirited feminist reading, Ita Sheres, *Dinah’s Rebellion: A Biblical Parable for Our Time* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), portrays Dinah as a heroine because she challenged the status quo when she left the confines of her family’s tents, ventured into the new land of Canaan, and intermingled with the Shechemites. Sheres’ thesis is based on the assumption that Gen 34 in its present form is a redaction of two sources: the first one written by “kingly sympathizers” during the “First Hebrew Commonwealth” (i.e., 10<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> B.C.E.); and a second one whose origins are found in the ideological leaders of the 6<sup>th</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.E. (i.e., the Deuteronomists). Sheres argues that the Deuteronomists, in particular, distorted the original tale about Dinah and silenced her because she violated male-driven traditions. Not only did the Deuteronomists villainize Dinah, Eve is likewise disparaged as well because she “first disobeyed God and subsequently led all of humankind out of the garden.” According to Sheres, then, the stories about women in Genesis display “the conditions that led to a diminishing of status for Hebrew women.” Indeed, when the Deuteronomists did not dwell “on Dinah’s motivation, except in a very esoteric and general way (she went out ‘to see the daughters of the land’), the text implies that there was something secretive and, therefore, wrong with what she did.” Furthermore, “[t]he ideology expounded by the redactors created a chasm between men and women not only with the intention of enslaving and subjugating women, but, paradoxically, for the ultimate purpose of communal and national harmony.” In sum, Sheres maintains—from the Deuteronomists’ perspective—Dinah’s “unconventional action cannot be tolerated because if other women would use her as their role model, the whole community would be led into error and delinquency.” See Sheres, *Dinah’s Rebellion*, 7, 23-29, 48, 58, 72, 80, 87, 110. On the one hand, if a person accepts Sheres’ underlying presupposition about the Deuteronomists, remains focused on v. 2 throughout the exposition as Sheres does, and back-fills the lacunae of the text (e.g., “whatever association [between Dinah and her father and brothers] can be *inferred* from the text is alienation and noncommunication;” “Dinah *apparently lingers* in the house of her rapist;” and “*it stands to reason*” that Shechem’s “kindness” is extended to Dinah “at the moment of her arrival at the tent;” idem, 67, 68, 72, italics added), Sheres’ argument holds together. On the other hand, if one questions her basic premise, views her focus on v. 2 to be excessive in light of her neglect of the bulk of the pericope, and hesitates to fill in the textual gaps with speculation, her argument—though fascinating and extremely entertaining—breaks down. For an older and less ideologically-driven polemic view of the relation between Gen 34 and the Deuteronomists, see Otto Eissfeldt, “Zusatz: Bemerkungen—Die levitischen Traditionen in Gen 34 und 49, Dtn 33 sowie Jdc 17-18 und 19-21,” in Johannes Lindblom, *Erwägungen zur Herkunft der josianischen Tempelurkunde* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1971), 76-79.

<sup>263</sup> Even though I am skeptical of those who think Dinah consented (see n. 264 below), some manuscripts (e.g., Greek, Syriac, Pseudo-Jonathan Targum, and Vulgate) replace the Hebrew direct object marker with a preposition that possibly suggests Dinah consented (i.e., Shechem “laid with her [μετ’ αὐτῆς]” rather than Shechem “laid her”). *BHS* text. crit. notes, 54. Cf. Wenham, *Genesis*, 306, n. 2.b; Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 136-137; and Wevers, *Notes*, 558. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 354, finds no reason to emend the text “once it is understood that *’et* is not only the indicator of the direct object but also has the meaning ‘with’ (e.g., Josh. 10:25; 14:12; 2 Sam 24:24).”

<sup>264</sup> JPS translation of v. 2 is: “Shechem son of Hamor the Hivite, chief of the country, saw her, and took her and lay with her by force.” LXX translates the last phrase of this sentence as καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν αὐτήν, that is, “[A]nd he humbled, shamed, or humiliated her.” (Unless otherwise noted, all translations of LXX are mine.) Speiser, *Genesis*, 264, renders this phrase as: “[S]lept with her by force. Literally ‘lay with her and violated her’ (hendiadys).” Wenham, *Genesis*, 311, suggests the following: “‘Laid her’ instead of the

of Leah,” went “to see the daughters of the land,”<sup>265</sup> but rather than being the observer of them, she is the one observed, since “Shechem saw her.” Though not stated explicitly, the narrator’s initial abruptness may also convey a central feature about Shechem’s temperament: when it comes to women, their role is to serve and satisfy him.<sup>266</sup> Of course, as “prince of the region [נְשִׂיא הָאָרֶץ],”<sup>267</sup> that he could have whatever woman or women he desired is not terribly surprising. Indeed, to behave differently would be the real surprise.

On the one hand, the narrative’s rapid-fire trifecta about Shechem seems to portray him as a rather coarse and narcissistic person. On the other hand, the story’s next trifecta immediately dispels any simplistic characterization of him. In staccato style the narrator offers three corresponding counter-points that contradict his preceding observations about Shechem and thus disrupt all first impressions. Shechem who formerly “saw her,” “seized her,” and “lay with

---

more usual ‘lay with her’ implies forcible illegitimate intercourse (cf. n. 34:2.b). ‘Shamed her’ is another term always used to describe intercourse without marriage (e.g., Deut 21:14; 22:29; 2 Sam 13:12). The duplication of very negative terms shows the author’s strong disapproval of Shechem’s behavior.” So, too, Sternberg, *Poetics*, 446. Westermann, *Genesis*, 538, says, “The three narratives are not narrating a seduction, but a forceful violation.” According to Mp, the form נִיַּעַנְהָ occurs two times in the MT, here and in 2 Sam 13:14 when Amnon forced his half-sister Tamar to have sexual relations with him. It is also notable that Tamar’s opposition to Amnon’s sexual advances is similar to the objection that Jacob’s sons express in Gen 34:7 (cf. 2 Sam 13:12; see also n. 277). To be sure, these preceding translations seem to suggest “rape” though they do not specifically employ this word—a fact that illustrates the interpreter’s challenge. Yet irrespective of whatever conclusion one reaches about the exact nature of Shechem’s misdeed, it is ultimately immaterial for this project’s thesis. For further discussion on this issue, see the excursus at the end of this chapter.

<sup>265</sup> Author’s translation of לְרִאוֹת בְּבָנוֹת הָאָרֶץ.

<sup>266</sup> For a socio-cultural analysis on Dinah’s status and familial relationships in light of type-scene motifs, see Irmtraud Fischer, *Die Erzeltern Israels: Feministisch-theologische Studien zu Genesis 12-36* (BZAW 222; Berlin—New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 84-87, 231-233.

<sup>267</sup> JPS translation introduces some ambiguity about this expression’s antecedent. I understand Shechem as the antecedent for נְשִׂיא הָאָרֶץ whereas JPS version seems to link it more with Hamor who is the “chief of the country.” Sarna, *Genesis*, 233-234, justifies this translation, since “the city-state of Shechem in pre-Israelite times extended its control over a vast area that at one time included the central hill country as far as the borders of Jerusalem and Gezer to the south and Megiddo to the north, a domain of about 1,000 square miles...[In addition,] Hamor’s unusual title reflects political and historical reality. The ruler of Shechem has dominion over rural—that is, tribal—territory as well as the urban center, in this case a confederacy of various ethnic elements.” LXX reads, Συχεμ ὁ υἱὸς Εμμορ ὁ χορραῖος ὁ ἄρχων τῆς γῆς, that is, “Shechem, the son of Emmor, the Chorraiios, the ruler of the land.” Since ὁ ἄρχων can legitimately modify either Συχεμ ὁ υἱὸς or Εμμορ ὁ χορραῖος, LXX neither eliminates nor reduces the ambiguity associated with the appellation’s antecedent in my opinion. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 135, also discusses this problem, but seems to favor Shechem as the antecedent for “prince of the land.” Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 557.



her by force,” is now the one whose “soul was drawn to Dinah [בְּרִינָהּ נִפְשׁוֹ נִתְרַבֵּק]”<sup>268</sup>...he

loved the girl [וַיֵּאָהֵב אֶת־הַנְּעִמָּה]<sup>269</sup> and he spoke tenderly to her [וַיְדַבֵּר עַל־לֵב הַנְּעִמָּה]” (v.

3).<sup>270</sup>

Even though the narrative is just beginning, the proximate juxtaposition of two very dissimilar characterizations of Shechem illustrates the deft skill with which the story was written. Had the author written, “When Shechem...saw her...his soul was drawn to Dinah,” and so “he seized her...[because]...he loved her;” and though he “lay with her by force...he spoke tenderly to

---

<sup>268</sup> Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 139, states that “[t]he verb [i.e., רַבֵּק] is often translated as ‘to love.’” I found no basis for this claim—neither in BDB nor the references she cites in n. 37. It connotes—as Scholz shortly observes—“spatial closeness,” not love.

<sup>269</sup> Mp points out that the Gen 34 narrative about Dinah, a girl (נְעִמָּה) who was violated by Shechem, stands in contrast to the statutes in Deut 22 (“*archetypus Gen contra archetypum Dt*”). Cf. Gen 34:3, 12 with Deut 22:13ff. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 140, favors “to desire” or “to lust” for the meaning of אָהֵב over the word’s more usual meaning “to love.” For support, Scholz refers to Phyllis Trible’s decision to translate אָהֵב with “the ambiguous word *desire* to let the plot [of the story of Amnon and Tamar] disclose the precise meaning.” In my estimation, Trible’s decision contributes as much, if not more, “disclosure” to Scholz than does the plot itself. Arguably, the somewhat arbitrariness of these interpretative decisions—both by Scholz and Trible—suggest that their feminist readings are—on occasion—just as tendentious as are other interpreters. Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (OBT 13; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 58, n. 6.

<sup>270</sup> JPS translation of v. 3 is: “Being strongly drawn to Dinah daughter of Jacob, and in love with the maiden, he spoke to the maiden tenderly.” LXX reads: καὶ προσέσχεν τῇ ψυχῇ Δίνας τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰακωβ καὶ ἠγάπησεν τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἐλάλησεν κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν τῆς παρθένου αὐτῇ (“And he devoted himself to [or, “held fast to,” “attached himself to;” LSJ, 1511-1512; LEH, 401; Wevers, *Notes*, 558] the soul of Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, and he loved the unmarried girl and he spoke with understanding to the unmarried girl”). According to Speiser, *Genesis*, 264, “[H]e then sought to win her affection. Literally ‘he spoke at/upon her heart,’ not so much to comfort her as to persuade her; see Judg xix 3; Hos ii 16.” Jeansonne, *Women of Genesis*, 138, n. 17, states that this phrase (i.e., “he spoke to the heart”) “implies not only tenderness and kindness, but may imply that he asked Dinah’s forgiveness as well.” Richard M. Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), 515, n. 43—relying on Sternberg—sees no romantic overtones in this expression. So, too, Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 141. Speiser, *Genesis*, 264, Jeansonne, *Women of Genesis*, 138, n. 17, Hamilton, *Genesis*, 355, and Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 138-142, agree that Shechem was speaking tenderly not in a romantic sense, but out of a sense of guilt or remorse in order to “persuade her,” “to change her mind,” and assuage his conscience, a conclusion I would affirm as well. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 352, n. 6, also states that “the threefold repetition of clauses...is a way of underscoring the intensity of Shechem’s attraction to Dinah.” Idem, cf. 352, n. 7 and 8, and 365 as well. For an opposing view, see Fewell and Gunn, “Tipping the Balance: Sternberg’s Reader and the Rape of Dinah,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 195-197, 200. In an odd maneuver that moves beyond the text, Hilary B. Lipka, *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006), 198, suggests that “the only possible indication of what Dinah is experiencing or what she might want is the expression ‘he spoke to her heart’, which seems to indicate that she was amenable to marrying Shechem,” a claim that Lipka immediately questions and takes back. Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading, 179, wisely notes that “nothing can be inferred about how Dinah responded to Shechem’s expressions of love.”

her,” a rather different portrait would emerge.<sup>271</sup> In this scenario, readers likely would find it prudent to alter their opinion of Shechem. No longer would he have two distinct and separate

---

<sup>271</sup> With marked generosity toward Shechem, Fleishman, “Why Did Simeon and Levi Rebuke Their Father in Genesis 34:31?” *JNSL* 26 (2000): 103-105, suggests that the juxtaposition of these three pairs provides “a deep penetration into Shechem’s feelings and it serves to explain his actions.” Accordingly, Fleishman asserts, “The information given in v. 3 is important to understand the nature of Shechem’s behaviour [*sic*] with Dinah. It was intended to emphasize that Dinah was important to him. He did not consider her a sexual object to satisfy momentary lust, or view her as just a woman to bear his children. Shechem wanted Dinah as his wife...in this case Shechem’s major goal was to remain with his beloved.” To be sure, Fleishman’s depiction of Shechem’s affection and fondness for Dinah is possible. Nonetheless, I think Fleishman infers more than is justified. I am not convinced the text penetrates this far into Shechem’s psyche. This sort of textual extrapolation by Fleishman is also found elsewhere in his essay, which tends to increase my hesitancy to accept his conclusion, though we eventually reach a similar understanding about the story’s conclusion (n. 370). For example, Fleishman states that “Hamor and the people of Shechem were not horrified by the sexual connection between Dinah and Shechem, and did not view it as an unacceptable deed.” How does Fleishman know this fact given the laconic propensity of HB narratives? It is possible that they did not view it as “a felony,” but no one really knows what they thought. In fact, one could argue that the effort by Hamor and Shechem to negotiate a contract with Jacob suggests they knew Shechem’s deed was inappropriate at least on some level. In addition, Fleishman speaks of Jacob’s clan as “a group of semi-nomadic *monotheistic* shepherds,” which is patently untrue in light of Gen 35:1-4 where Jacob calls upon his family to rid themselves of foreign gods (*italics added*). Agreeing somewhat with Fleishman is Lyn M. Bechtel, “What if Dinah is not Raped (Genesis 34),” *JSOT* 62 (1994): 29-36, who asserts that “[t]he overall action of Shechem (and his community) is one of honor...[that]...the motive for this alliance is economic growth and peaceful coexistence (v. 23)...[and that]...Shechem is honoring the customs of the Jacobites and seeking to find favor in their eyes.” (In a similar way, it is notable that Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* [OTL; rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972], 332-333, 335, describes Shechem’s offer as “generous and without guile” but also speaks of him as “stormily present[ing] his case” and “the aggressive Shechem.”) Not only are the Shechemites honorable, Bechtel also concludes that “from the perspective of the story Jacob is the ideal group-oriented person!” Furthermore, “Dinah and Jacob, Hamor and Shechem are mediating figures between the inside group (the Jacobites) and the outside group (the Shechemites).” Therefore, according to Bechtel, the villains of the story are Simeon, Levi, and the sons of Jacob, a conclusion that stands in sharp contrast to the way Simeon and Levi are extolled in later Jewish literature (see chapter three). Lipka, *Sexual Transgression*, 195, n. 95, says unequivocally, “Shechem is presented throughout the narrative as honorable.” Coats, *Genesis*, 234, appears to hold a sympathetic disposition toward Shechem as well. He says, “Both Hamor and Shechem appear to negotiate in trust...The Shechemites respond to the negotiations in trust,” though Coats later admits that “the appeal [of Shechem and Hamor to the men of the city] reveals an element of deceit in its own right (v. 23a)...[and that]...neither party has any basis for trust of the other.” As expected, Sheres, *Dinah’s Rebellion*, 71, 111, cf. 73, condemns Simeon and Levi, but views Shechem sympathetically, because even though “Shechem the rapist is obnoxious,...Shechem the lover atones right away for committing an obscenity.” Indeed, “[i]f one is to find male compassion in the story, one has to turn to Shechem, ‘the stranger,’ who after the rape falls in love with Dinah and realizes that he must ‘console the girl’ before proceeding with official, ritualized courtship.” Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 158-160, 165-168, is also moderately sympathetic to Hamor, Shechem, and the Hivites. Christian translators who produced English Renaissance Bibles and sought to avoid “judaization” of any text, especially the OT, also villainized Simeon and Levi. Rashkow, “Hebrew Bible Translation,” 217-233. Ralph W. Klein, “Israel/Today’s Believers and the Nations: Three Test Cases,” *CurTM* 24 (1997): 234-235, offers an “alternate interpretation” that de-emphasizes Dinah’s plight, since “the issue is not about rape at all but about whether we the readers are ready to be open to the ‘other.’” On the contrary, after reproving Simeon and Levi—“[i]f there is rape in the story, they are the ones who do it”—Klein claims the issue is that “[a]ncient and modern readers must wrestle with two powerful arguments, one for inter-ethnic marriage (by Jacob), one opposed to it (by Simeon and Levi).” Several of the preceding excerpts illustrate well Scholz’s, *Rape Plots*, 92-102, esp. 98-102, contention that interpreters’ “focus on the men” plays down Dinah’s rape. See n. 262 and excursus. Contra Fleishman, Bechtel, Coats and Sheres, Frank M. Yamada, “Dealing with Rape (in) Narrative (Genesis 34): Ethics of the Other and a Text in Conflict,” in *The Meanings We Choose: Hermeneutical Ethics, Indeterminacy and the Conflict of Interpretations* (ed. Charles H. Cosgrove; JSOTSup 411; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 149-165, astutely opines, “Genesis 34 clearly is a

personalities. On the contrary, if the narrator had described Shechem in this way, he is less fascinating as a character, since he is effectively reduced to an amalgam of diverse attributes despite being terribly dysfunctional. To be sure, he would remain a conflicted person in such circumstances, but still an integrated—though admittedly complex—whole. Simply put, if Shechem had been depicted thus, a somewhat milder picture of him comes into view. Rather than being a robust, bifurcated character who vacillates between two extremes—one repellent, one winsome—he would have become a mundane blend of competing drives.

---

text fraught with ethical tension both within and without, both in the story it tells and in the way interpreters tell the story.” After this insightful characterization, he then states that “Genesis 34 is a story about what happens when the ‘Other’ is neglected for the sake of establishing one’s own position...[and ultimately concludes]...[a]t the end of Genesis 34, no one wins. The rape of a woman calls for an ethical response concerned with the victim, but this story of rape deteriorates into a contest of male honor and reputation. The result is violence (against Shechem and the city), fragmentation (of the Jacobite family) and desolation (of Dinah).” In other words, Yamada offers what is perhaps the most balanced assessment of the story’s male characters in that he sees all of them as “conflicted and morally questionable at different points in the story.” Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 177, reaches a similar conclusion when he states that “the narrator has induced a sympathetic response to all the characters in one way or another and also a disapproval of all the characters at some point. The reader is never able to see any of the male characters as clear models to imitate”—a position that I, Driver (*Genesis*, 307), and Noble (“A ‘Balanced’ Reading”, 195) would affirm as well. Finally, Yamada’s evaluation of the story’s flawed male characters reaches a brilliant crescendo as he compares Sternberg’s approach to the narrative with the one offered by Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn in light of Emmanuel Levinas’ “ethics of the Other.” For critical background on Yamada’s discussion and analysis, see: (1) Sternberg, *Poetics*, 445-475; (2) Fewell and Gunn, “Tipping the Balance: Sternberg’s Reader and the Rape of Dinah,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 193-211, who question Sternberg’s “foolproof composition” and by their sympathetic presentation of Jacob, Shechem, and Hamor offer a counter-reading to Sternberg who views Simeon and Levi as the story’s heroes; (3) Sternberg’s highly-charged riposte in “Biblical Poetics and Sexual Politics: From Reading to Counterreading,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 463-488; and (4) Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading,” 173-204. The exchange between Sternberg and Fewell and Gunn is informative, deliciously energetic, intense, and direct. For example, in the final analysis, Fewell and Gunn (“Tipping the Balance,” 211) assert that Sternberg’s “foolproof text is a dangerous illusion.” Conversely, Sternberg (“Biblical Poetics and Sexual Politics,” 476) speaks of Fewell and Gunn’s “tangled methods of reading...[by which]... the text comes to figure as a kind of glorified Rorschach ink blot on which to project one’s ideology.” Though Noble tries to strike a balance, my sense is that he finds more common ground with Sternberg than with Fewell and Gunn, because Sternberg conducts a more careful exegesis than Fewell and Gunn who are guilty of reading their ideology into the text far too often, an assessment that I share as well. (E.g., see Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading”, 196, 199.) For further discussion on this scholarly debate and feminist readings of Gen 34, see Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 223-232. For an additional evaluation of Sternberg—along with Sandmel—see Gila Ramras-Rauch, “Fathers and Daughters: Two Biblical Narratives,” in *Mappings of the Biblical Terrain: The Bible as Text* (eds. Vincent L. Tollers and John Maier; London: Associated University, 1990), 158-164. Like Yamada, J. Gerald Janzen, *Abraham and All the Families of the Earth: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 12-50* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 135-138, too, finds an abundance of misconduct in the story’s characters. He says, “The driving energies of the primary actors are *eros* and *eris*, passion and strife;” “The whole passage is riddled with betrayal;” and “the chapter is a study in the rape of justice.”

Yet to the author's credit, no such explicit, symmetrical, point-counter-point depiction is crafted whereby one assertion is immediately rescinded by the next one.<sup>272</sup> Instead of minimizing the dissimilarity between two distinct components of Shechem's character in such a way, the author places two complete and radically contradictory characterizations side by side. Shechem, "the prince of the region," is thus free to fluctuate between two radical poles. He is unpredictable and, as a result, the story's tension grows. From the outset, the final outcome is uncertain because no one knows at what point in the tale which "Shechem" will reappear. In short, his two diametrically opposed personalities ratchet up the volatility index in an already unstable situation that has the potential to explode at any moment.

Shechem's impulsive persona promptly appears again when he speaks with Hamor, his father. Though he may have spoken "tenderly" to Dinah, Shechem's attitude now resembles his first encounter with her. In short, Shechem is demanding and curt. Therefore, when he says to Hamor, "Get me this girl [אֶת־הַיְלֵדָה הַזֹּאת] to be my wife" (v. 4b),<sup>273</sup> Shechem's speech is consistent with his initial conduct when he "seized" or "took [קָחַ]" Dinah. Naturally, one suspects that Shechem lived a relatively privileged life. As "prince of the region" it is likely that he was seldom denied much nor had to wait long before satisfying his desires. Whatever he wanted, he would get very quickly. All things considered he probably lived an entitled life. Consequently, if Shechem wanted Dinah, his father was obliged to "get for me" or "take for me [קָחַ]" the girl.<sup>274</sup> In other words, Shechem sent his father to fetch Dinah for him.

---

<sup>272</sup> As Sternberg, *Poetics*, 447, points out, "Verse 3 does not quite counterpoise, still less cancel out, the impact of its predecessor." Conversely, Fewell and Gunn, "Tipping the Balance," 197, opine, "However one views the rape, one must acknowledge that the narrator tips the balance in Shechem's favor."

<sup>273</sup> LXX renders Shechem's command as: Λαβέ μοι τὴν παιδίσκην ταύτην εἰς γυναῖκα ("Get this young girl [maiden] as a wife for me"). Wevers, *Notes*, 559, opts for *παῖδα* instead of *παιδίσκην* due to older MSS though fewer in number when compared to the majority witnesses. Wenham, *Genesis*, 311, observes, "Not only does he [i.e., Shechem] use the bluntest form of imperative without even a 'please,' but he describes Dinah rather disparagingly as 'this child.'" Hamilton, *Genesis*, 355, points out that Shechem's demand is close to Samson's in Judg 14:2.

<sup>274</sup> Also Sarna, *Genesis*, 234, who translates the expression as: "Literally, 'take for me.'"

*Scene Two: Learning of Shechem's Offense (vv. 5-7).*

With remarkable dispatch in the opening scene, the author sets the stage for the forthcoming drama. By means of his shrewd choice of expressions not only does he provide critical background information (e.g., Shechem is “prince of the region;” he has sexual relations with Dinah), he also ingeniously depicts Shechem’s schizophrenic personality. Readers learn in two adjoining verses that Shechem is a young man who is impetuous and demanding on the one hand but also gentle and kindhearted on the other hand.

In light of these initial divergent revelations about Shechem, it is not startling that the second scene opens with a subtle, but evocative style that continues to anticipate a looming clash. Rather than link the second scene to the first scene with a conjunctive *waw* in typical Hebrew style, the author uses a disjunctive *waw* along with a proper noun (i.e., Jacob) in order to contrast the preceding events with those that follow. In short, the disjunctive *waw* adumbrates the narrative’s future conflict. Though the NRSV’s translation, “Now Jacob heard...” (v. 5a), is acceptable, it unfortunately lessens the impact of the Hebrew construction that cleverly reveals Jacob’s displeasure regarding the illicit relationship between Shechem and Dinah. Therefore, rendering **וַיִּשְׁמַע יַעֲקֹב** as, “But Jacob heard...”,<sup>275</sup> highlights the variance between the preceding scene and subsequent events and also draws attention to Jacob’s disapproval of Shechem’s scandalous behavior.

To be sure, what “Jacob heard” was disturbing and disconcerting because Shechem “had defiled his daughter Dinah [בְּתוּלַת אֶת־דִּינָה בָּתוֹן]” (v. 5a).<sup>276</sup> Although there appears little doubt that Shechem had behaved badly in Jacob’s eyes, the exact nature of his offense is unclear. Had he merely sexually defiled Dinah or made her unclean? Or, by his actions had he also dishonored

---

<sup>275</sup> JPS ignores the *waw* completely and renders the opening of v. 5 as: “Jacob heard...”

<sup>276</sup> LXX uses ἐμίανεν (from μιάνω meaning “to stain,” “to defile,” or “to sully”) for **בָּתוֹן**. LSJ, 1132; LEH, 305. According to Westermann, *Genesis*, 534, n. 5a, “Dishonor, actually desecrate, a cultic notion, common in P; applied in the same sense to a woman only in Ezek. 18:6, 11, 15; 23:17; 33:26.”

her, Jacob, and Jacob's family as well?<sup>277</sup> Whatever the case, Shechem's conduct was objectionable to Jacob. Dinah, who was initially introduced as "the daughter of Leah," is now designated for a second successive time as Jacob's daughter (cf. vv. 3, 5).

Jacob, however, restrains himself and tempers whatever censures this knowledge about Shechem's scandalous conduct elicits because his sons are away tending his cattle. Once more

---

<sup>277</sup> According to BDB (379), the first definition of the piel stem of נִדְּבָה is "to defile sexually." According to KB (375), the piel stem of the word can also mean "to dishonor" or "to profane." Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 275-277, suggests that this is one of three pivotal terms in the narrative (the other two being "folly [*n<sup>o</sup> bālah*, v. 7]" and "disgrace [*h<sup>o</sup> rpāh*, v. 14])." He says, "This term is found nowhere else in Genesis, though it is a normal term in the Priestly tradition with reference to ritual purity. (cf. Lev. 5:2; 11:25, 28; 12:2, 5; 15:18; 22:8—RSV renders 'unclean')...It is this elemental passion regarding 'defilement' which lies behind the outraged retribution that follows. The shift of images from guilt to defilement makes the issue much more outrageous in the perception of Israel." Tikva Frymer-Kensky, "Law and Philosophy: The Case of Sex in the Bible," *Semeia* 45 (1989): 95, contends that "[t]he power of sex to cross over the lines between households or blur distinctions between units of a family is an example of sex's power to dissolve categories...This issue is clearly highlighted in Genesis 34, a chapter often called 'the rape of Dinah,' even though it is probably not about a forcible rape, and really not a story about Dinah at all. Dinah had 'gone out to see the daughters of the land.' Shechem saw her and lay with her, thus treating her improperly. In this way, he treated her as a whore (v 31), a woman whose consent is sufficient because her sexuality is not part of a family structure. Even though Dinah may have consented to the act, the fact that he had not spoken to her parents in advance constituted an impropriety. The integrity of the family has been threatened, and Dinah's own wishes are incidental...Even though the generation of Jacob's sons was the first to intermarry with the local inhabitants, they had to do so under controlled conditions in which they could remain a distinct unit. The free exercise of erotic love by Shechem threatened that type of control." Alice A. Keefe, "Rapes of Women/Wars of Men," *Semeia* 61 (1993): 79-97, esp. 84-85, concurs with Frymer-Kensky. She states, "The forced sexual encounter between Shechem and Dinah serves as an expression of Israel's vulnerability to being dominated, taken over and absorbed by the other peoples, particularly perhaps by urban Canaanite culture." Along similar lines, Fleishman, "Shechem and Dinah," 30, concludes, "Thus sexual relations between Shechem and Dinah damaged Dinah. They also seriously damaged her father, her brothers and Jacob's entire household because not only was Dinah's honor defiled, but also the honor of her father and family." Sarna's assessment is even more pronounced. He states, "Even more terrible than the offense against the person and dignity of the girl and the assault upon the honor of the family is the pollution of the moral environment. The entire community becomes infected by such wanton deeds." Cf. idem, "The Legal Significance of Jacob's Statement: 'I Will Divide Them in Jacob, I Will Scatter Them in Israel' (Gen 49,7b)," in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. A. Wénin; Leuven: University Press, 2001), 545-550. Sarna, *Genesis*, 234. In "Tipping the Balance," 202, 206-207, Fewell and Gunn also see family honor as an issue. So, too, Susan Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence* (New York: Oxford, 1993), 107-111, who says that "the story is not about her [i.e., Dinah], but about the contest for honor and the struggle for power between two groups of men linked by her." Based on anthropological studies of Mediterranean cultures, Pitt-Rivers claims the following: "The connection between masculine honour [*sic*] and the purity of women which makes a man vulnerable not only through his wife but through his mother, sister, or daughter, is common to all the traditional peoples of the Mediterranean and it poses a problem to the men of the nuclear family." Moreover, Pitt-Rivers ultimately concludes that "[t]he fate of Shechem then marks the transition from an elementary to a complex structure of kinship, from a closed kinship system to a system of marriage strategy dominated by political values, and the adoption of the Israelites of the concepts of *honour [sic] and shame* which go with that system." Pitt-Rivers, *Fate of Shechem*, 165, 170, emphasis added. *Contra* the preceding scholars who view honor as a pivotal issue in Gen 34, are Noble ("A 'Balanced' Reading," 191) and Scholz (*Rape Plots*, 176-77). Noble rightly questions the validity of the honor explanation, since the text does not raise the issue itself. Scholz does not think "shame and honor play a significant role" in this pericope.

a disjunctive *waw* [i.e., וּבְנָיִי; “but his sons...”] accentuates another contrast.<sup>278</sup> Yet this time the disparity is not between two separate parties who have a dispute, but is an inner conflict that resides wholly within Jacob. Though Jacob is negatively disposed toward Shechem, he is nonetheless unwilling to act on his emotions and confront Shechem. In short, Jacob is paralyzed, entirely passive, utterly impotent.<sup>279</sup> Consequently, as long as his sons were absent, “Jacob held his peace [וְהָחֵרֵשׁ יַעֲקֹב]; or, alternatively, ‘Jacob remained silent or speechless<sup>280</sup>’” (v. 5b).

On the surface this text appears to depict Jacob as the inert father, waiting for his sons to return. Yet underneath this fleeting—and incomplete—characterization of a mature patriarch, it is important to recall Jacob’s prior proactive personality. Here, after all, is the man whose birth name means “he takes by the heel” or “he supplants” (Gen 25:19-26, esp. v. 26).<sup>281</sup> He is also the

<sup>278</sup> It is noteworthy that LXX renders all three consec. *waws* in v. 5 as *δέ* rather than *ἀλλά*, which would stress the contrast even more, especially in the first two instances. Wevers, Notes, 559, states that “the subjects change in vv.5,6,7 is stressed by *δέ*.”

<sup>279</sup> For more on Jacob’s impotence, see Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 160-161.

<sup>280</sup> Author’s translation. JPS renders this expression as: “Jacob kept silent.” In contrast to *BHS*, SP uses וַחֲרִישׁ, the hiph. form of חָרַשׁ with *waw* conjunction, which when translated is: “and he devised [fabricated] mischief,” indicating a more proactive disposition on Jacob’s part until his sons returned. BDB, 360. Sarna, *Genesis*, 234, opines, “The need to exercise restraint, pending the arrival of his sons, is understandable, but his passivity throughout the entire incident is remarkable.” According to Speiser, *Genesis*, 264, “[T]ook no action. Literally ‘kept still’; cf. xxiv 21.” Wenham, *Genesis*, 310-11; cf. 317, says, “Though silence may be right in some circumstances, the observation of the narrator here reflects badly on Jacob. He does not seem to care about his daughter’s honor.” For Wenham, Jacob’s lack of concern is due to the fact that Dinah “is the daughter of Jacob’s unloved wife Leah, hence Jacob’s relative indifference at her disgrace.” Naomi H. Rosenblatt and Joshua Horwitz, *Wrestling with Angels: What the First Family of Genesis Teaches Us About Our Spiritual Identity, Sexuality, and Personal Relationships* (New York: Delacorte, 1995), 305-312, reprimand Simeon and Levi for their injustice and indict Jacob for not loving Leah (i.e., the mother of Dinah, Simeon and Levi) and for failing to intervene or be more proactive in his adult children’s lives. Sternberg, *Poetics*, 448-451, holds an unfavorable view of Jacob’s inaction as well. So, too, Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading,” 180. Fewell and Gunn suggest that Jacob’s silence is problematic because of cultural forces, that is, pro-active Western readers are disinclined to view inactivity favorably. They also assert that “Jacob’s initial silence is wisdom in the face of a potentially explosive situation for his family as a whole.” Fewell and Gunn, “Tipping the Balance,” 197-198, 208. In an attempt to vindicate Jacob, Ramras-Rauch, “Fathers and Daughters,” 163-164, asserts—contra Wenham, Rosenblatt and Horwitz, and Sternberg, but with Fewell and Gunn—that Jacob’s “silence is not diffidence or cowardice but the understandable caution of a man who has bought a parcel of land amidst a region of strangers and has at last settled into peace after years of uncertainty.” Westermann, *Genesis*, 538, is not disturbed by Jacob’s silence and offers an uncorroborated explanation for it, i.e., “It is the business of the brothers to do something in such a situation.” Perhaps, Hamilton’s observation, *Genesis*, 356, is best: “Nothing is said about Jacob’s feelings.”

<sup>281</sup> *HarperCollins Study Bible, New Revised Standard Version with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books* (ed. Wayne A. Meeks; New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 39, n. t. Cf. BDB, 784-785.

younger brother who—along with his mother’s assistance—manipulated and deceived his older brother in order to obtain both Esau’s birthright and his father’s blessing (Gen 25:29-34; 27:1-40). Moreover, when Jacob lived in Paddam-Aram, he prospered by means of his astute animal husbandry while his uncle Laban languished (Gen 30:25-43). Seen against these parameters, the laconic nature of this pericope about Jacob is exceptional. For even though he does not immediately appear to react to Shechem’s bad behavior with any demonstrable urgency, Jacob may have already set into motion his deliberate, premeditated response by sending word of Shechem’s deed to his sons, which effectively summons them. In other words, Jacob’s silent waiting may simply be a sign of an angry father’s determined resolve.<sup>282</sup>

Whatever the reason for Jacob’s silence, his apparent inability or unwillingness to respond actively to Shechem’s misdeed while his sons are caring for his cattle, Hamor, Shechem’s father, embraces his son’s request and goes out to meet Jacob in order to get Dinah for him (v. 6). But was this encounter actually the result of happenstance? The text is unclear whether Hamor intentionally timed his meeting with Jacob to coincide with the return of Jacob’s sons or whether this rendezvous happened by chance as the NRSV translation suggests. In view of the ultimate reason for this meeting—Shechem’s misconduct—it is conceivable that Hamor thought it best to approach Jacob while his sons were away. By keeping the participants to a minimum, the negotiations might proceed more smoothly and swiftly. This rationale may therefore explain why only Hamor and his son Shechem went out to meet Jacob even though Hamor had

---

<sup>282</sup> This interpretation is strengthened by JPS translation. By linking כִּשְׁמָעוּ [qal inf. const. of שָׁמַע with כ preposition and 3<sup>rd</sup> person pl. suffix ] with the opening sentence and viewing this temporal clause in a causal capacity, the verse reads, according to JPS, as follows: “Meanwhile, Jacob’s sons, having heard the news, came in from the field.” This rendering suggests that the news about the affair between Shechem and Dinah motivated Jacob’s sons to return from the field, rather than it being the result of a chance encounter that the NRSV seems to connote. Wenham, *Genesis*, 311, too, notes that “the syntax is ambiguous.” In contrast, Kessler, “Genesis 34,” 4, offers the following suggestion: “Possibly the narrator intentionally safeguarded Jacob’s innocence in the ensuing atrocity, to leave him flawless in his patriarchal status, so that he may rebuke his sons for their misdeed, as tradition represents Jacob as having done, Gen. 49:5f.” Frankly, I find Kessler’s position indefensible in view of the broader characterization of Jacob in Genesis. In short, since there is no reticence on the narrator’s part to describe Jacob with all his foibles elsewhere, it seems improbable here.



other sons (Gen 33:19). Whatever the case, Hamor's conversation with Jacob begins "just as the sons of Jacob came in from the field [מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה בָּאוּ וַיְבִי יַעֲקֹב בָּאוּ] (v. 7a).

The story, however, suddenly introduces a new character by means of a different epithet: "the men" (v. 7a). On the one hand, the tag may simply indicate that Jacob's sons as well as other men—such as household servants—had been caring for the cattle. On the other hand, if this designation refers exclusively to Jacob's sons, it is unexpected, since prior to this point they have been referred to as "his sons" or "the sons of Jacob" (cf. vv. 5, 7a). Moreover, if "the men" is synonymous with "Jacob's sons," what does this new appellation imply? Is the narrator suggesting that this episode is transforming Jacob's sons into adults with their own separate identities? Are they no longer to be viewed merely as an extension of him, since their assessment of the situation—unlike that of their father—is passionate, unqualified, and full of conviction in the narrator's eyes?

Irrespective of these questions and their irretrievable answers, "[w]hen they heard of it [כִּשְׂמֵעָם],<sup>283</sup> the men were indignant and very angry [וַיַּחַר לָהֶם מְאֹד] (v. 7b).<sup>284</sup> Why? "[B]ecause he [i.e., Shechem] had committed an outrage [כִּי־נִבְלָה עָשָׂה] in Israel<sup>285</sup> by lying [לְשָׁכַב] with Jacob's daughter, for such a thing ought not to be done [לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה]

---

<sup>283</sup> Sternberg, *Poetics*, 451-453, points out that "[t]he rabbis have already numbered this among the 'undecidable texts' (*Bereshit Rabba* 80:5)—they might add, untranslatable—which lend themselves to more than one grammatical segmentation and analysis: a. Jacob's sons came in from the field when they heard it. The men were grieved and very angry; b. Jacob's sons came in from the field. When they heard it, the men were grieved and very angry." Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 356, n. 25.

<sup>284</sup> וַיַּחַר לָהֶם hith., impf., 3<sup>rd</sup>, masc., pl., of עָצַב with *waw* consec. The term, found only here and in Gen 6:6 in the hith., can also be rendered, "then they were grieved (vexed)..." BDB, 780. וַיַּחַר qal, pf., 3<sup>rd</sup>, masc., sg. of חָרָה with *waw* consec. The phrase, וַיַּחַר לָהֶם, is an idiom that literally means "anger was kindled for them" or "anger burned in them." A more colloquial rendering is: "they burned with anger." BDB, 354. LXX reads: ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν, κατενύχθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ λυπηρὸν ἦν αὐτοῖς σφόδρα ("And when they heard, the men [husbands] were deeply troubled and very distressed"). κατενύχθησαν is the aor. indic. pass. of κατανύσσω, which means "to be sorely pricked" or "to be bewildered, stunned." LSJ, 903; LEH, 240. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 148, asserts that the verb in this instance means "to be depressed." Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 559-560; and Hamilton, *Genesis*, 353, n. 11.

<sup>285</sup> Wenham, *Genesis*, 312, says of this prepositional phrase, "The use of 'in Israel' surely suggests that the brothers' view of what is right and proper has abiding validity in national life." Agreeing partially with Wenham are Fewell and Gunn, "Tipping the Balance," 199, who remark that "[t]heir [i.e., Jacob's sons']

וְיָכֵן” (v. 7c).<sup>286</sup> Shechem’s act was “senselessness,” “disgraceful folly [נְבָלָה].”<sup>287</sup> On account of

Shechem’s deed, the anger of “the men” is both understandable and warranted. With clever diction, the narrator observes that it was no longer Dinah with whom Shechem had lain, but now “Jacob’s daughter,” a signification that reinforces the claim that the offense was not only against Dinah but also Jacob. To be sure, Shechem had sullied Dinah, but his chief offense is perhaps that he had shamed Jacob and his sons as well. In other words, two of the narrative’s motifs begin to emerge because Shechem had not only brought disgrace on Jacob’s family identity and

---

anger stems from the reckless act against Israel” However, Fewell and Gunn go too far with their assertion “that the issue is not that their sister has been raped but that she has been ‘lain with.’ The fact that she has been forced seems immaterial.” Sternberg, *Poetics*, 453-454, sees this as a “key sentence [that] goes a long way toward aligning at this stage the viewpoints of the brothers, the narrator, and the reader—and, ultimately, toward producing the balanced attitude to the act of vengeance.” According to him, one way that the narrator achieves this goal is by means of the inherent ambiguity associated with “because [כי],” since it is unclear whether the opinion belongs to Jacob’s sons or the narrator.

<sup>286</sup> Westermann, *Genesis*, 538; 534, n. 9c, claims that these two reasons are late additions. The first is “an anachronism;” the second is “a grammatically clumsy addition.” He also sees “[a]n almost verbal parallel to this verse in Deut. 7:3.”

<sup>287</sup> BDB, 615. According to Speiser, *Genesis*, 264, “A deed regarded as moral anathema by the Israelites; cf. Judg xix 23; Deut xxii 21; Jer xxix 23.” Sarna, *Genesis*, 234, says, “Hebrew *nevalah* is a powerful term describing offenses of such profound abhorrence that they threaten to tear apart the fabric of Israelite society.” Von Rad, *Genesis*, 332, asserts that “[t]he word for infamous deed (*nēbālāh*) is an ancient expression for the most serious kind of sexual evil. The references—especially Judg. 19.23f.; 20.6 (Ex. 22.2)—reveal that surrounding this word was the horror of a sacrilege which incriminated the whole cultic community before God.” LXX translates נְבָלָה as ἄσχημον, that is, something “unseemly,” “shameful,” or “indecorous.” LSJ, 267; LEH, 68-69. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 560. Keefe, “Rapes of Women,” 82-83, notes that “[w]hile folly or senselessness is the common translation of *nēbālāh*, this rendering misses the full significance of its meaning.” In her estimation—based on a comparison of Gen 34, Judg 19-21, and 2 Sam 13, texts that show a “repeated narrative conjunction of rape and warfare”—“rape as *nēbālāh* is somehow, on the symbolic level at least, inherently generative of disorder, chaos, and the disintegration of *shalom* within a community.” She also contends that “[t]he conjunction of *innāh* with *nēbālāh* suggests the hypothesis that these stories of rape are not intended primarily as stories of personal tragedies, but of disruptions of community life in Israel.” On the whole, I concur with Keefe, though I would dispute her claim that “Dinah’s primary relation is given as Leah, not Jacob, an identification which will resonate at the conclusion of the story, where it is Leah’s other children, Simeon and Levi, who will act to take vengeance, in contrast to Jacob’s seeming acquiescence to his daughter’s rape.” Though Dinah’s first appellation in the narrative is “the daughter of Leah,” Dinah is also called “his daughter,” “Jacob’s daughter,” “your daughter,” “their sister,” “our sister,” and “our daughter” (cf. Gen 34:5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 17, 27). I think these varied signifiers—even more so than “the daughter of Leah”—enhance Keefe’s argument that this story concerns “disruptions of community life.” Dinah, after all, belongs to the whole clan, according to these designations. Keefe’s argument is supported by Wolfgang M. W. Roth, “NBL,” *VT* 10 (1960): 394-409, esp. 408-409; and Anthony Phillips, “NEBALAH—a term for serious disorderly and unruly conduct,” *VT* 25 (1975): 237-242, esp. 238, 241.

honor and but also on the nation's identity and honor as the narrator's expression "in Israel" (v. 7c) indicates.<sup>288</sup>

One other fascinating literary trait found in this scene is what George W. Savran describes as "the truthful presentation of the identity and/or motives of the characters."<sup>289</sup> This feature is especially conspicuous with the sons, both Shechem and the sons of Jacob. For example, Shechem's motive for acquiring Dinah is due—at least in part—to the fact that "his soul was drawn" to her and "he loved the girl" (v. 4; cf. v. 8). The motive for revenge by Jacob's sons is their anger and rage toward Shechem (v. 7; cf. vv. 13, 31). In contrast to the narrator's plain disclosure of the sons' motives, the account merely hints about Jacob's motive for his actions and offers none for either Hamor, Shechem's father, or Dinah (vv. 1, 5-6). In sum, the escalating conflict between Shechem who loves Dinah and Jacob's sons who detest Shechem is further intensified with the narrator's revelation of the sons' motives. The narrator's disclosure anticipates the remaining two motifs embedded in the story when later the brothers defend the honor of their sister and justify their vengeful conduct to Jacob.

---

<sup>288</sup> Wevers, *Notes*, 560, claims that "[t]he phrase [i.e., 'in Israel'] was to become common in Israelite times, but here it probably must be used as the designation for Jacob's clan." I do not take such a restrictive view of the expression, since I believe it entails—certainly from the narrator's perspective—both family and national concerns.

<sup>289</sup> George W. Savran, *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington—Indianapolis: Indiana University, 1988), 22. On this same topic, Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 114, 158, puts forward a fascinating assessment. He declares, "Biblical narrative offers us, after all, nothing in the way of minute analysis of motive or detailed rendering of mental processes; whatever indications we may be vouchsafed of feeling, attitude, or intention are rather minimal...In short, all the indicators of nuanced individuality to which the Western literary tradition has accustomed us—preeminently in the novel, but ultimately going back to the Greek epics and romances—would appear to be absent from the Bible." Returning to this subject much later, Alter says, "[C]haracter is revealed primarily through speech, action, gesture, with all the ambiguities that entails; motive is frequently, though not invariably, left in a penumbra of doubt; often we are able to draw plausible inferences about the personages and their destinies, but much remains a matter of conjecture or even of teasing multiple possibilities." On the one hand, I generally concur with Alter's estimation of biblical narrative. For example, the typical features he enumerates are certainly present in Gen 34, because Dinah's and Jacob's "mental processes" are unknown, their motives are "left in a penumbra of doubt," and "much remains a matter of conjecture or even of teasing multiple possibilities" (e.g., vv. 1, 5). Additionally, the character of both Shechem and Jacob's sons is "primarily revealed through speech, action, gesture, with all the ambiguities that entails" (e.g., vv. 2, 8-12, 14-17, 25-29). On the other hand, Savran is correct to observe that biblical narrative will on occasion disclose "the identity and/or motives of the characters," which in this instance occurs with both Shechem and Jacob's sons (e.g., vv. 3, 13).

*Scene Three: Luring Shechem (vv. 8-19a).*

Having swiftly dispensed vital background information about the origin of the conflict between Shechem and Jacob's sons, the pace of the narrative slows and as the details of the negotiations are set out, the narrator foreshadows how this dispute will ultimately lead to bloodshed when Jacob's sons retaliate against Shechem. As the negotiations occur, the build-up to that climactic and tragic event is disclosed through the characters' speeches. Appropriately, the narrator skillfully initiates his orchestration of the unfolding drama when Hamor, Shechem's father, speaks with Jacob and his sons in order to get Dinah for Shechem.

Yet the contrast found in the NRSV's translation, "But Hamor spoke ...[וַיִּדְבֹר הָמוֹר]," is more pronounced than necessary. Indeed, on this occasion a literal translation of the *waw* is preferred for two reasons. First, the verbal prefix is a conjunctive *waw*, for which "and" suffices.<sup>290</sup> Second, such a rendering seems more consistent with Hamor's reticent behavior up to this point in the story. For instance, when Shechem ordered his father to get Dinah for him, no reply from Hamor is reported. On the contrary, he simply complies and offers neither his opinion nor any addendum to his son's charge.

Hamor noticeably avoids any reference to his son's misdeed and instead focuses on Shechem's affection for Dinah.<sup>291</sup> By ignoring the reprehensible side of his son's character—that is, the one who "saw," "seized," and "lay with her by force"—and stressing his son's more pleasant traits, Hamor is perhaps attempting to placate Jacob's sons. Hence, he says, "The heart

---

<sup>290</sup> JPS agrees with this translation as does LXX which uses *καί*.

<sup>291</sup> Though not stated directly, it seems safe to assume that Hamor was fully cognizant of his son's act with Dinah, since both Jacob and his sons knew of it. About Hamor and Shechem's proposal, Sternberg, *Poetics*, 456, says, "One is first struck by the brazen disregard of antecedents. The narrator has steadily built up a sense of all-round outrage—human, familial, national, religious. But Hamor and Shechem make no apology for or even allusion to the crime, speaking as if nothing has happened except that a young man has fallen in love and wants to negotiate a marriage according to custom." On the one hand, Hamilton suggests that "as far as Hamor is concerned, Shechem's feelings for Dinah are genuine and honorable." On the other hand, Hamilton—concurring with Sternberg—observes the following: "While Hamor's offer to Jacob and his sons seems generous, it noticeably lacks any reference to his son's humiliation of Dinah." Hamilton, *Genesis*, 358360.

of my son Shechem longs for your daughter [בְּבִתְכֶם נַפְשׁוֹ חֲשָׁקָה נִפְשׁוֹ];<sup>292</sup> please *give* her to him in marriage [וְהָיָה לְאִשָּׁה לּוֹ לְאִשָּׁה]<sup>293</sup> (v. 8; italics added). Strangely enough, the one for whom “Shechem longs” is not solely Jacob’s daughter, but “your daughter [בְּבִתְכֶם]; 2<sup>nd</sup> masc. pl. suffix]<sup>294</sup> who belongs to the whole family, both to Jacob and to his sons. Dinah, the corporate property of Jacob’s family, is the property that Hamor seeks when he asks, “[P]lease *give* her to him.” Yet his request “give” is more like a demand, the initial refrain of a chorus that repeats itself throughout the scene (cf. vv. 8, 9, 11, 12, 14) until at last Jacob’s sons threaten to “*take* our daughter” unless Shechem, his clan, and neighbors accept circumcision as a rider on the counter-offer (v. 17; italics added).

Immediately after revealing his son’s heart and making his request known, Hamor expands the goals of the negotiations. Whereas his first objective was very limited—i.e., to get Dinah for his son—Hamor’s secondary aims involve much more, for he says, “Make marriages with us [וְהָיָה חַתָּנֵינוּ אִתָּנוּ]; *give* your daughters to us [בְּנִתֵיכֶם תִּתְּנוּ לָנוּ], and *take* our daughters for yourselves [וְנִאֲתָבְנֵינוּ תִקְחוּ לָכֶם]” (v. 9; italics added). Here, Hamor’s language reflects the impulsiveness of his son’s prior act with Dinah. In reality, he does not ask for the daughters of Jacob’s clan, but rather speaks imperatively: “make marriages with us [אִתָּנוּ]

<sup>292</sup> LXX renders חֲשָׁקָה (i.e., “loves” or “is attached to;” BDB, 365-366) as προείλατο, aor. indic. mid. of προαιρέω, which means “to take away first for oneself,” “to take by deliberate choice,” or “to prefer.” LSJ, 1466-1467; LEH, 393.

<sup>293</sup> LXX literal word for word translation here, δότε οὖν αὐτὴν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα, corresponds well to the Hebrew.

<sup>294</sup> LXX picks up on this pl. poss. with its use of ὑμῶν.

וְנָתַתְּ אֹתָהּ לְבָנָיו,<sup>295</sup> a tense that effectively controls the two subsequent qal imperfects and thus converts them into commands as well: “give...[וְנָתַתְּ אֹתָהּ],” and “take [וְתִקַּחְתָּ].”<sup>296</sup>

This last directive is especially remarkable, since it divulges much about Shechem and his father. In the first place, Hamor orders Jacob and his sons to do exactly what Shechem did: when you see and desire a daughter, *take* her (v. 2). In the second place, these words perhaps disclose a fundamental principle that Hamor had instilled in his son—“In order to get what you want, you must act forcefully, resolutely, and without delay.” Consequently, it comes as no surprise that both Hamor’s daughters and Jacob’s daughters are regarded as property over which men barter and exchange. In brief, these ancient men hold the power and retain the prerogative to trade women as if they were nothing more than chattel.

It is also worth noting that the “give” refrain previously mentioned, recurs in Hamor’s demand. Yet this time it does not stand alone. On the contrary, it is conjoined with “take.” Thus with deft artistic skill, the narrator juxtaposes two antiphonal themes: “give” and “take.” This latter refrain not only foreshadows what the sons of Jacob will eventually do when the story reaches its climax, but also ironically adds thematic symmetry to the narrative by subtly alluding both to the story’s origin when Shechem *took* Dinah and the story’s close when her brothers *take* her back. In short, the sons of Jacob will heed Hamor’s command and *take* a daughter. But instead of following his decree as he expects, the daughter that the sons of Jacob will *take* will be their own daughter, their sister Dinah, and not one of Hamor’s daughters (cf. vv. 17, 26).<sup>297</sup>

---

<sup>295</sup> Hith., impv., masc., pl. of נָתַן. This verb occurs only in the Hithpael stem in the HB. The *waw* in this instance could be left untranslated—as it is in the NRSV—but could also be rendered “so” or “thus,” which would then link it more forcefully with Hamor’s request of Dinah for Shechem.

<sup>296</sup> It appears that LXX translators also detected this imperative conversion. Consequently, all three verbs are appropriately rendered as imperatives (i.e., ἐπιγαμβρεύσασθε, δότε, λάβετε). Wevers, *Notes*, 561-562, discusses the change from imperfect Hebrew verbs to imperative Greek verbs.

<sup>297</sup> Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 100, rightly points out that “language manifestly makes things happen.” In particular, his observation that “[v]ariation in repetition is sometimes used to adumbrate not a feature of character but a development of plot” is clearly present in Gen 34 as the “give-take” *Leitmotiv* looks back to the story’s beginning, constantly reappears throughout the negotiations, and ultimately anticipates the story’s violent end when Jacob’s sons take back Dinah who had never been given to Shechem. For more on “the techniques of repetition,” idem, 88-113.

Hamor's forceful and domineering attitude continues as he ups the ante. He invites Jacob and his sons to dwell with them. Yet the inverted word order suggests not an equitable living arrangement, but rather one that privileges Hamor's people. With discernible presumption, Hamor says to Jacob, "Thus *with us*, you will live [וְאֶתְנַן תִּשְׁבוּ] (v. 10a; italics added; author's translation).<sup>298</sup> To be sure, Hamor promises "the land shall be open [וְהָאָרֶץ תְּהִיָּה לְפָנֵיכֶם]"<sup>299</sup> to them (v. 10b), but the imperatives belie his taken-for-granted world and reflect the entitlement that he assumes belongs to him and his clan. With that in mind, Hamor unceremoniously orders Jacob and his sons to "live [שְׁבוּ] and trade [וְסִחְרִיתָהּ] in it, and get property [וְהָאֲחֻזָּיו] in it" (v. 10c),<sup>300</sup> which would include not only land, but also daughters (cf. Gen 33:19; 34:9).<sup>301</sup>

---

<sup>298</sup> JPS translation is: "You will dwell among us." Here, too, Hamor's privileging is apparent, for he does not say, "We will dwell together." Though it is not explicitly stated, Hamor does not appear to have much interest in forming an integrated community where all parties have equal standing, though Wevers, *Notes*, 562, asserts that "[i]nter-marriage...will produce all the benefits of citizenship." LXX also captures this sense with καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικεῖτε ("Then with us you will dwell [live]").

<sup>299</sup> וְהָאָרֶץ תְּהִיָּה לְפָנֵיכֶם is an idiomatic expression formed by the ל prefix affixed to the masc. pl. const. of פָּנָה with second person masc. pl. suffix כֶּם. Literally, the entire phrase is, "and the land will be before your faces." LXX uses the fem. adjective πλατεῖα ("wide") in order to translate the Hebrew idiom. Wevers, *Notes*, 562, translation is: "as for the land, behold it lies wide open before you."

<sup>300</sup> The first two verbs (שְׁבוּ; וְסִחְרִיתָהּ) are qal impv. masc. pl.; the last verb (וְהָאֲחֻזָּיו) is a niph. impv. masc. pl. whose form is found only here and in Josh 22:19 according to Mp. SP has the qal impv. form of אָחַז rather than the niph. Speiser, *Genesis*, 264-265, takes exception to the translation "trade." He says, "The prevailing translation 'trade therein' is against both syntax and context. The Heb. verb *shr* signified originally 'to circle, follow an irregular course,' and this range of meaning persists in Akkadian and Aramaic...The connotation 'to trade' is a late secondary development in Heb. and Jewish Aramaic based on the noun *sōhēr* 'merchant' (cf. xxiii 16)." Neither Sarna (*Genesis*, 235) nor Wenham (*Genesis*, 312) are disturbed by "trading." Agreeing with Speiser but against Wenham is Westermann, *Genesis*, 539; 534, n. 10a, who says that "[t]he hypothesis that the patriarchs were traders, 'caravaneers' (W. F. Albright, C. H. Gordon), cannot lay claim to this passage." Westermann, however, admits that the word eventually "took on the meaning, 'merchant.'" LXX translation follows the Hebrew nicely here with its string of four imperative verbs: κατοικεῖτε ("dwell" or "live" [2x]), ἐμπορεύεσθε ("trade" or "be a merchant;" LSJ, 547-548; LEH, 147), and ἐγκτήσασθε ("acquire possessions," LSJ, 474; LEH, 128). Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 562-563.

<sup>301</sup> Sarna, *Genesis*, 235-36, too, impugns Hamor's offer about which he states, "Although outwardly polite, Hamor, in effect, has besmirched the characters of Jacob and his sons. By inference, he has attributed to them a sordid, mercenary concern that outweighs all other considerations, thus adding insult to injury." Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 152, says, "Given the subject of the story, these feminine suffixes subtly allude to Dinah."

Immediately after Hamor presents his offer to Jacob and his sons, Shechem returns to the center of this growing maelstrom when he adds his own condition to his father's proposal. He says to them, "Let me find favor with you [אֶמְצָא־חֵן בְּעֵינֵיכֶם]<sup>302</sup> and whatever you say to me I will *give* [וְנִאֲשֶׁר תֹּאמְרוּ אֵלַי אֶתֶן]<sup>303</sup> (v. 11; italics added). Ironically, the one who previously *took* Dinah without their consent now seeks their permission to *give* something in return for his deed. His stipulation is astonishing because of its completely open-ended condition. To press the point, his unqualified proviso is shocking—assuming that Shechem is aware of their disapproval—since it provides an opening by which Jacob's sons can exact their revenge. By entirely obliging himself to them, Shechem sets into motion a sequence of events by which he, his family, and village will suffer unintended, unanticipated, and atrocious consequences from the hands of Jacob's sons.

Yet even though Shechem's initial pitch is uttered entirely without qualification, his second bid categorically seals his future fate; and just as his father had widened his offer beyond the primary aim of getting Dinah, in a similar way Shechem increases his tender as well. He declares, "Put the marriage present and gift as high as you like עָלַי מְאֹד מוֹהַר וּמִתֶּן]<sup>304</sup>

and I will *give* you whatever you ask me [וְנִאֲתַנָּה כִּפְאֲשֶׁר תֹּאמְרוּ אֵלַי] (v. 12a-b;

<sup>302</sup> A cohort. qal impf. 1<sup>st</sup> per. masc. sg. followed by a common, poetic idiom: "Let me find favor in your eyes." JPS translates this phrase as: "Do me this favor." LXX translation is: Εὐροίμι (aor. opt. act.) χάριν ἐναντίον ὑμῶν, that is, "May I find favor before you."

<sup>303</sup> Rather than maintaining the 1<sup>st</sup> per. sg. voice of אֶתֶן, LXX adopts the 1<sup>st</sup> per. pl. voice with its use of δώσομεν ("we will give").

<sup>304</sup> More literally, "Multiply [הַרְבֵּן hiph. impv. masc. pl.] upon me the purchase-price and marriage gift." Author's translation. "[A] bridal payment. Heb. *mohar umattān*, not as two separate items but as one payment of the amount due the family for the release of the girl; for a similar hendiadys in Akkadian cf. *biltu u mandattu*, literally 'tribute and payment,' i.e., payment of tribute." Speiser, *Genesis*, 265. Conversely, Westermann, *Genesis*, 540, says, "[D]he מוֹהַר is paid to the family of the bride, the מִתֶּן is probably the present to the bride. Gen. 24 clearly distinguishes the present to the bride from the gifts to the family." Though Hamilton, *Genesis*, 361, sees these two terms as a hendiadys like Speiser, he allows for Westermann's position. LXX captures the sense of this clause well with: πληθύνετε τὴν φερνήν σφόδρα ("Multiply [Increase] the bridal gift exceedingly."), though וּמִתֶּן is missing or absent in most Greek MSS. Technically, φερνή is the bride's dowry, that is, the gift(s) brought by the bride and offered to the groom. Shechem's concern is the מוֹהַר, the price a groom (and his family) must pay for his bride to her



italics added).<sup>305</sup> Paradoxically, Shechem’s impulsive persona, which initially appeared when he took Dinah, is seen in his extravagant offer; and like his father before him, the initial request mutates into a disturbing order: “[O]nly *give* me the girl to be my wife [לִי אֶת־הַנְּעֶרָ לְאִשְׁתִּי]” (v. 12c; italics added).<sup>306</sup> His desperation, desire, and perhaps guilt as well are palpable as he amplifies his follow-up offer, which the NRSV rightly detects when it renders the *waw* of this final clause as “only.” Since he is willing to sacrifice everything he has as long as he can have Dinah as his wife, his tragic, but as yet unknown, fate is inexorably fixed.

Though Shechem and his father are unaware of their impending doom, the narrator adumbrates this fact for his audience when he reports that “[t]he sons of Jacob answered Shechem and his father Hamor deceitfully [בְּמִזְרָמָה],<sup>307</sup> because he had defiled their sister Dinah

---

family. LSJ, 1922-1924; LEH 501. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 166, offers the following assessment on Shechem’s generosity: “They [i.e., Jacob’s sons] understood that Shechem sought to pay for his deed and called his payment euphemistically *בְּמִזְרָמָה*.” For further discussion on this topic, see Wenham, *Genesis*, 312-313 and Wevers, *Notes*, 563-564.

<sup>305</sup> JPS translation of v. 12a-b is: “Ask of me a bride-price ever so high, as well as gifts, and I will pay what you tell me.” Here, LXX reverts back to the 1<sup>st</sup> per. sg. (i.e., δῶσω) and thus correctly mimics the Hebrew.

<sup>306</sup> לִי אֶת־הַנְּעֶרָ qal impv. masc. pl. with consec. *waw*. LXX translates this impv. verb as a fut. indic. (i.e., δώσετε [“you will give...]). About Shechem’s offer, Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 277-280, says, “There is no hint in the son’s proposal of anything but good faith.” In his estimation, Shechem, Hamor, and Jacob act responsibly and pragmatically, the villains are Jacob’s sons who “were not acting in good faith.” Brueggemann’s final condemnation of Jacob’s sons is so intense that it is worth quoting at length, especially since it stands in such sharp contrast to later Jewish writings that extol the two brothers. He says, “Sadly, at the end of the narrative Jacob’s sons have learned nothing and conceded nothing (v. 31). They are fixed on the narrow sexual issue. The sons remain blind to the larger economic issues, blind to the dangers they have created, blind to the possibilities of cooperation, and blind even to the ways they have compromised their own religion in their thirst for vengeance and gain.” In a similar way, Von Rad, *Genesis*, 335, says, “The narrator is clearly concerned to do justice to the Shechemites. Their offers in vs. 8-10 and v. 12 are generous and without guile.” *Contra* Brueggemann and Von Rad is Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 153-154, who categorically repudiates Shechem. She states, “Pretended humility and modesty characterize Shechem’s speech.” My reading is not as intractable as any of these interpreters. I find some flaws with all the men, since I detect sufficient textual ambiguity that permits blame to be shared by all. See n. 271.

<sup>307</sup> LXX, δόλου (“deceit” or “treachery”). In contrast to many authors who present a sympathetic reading of Shechem’s conduct and disparage Jacob’s sons (n. 23, 57), Sarna, *Genesis*, 236, states emphatically, “The Narrator informs us at once that the brothers’ seeming acceptance of intermarriage with the Shechemites is merely a ruse. No moral judgment is intended and would, in fact, be gratuitous. The victim of the assault is still being held by the perpetrator (vv. 17, 26), who has not even admitted to a crime, let alone expressed regret. There is no way that Dinah can be liberated by a tiny minority in the face of overwhelming odds—except by the exercise of cunning.” So, too, Sternberg, *Poetics*, 468, cf. 457-463, who says, “Considering the numerical superiority of the troops behind ‘the prince of the land’—‘two of Jacob’s sons’ faced a whole

אֲשֶׁר טָמְא אֶת דִּינָה אֶחָתָם]”<sup>308</sup> (v. 13). Without explanation, the NRSV fails to translate וַיַּדְבֵּרוּ.<sup>309</sup> Arguably, a translation of the Hebrew that accounts for both verbs and the adverb בְּמִרְמָה is: “Then Jacob’s sons answered Shechem and his father Hamor; so they spoke deceitfully [or, ‘with deceit’] because he had defiled their sister Dinah.”<sup>310</sup> This rendition is preferred, because it incorporates both verbs and their attendant *waws* in the translation. To be more exact, the first consecutive *waw* and verb not only link the answer given by Jacob’s sons with Shechem and Hamor’s offer but also convey a temporal component in their dialogue. In other words, the current form of the narrative offers some hints of premeditation by Jacob’s sons, since they reply immediately and without any deliberation. Furthermore, the second *waw* and verb—along with the adverb בְּמִרְמָה and relative particle אֲשֶׁר—denote causation and thus reveal the interior motive for their deceitful riposte, which is uncharacteristic of biblical narrative.<sup>311</sup>

---

city—no wonder the brothers resorted to trickery to make odds more even.” Hamilton, *Genesis*, 361, notes that “Targ. Onqelos reads ‘with wisdom’ (*bhwkm*) for MT *b<sup>e</sup>mirmâ*.”

<sup>308</sup> Once again, LXX inexplicably shifts from the sg. to the pl. Whereas *BHS* has טָמְא (“he defiled” [3<sup>rd</sup> per. sg.]), LXX is ἐμίαναν (“they defiled” [3<sup>rd</sup> per. pl.]; cf. v. 5). Wevers, *Notes*, 564, suggests that “the verse was changed to the pl....since the deceitful reply was addressed to father and son.” Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 361, n. 2.

<sup>309</sup> Piel, impf., 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. pl. of דָּבַר with consec. *waw*.

<sup>310</sup> JPS is also more precise with its translation of v. 13 which reads: “Jacob’s sons answered Shechem and his father Hamor—speaking with guile because he had defiled their sister Dinah.” LXX likewise maintains the double verb structure of v. 13, though it seems more natural to read the adverb μετὰ δόλου with ἀπεκρίθησαν rather than ἐλάλησαν. Westermann, *Genesis*, 534, n. 13a, opines, “[V.] 13b is syntactically difficult and recognizable as a subsequent insertion.” Von Rad, *Genesis*, 333, claims that “Jacob’s passive role in the story is never more remarkable than it is here, where after old Hamor’s speech, not Jacob but his young sons take over the conversation and stipulate the conditions.”

<sup>311</sup> Von Rad, *Genesis*, 333, concurs: “The statement that the brothers spoke ‘deceitfully’ is a surprising moral judgment, for most of the patriarchal narratives are extremely reticent in evaluating human words or deeds.” For more on this point, see the discussion on Savran and Alter above (n. 289). Cf. Sternberg, *Poetics*, 457-463, on the ambiguity of “*asher* [to him who / because he / and literally, who].” Though Wenham, *Genesis*, 313, thinks it best to translate אֲשֶׁר as “because,” he allows for “who.” For more on the ambiguity of v. 13, esp. אֲשֶׁר, see Rashkow, “Hebrew Bible Translations,” 229-230.

The story's tension is further amplified by the way Dinah is now represented. Whereas previously she was “the daughter of Leah” (v. 1), “the daughter of Jacob” (vv. 3, 5), “[their] daughter” (v. 8), and “the girl” (v. 12), now she is “their sister” (v. 13). Not only had Shechem defiled a daughter and a girl, he had also defiled their sibling—an abhorrent act that evoked the anger of the sons of Jacob and provoked them to answer deceitfully. Understandably, they reply, “We cannot do this thing [לֹא נוּכַל לַעֲשׂוֹת הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה],<sup>312</sup> to *give* our sister to one who is uncircumcised [לָתֵת אֶת־אֶחָתֵנּוּ לְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ עֶרְלָה],<sup>313</sup> for that would be a disgrace to us [כִּי־חֲרָפָה הוּא לָנוּ]<sup>314</sup> (v. 14; italics added).

On the one hand, though Shechem had defiled their sister, which is the ostensible reason for their deceitful reply according to the narrator, their initial answer belies another possible motive for their deception. For, once they permit Shechem—an uncircumcised brute—to *take* their sister, they will bring shame and reproach upon themselves. Hence, they “cannot do this [disgraceful] thing.” They categorically reject Hamor’s first offer that they *give* their sister to his uncircumcised son, not first and foremost because he had defiled Dinah, but more importantly because they would suffer disgrace (i.e., become the object of scorn and ridicule). Once again, the motif of family identity and honor is evident in their reply (i.e., “that would be a disgrace to us”).<sup>315</sup> In addition, their anger toward Shechem—though presently held in check—prefigures the story’s ominous end.

<sup>312</sup> LXX and Hebrew correspond well. LXX reads: Οὐ δυνατούμεθα ποιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο (“We are unable to [cannot] do this thing”). Interestingly, LXX specifically names Simeon and Levi here. See Wevers, *Notes*, 565.

<sup>313</sup> Literally, the phrase לְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ עֶרְלָה says, “to a man who has a foreskin.” LXX reads: δοῦναι τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπῳ ὅς ἔχει ἀκροβυστίαν (“to give our sister to a man who is uncircumcised”).

<sup>314</sup> חֲרָפָה can also mean “reproach” or “shame,” BDB, 357-358. LXX reads: ἔστιν γὰρ ὄνειδος ἡμῖν (“for it is reproach [censure, blame] to us”). Rashkow, “Hebrew Bible Translation,” 230, says, “*Herpāh* is more than the mere loss of face; it is total reproach.”

<sup>315</sup> Fleishman states, “The sin is against Israel, against the religious norms, which must not be violated, against their honour (*sic*) and against purity of their women...The matter of circumcision is designed to allow

On the other hand, their deceitful answer may not point to any narcissistic, family-centered drive for their ruse at all, but rather may be the very means by which they are luring Shechem into their trap. He, like all men of that culture, would certainly be sympathetic to the issue that Jacob's sons raise: their honor. Indeed, preservation of one's honor would probably rank high on a list of commonly shared values. If this line of thinking is plausible and Shechem takes the bait, they have shrewdly reinforced his previous commitment to give them whatever they ask. Why? As a man in that society, Shechem understands precisely how detestable public shame is; and since he would not want to experience such humiliation himself, he knows that Jacob's sons—as men—must avoid it at all costs and in all situations.

By refusing Shechem and Hamor's offer and baiting them with a mutually shared cultural value—that is, the preservation of family, especially male, honor—Jacob's sons have concocted a scheme that they expect will trap their adversaries. To achieve their goal, the sons of Jacob present their counter-proposal without delay. With clever and calculated skill, they name the sole prerequisite they require before they will *give* their sister to Shechem: “Only on this condition will we consent to you [אֲדִבְזֹאת נָאוֹת לָכֶם]:<sup>316</sup> that you will become as we are and every male among you be circumcised [אִם תְּהִי כִמֹּנֵנוּ לְהַמַּל לָכֶם כָּל־זָכָר]”<sup>317</sup> (v. 15). In view of Shechem's rash offer—to *give* them whatever they ask—this offer appears, at first glance, too good to be true by all accounts. Rather than having to part with a substantial portion of their

---

them to avenge the honor of their sister by murdering Shechem, Hamor, and all of the males of the city of Shechem.” Fleishman, “Legal Significance,” 548, 551-552.

<sup>316</sup> נָאוֹת (niph. impf. 1<sup>st</sup> masc. pl.) is from אָוַת. It is an infrequent verb that occurs only four times in the HB (RHELOT, 18) and is found only in the niph. stem (BDB, 22). LXX reads: ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθησόμεθα ὑμῖν καὶ κατοικήσομεν ἐν ὑμῖν (“By this will we become like you and live with you”).

<sup>317</sup> לְהַמַּל is a niph. inf. const. with ל prefix from מָוַל, which means “to circumcise.” The entire clause in LXX reads: εἰ ἂν γένησθε ὡς ἡμεῖς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ περιτμηθῆναι ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν (“If you would become as we, then you circumcise yourselves every male”). Hamilton, *Genesis*, 361, proposes that circumcision in this case “has the primitive significance of initiation into marriage and into the communal life of a tribe. There is no indication here that the Hamorites are asked to convert from one religion to another.” For more on the ancient practice of circumcision, see Philip J. King, “Circumcision—Who Did It, Who Didn't and Why,” *BAR* 32/4 (July/Aug 2006): 48-55.

material possessions, Jacob's sons merely expect Shechem, Hamor, and the other men to part with their foreskins—a tiny member that will exact no economic toll on them.

Oddly, both the NRSV and JPS translate אֵלַּי as “that.” While this is an apt reading, opting for “if” is preferred, since it maintains the symmetry of their proposal, which is structured as an “if-if not” clause in verses 15 and 17.<sup>318</sup> It also conveys more clearly the conditional nature of the counter-offer, which is critical if their ruse is to succeed. Obviously, Jacob's sons desperately want Shechem and his father to accept the counter-proposal, which is more likely to happen if they can be lured into an either-or conundrum. To reach their ultimate objective, then, Jacob's sons configure their counter-proposal in such a way that it permits no further negotiations. Shechem and Hamor must embrace the “if-if not” scenario and either accept or refuse the stipulation put forward by Jacob's sons. If they accept, Jacob's sons will *give* the girl to them; if they decline the offer, the sons of Jacob will *take* their daughter. Simply put, the ambush the sons of Jacob hope to carry out is becoming more probable with this calculated maneuver.

Yet before the “if not” component is stated, Jacob's sons seek to increase the odds that their counter-offer will be accepted by incorporating some facets of Hamor's proposal, that is, to intermarry and live together. On the presumption that the trap they are setting will succeed, Jacob's sons declare, “Then we will *give* our daughters to you [וְנָתַנּוּ אֶת־בָּנֹתֵינוּ לָכֶם],<sup>319</sup> and we will *take* your daughters for ourselves [וְאָת־בָּנֹתֵיכֶם נִקְחָלֵנוּ],<sup>320</sup> and we will live among you

---

<sup>318</sup> LXX supports this line of thinking and translates אֵלַּי as εἰάν. The conditional facet of this clause is reinforced even further by the subsequent subjunc. verb γένησθε. On the conditional nature of this clause in LXX, see Wevers, *Notes*, 565-566. A classic example of the “if-if not” style of rhetoric in the HB occurs when Nebuchadnezzar presents an “if-if not” scenario to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego and they, in turn, disavow his offer with an “if-if not” scenario of their own (Dan 3:15, 17-18).

<sup>319</sup> Here, both the NRSV and JPS adroitly interpret the consec. *waw* as “then.”

<sup>320</sup> LXX continues its mime of the “give-take” Hebrew motif with the verbs δώσομεν (“we will give”) and ληψόμεθα (“we will take”). Wevers, *Notes*, 566, says that “the ‘taking’ is honorable,” since the daughters are not “being taken as slaves or plunder.”

and become one people [וַיִּשְׁבְּנוּ אִתְּכֶם וְהָיִינוּ לְעַם אֶחָד]”<sup>321</sup> (v. 16; italics added).The

significance, if any, of their modification to Hamor’s offer is, for the moment, unclear. Whereas Hamor had proposed that Jacob and his sons “live and trade” and “get property in [the land],” Jacob’s sons suggest that they “become one people” (cf. vv. 9-10). Irrespective of this clear modification, the *Leitwörter* of “give” and “take” recur as Jacob’s sons clarify their offer and amend Hamor’s.

Jacob’s sons continue to demonstrate their shrewd negotiating skills as they conclude their counter-proposal.<sup>322</sup> Undeniably, the minor stipulation that they add, specifically, circumcise all males, and the negligible change that they make to Hamor’s offer seem relatively insignificant. Yet to finish setting their trap, they must impress upon Shechem and Hamor that if this proposal is rejected, no transaction will occur. Accordingly, they say, “But if you will not listen to us and be circumcised [וְאִם־לֹא תִשְׁמָעוּ אֵלֵינוּ לְהַמּוֹל],”<sup>323</sup> then we will *take* our daughter and be gone [וְהִלְכָנוּ]” (v. 17; italics added).<sup>324</sup> The abruptness of the “if not” component is a sign of their resolve and reinforces even further the declared consequences if Shechem and Hamor refuse to be circumcised. In short, not only will Jacob’s sons depart, they will also *take* Dinah with them, thus keeping her away from Shechem.<sup>325</sup>

---

<sup>321</sup> LXX translates אֶחָד לְעַם as ὡς γένος ἓν. Interestingly, LXX uses οἰκήσομεν (“inhabit,” “settle,” “manage,” or “govern;” LSJ, 1202-1203; LEH, 325) here rather than κατοικήσομεν to translate יָשַׁב as it had previously done (cf. vv. 10, 15), a variation that ever so slightly suggests Jacob’s sons will not merely live with Hamor and his clan, but that they will oversee the affairs of this new, blended people.

<sup>322</sup> Fleishman, “Simeon and Levi Rebuke,” 106, captures the sons’ determination well when he notes that they “display steadfastness and resoluteness in the negotiations.”

<sup>323</sup> According to Mp, וְאִם is found at the beginning of a verse in Genesis three times (cf. Gen 24:8; 34:17; 43:5). LXX renders וְאִם־לֹא as ἐὰν δὲ μὴ, properly indicating both the disjunctive *waw* and the conditional clause, which is buttressed by the subjunc. verb εἰσακούσῃτε.

<sup>324</sup> Of this verse, Sternberg, *Poetics*, 458, says, “Unless the counter-proposal is accepted, the brothers imply, what was ‘taken’ by force will be ‘taken’ back by force.” Hamilton, *Genesis*, 363, notes that “[t]here is no indication that Jacob is privy to this ruse, that he is even consulted for an opinion, that he has any say in the matter, or that he approved. He is reduced to silence, passivity, and noninvolvement.”

<sup>325</sup> LXX use of ἀπελευσόμεθα seems to capture both the literal meaning and the subtle implication that their threatened departure entails (“we [all of us, including Dinah] will go away [from you]”).

However, after listening to the counter-proposal by Jacob's sons, Hamor and Shechem do not dispute the offer from Jacob's sons. Could they, after all, find legitimate grounds for rejecting the offer, since the terms of the contract are virtually identical to their original proposal? Obviously not, for Hamor and Shechem are ecstatic that an agreement has been reached so quickly and without incident, especially when placed against the circumstances that necessitated the negotiations in the first place. Appropriately, the narrator describes their consent succinctly, "Their words pleased [וַיִּטְבוּ דְבָרֵיהֶם]<sup>326</sup> Hamor and Hamor's son, Shechem" (v. 18).

Needless to say, what happens next is entirely expected, particularly in light of their consent to the proposed compact and Shechem's impetuous personality. Predictably, the narrator reports, "And the young man did not delay to do the thing [וְלֹא־אַחַר הַנְּעָר לַעֲשׂוֹת הַדָּבָר], because he was delighted with Jacob's daughter [כִּי חָפֵץ בַּבַּת־יַעֲקֹב] (v. 19a).<sup>327</sup>

Though a deal has been struck, it must still be consummated—an act that Hamor and Shechem are certainly eager to do. Yet to consummate without forethought this time will result in unanticipated consequences that will extend far beyond any conceivable bounds. Whereas Jacob's sons, the narrator, and the audience know that a menacing storm is brewing, neither Hamor nor Shechem are aware of it. For, ironically, both he and his father are about to enter into a transaction—along with their comrades—that will ultimately *give* all they have to Jacob's sons when they return to settle the contract, fulfill their end of the bargain as they *take* their sister and everything else away, and reclaim their family's honor and avenge Dinah's humiliation.

---

<sup>326</sup> LXX similarly reads: καὶ ἤρεσαν οἱ λόγοι ("And the words pleased..."). As Wevers, *Notes*, 567, says, "Hemmor and Suchem fall into the trap; they accept the proposal."

<sup>327</sup> JPS version is: "And the youth lost no time in doing the thing, for he wanted Jacob's daughter." LXX reads: καὶ οὐκ ἐχρόνισεν ὁ νεανίσκος τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ἐνέκελτο γὰρ τῇ θυγατρὶ Ἰακωβ ("And the young man did not delay doing this deed, for he was devoted to Jacob's daughter."). Wevers, *Notes*, 567, points out that ἐνέκελτο means "was wrapped up in, involved with τῇ θυγατρὶ Ἰακωβ." Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 157, maintains that "the verb חָפֵץ does not regard the response of the other person." Perhaps, but not necessarily, since no one knows Shechem's interior thoughts. Consider also, e.g., Num 14:8 where God is concerned about the response of the people (cf. 2 Sam 15:25-26; 22:20; 1 Kgs 10:9; Isa 62:4).

*Scene Four: Catching Their Prey (vv. 19b-24)*

Convinced that they have reached an agreement with unusually favorable terms, Hamor and Shechem immediately turn their attention to the next critical matter: securing the pact's approval from their fellow citizens. That objective, though problematic, is not insurmountable given Shechem's credentials, for the narrator reports, "Now he was the most honored of all his family [וְהָיָה נְכֹבֵד מִכָּל בֵּית אָבִיו]" (v. 19b).<sup>328</sup> The NRSV subtly captures Shechem's strategy with: "So Hamor and his son Shechem came to the gate of their city and spoke to the men of their city..." (v. 20; italics added).<sup>329</sup> Since Shechem is well-respected, his course of action is entirely logical, especially if he is ever going to consummate his deal with Jacob's sons. This scene—the convocation of the city's leading men at the city gate, the commercial center for ancient cities—understandably describes the pragmatic means by which Hamor and Shechem hope to achieve their aim. Consequently, in view of Shechem's honored status it is prudent for Hamor and his son to follow established protocol<sup>330</sup> in order to expedite their acquisition of Dinah, which is, after all, the foremost objective.

With their objective in clear view, Hamor and Shechem say to the leading men, "These people are friendly with us [וְהָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה שְׁלָמִים הֵם אִתָּנוּ];<sup>331</sup> let them live in the land and

---

<sup>328</sup> JPS translation is: "Now he was the most respected in his father's house." LXX reads: αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ἐνδοξότατος πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ("Now he was honored more than all others in his father's house").

<sup>329</sup> Though JPS will curiously substitute "public place" for "gate" in this verse, perhaps hoping to make the setting of the town council sound familiar to modern readers (ultimately, I think the lack of specificity with the banal term "public place" undermines this decision), both the NRSV and JPS understand the initial consec. *waw* in the same way. Like the NRSV, JPS begins the verse with "So..." LXX, which slavishly imitates the Hebrew throughout v. 20, uses δέ, which can also be translated as "So..."

<sup>330</sup> Assembling with the leading men of the city at the city gate to conduct business and discuss civic affairs was common in ancient times. e.g., Ruth 3: 11; 4:1-12. Cf. Speiser, *Genesis*, 265; Wenham, *Genesis*, 314.

<sup>331</sup> Perhaps of some interest is the fact that וְהָאֲנָשִׁים in this verse is one of fifteen instances when an unusual word begins a verse in the HB according to the Mp. What makes this and the other fourteen words unusual is that "each occurs only once in the Bible in this form (without *vav* conjunction) and in this position (at the beginning of the verse)." Page H. Kelley, Daniel S. Mynatt, and Timothy G. Crawford, *The Masorah of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: Introduction and Annotated Glossary* (Grand Rapids—Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 136. Since the negotiations were conducted exclusively by men and the town meeting involves "the men of the city," I would translate וְהָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה as "these men" in this instance. Beyond that, translating this entire clause more literally (i.e., "These men are peaceful [at peace], they with us") would retain the



trade in it [וַיִּשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ וַיִּסְחְרוּ אֹתָהּ],<sup>332</sup> for the land is large enough for them [לְפָנֵיהֶם יָדִירִים רַחֲבֵתֵיהֶם];<sup>333</sup> let us *take* their daughters in marriage, and let us *give* them our daughters [וְנָתַתְּמָם נַקְחֵלָנוּ לְנָשִׁים וְנִתְּנוּ בְּנֹתֵינוּ נָתַן לָהֶם] (v. 21; italics added).<sup>334</sup> The words undeniably reveal that Shechem and Hamor have been charmed by the deceptive ruse devised by Jacob's sons. Indeed, the magnitude of Shechem and Hamor's naïveté is so profound that they describe Jacob's clan as being "friendly with us [שְׁלָמִים הֵם אִתָּנוּ]." And why should they not think that Jacob and his sons are friendly? No problems arose previously when Jacob bought some land on which to camp and set up an altar, did they (Gen 33:19-20)? More significantly, Jacob and his sons did not challenge Hamor's initial offer in any substantive way. On the contrary, they quickly embraced it with only one minor stipulation: every man in Hamor's clan must be circumcised (v. 15).

---

emphases and wide-ranging nuances entailed with the term שְׁלָמִים, a word directly related to the verb שָׁלַם (i.e., "be complete, sound") and noun שְׁלוֹמָה (i.e., "completeness, soundness, welfare, peace"). BDB, 1022-1023. Although εἰρηναίος (i.e., "for peace, peaceful" particularly in the sense of "the absence of war;" LS, 230) and its related terms do not entail all that the Hebrew שְׁלָמִים does, LXX translation (Οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι εἰρηναῖοί εἰσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν [i.e., "These men are peaceful with us..."]) accurately reflects the Hebrew. JPS translation of this clause, namely, "These people are our friends," is both sappy and hackneyed. Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 366, n. 12.

<sup>332</sup> LXX renders the two qal impf. verbs and their juss. meaning (i.e., וַיִּשְׁבוּ; וַיִּסְחְרוּ) as two impv. verbs (i.e., οἰκεῖτωσαν ["to inhabit, dwell, live" but also "to govern, manage, dwell"]; and ἐμπορευέσθωσαν ["to travel for traffic, to be a merchant, to trade, traffic;" dep. from ἐμπορεύομαι]). LS, 1202-1203, 547-548, respectively; LEH, 325, 147, respectively. Wevers, *Notes*, 568, states that "[t]he third pl. present imperatives correctly interpret [the Hebrew verbs] as precatives [i.e., as pleas, wishes]."

<sup>333</sup> וְהָאֶרֶץ הַגְּדוֹלָה רַחֲבֵתֵיהֶם לְפָנֵיהֶם is a phrase comprised of two idioms. Literally, the phrase says, "[T]he land is wide of (on) both hands before their faces." BDB, 390. Translating more colloquially, but still preserving the first metaphor, yields, "The land is broad-handed before them." LXX repeats the language it uses in v. 10 and therefore does not preserve any of the Hebrew imagery. n. 299.

<sup>334</sup> NRSV continues to interpret the qal impf. verbs as juss. (i.e., as a 3<sup>rd</sup> per. cohort.: "let us take...let us give..."). JPS does not follow this course and instead renders the qal impf. verbs literally: "we will take their daughters to ourselves as wives and give our daughters to them." The fut. indic. verbs used by LXX (i.e., ληψόμεθα ["we will take for ourselves"] and δώσομεν ["we will give"]) favor JPS interpretation. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 366, remarks that the verb change between v. 9 and v. 21 "makes it appear that the Shechemites will be in charge throughout these negotiations."

Without pausing to address any questions or offer clarification, Hamor and Shechem continue their verbal barrage and explain the deal's one stipulation. "Only on this condition will they agree to live among us [אֶתְנוּ] לְשֵׁבֶת לְשָׂבָת אֶתְנוּ,<sup>335</sup> to become one people [לְהִיּוֹת לְעַם אֶחָד]: that every male among us be circumcised as they are circumcised [בְּהִמּוּל לְנוּ כָּל־זָכָר כַּאֲשֶׁר הֵם נִמְלִיִּים]<sup>336</sup> (v. 22).<sup>337</sup> Reaching the end of their précis, it seems that Hamor and Shechem have faithfully reported the details of the agreement. Indeed, they ought to be commended for speaking truthfully and reliably. How could it be otherwise, especially since Shechem is the most honored member of his family?

Yet despite all that being true, there are three glaring omissions.<sup>338</sup> First, they never mention their chief aim: to get Dinah for Shechem (vv. 4, 8, 11). Second, they do not disclose

<sup>335</sup> Except for the required shifts in person (e.g., from first ["we"] to third ["they"]), the first portion of this clause is identical to v. 15. The NRSV noticeably fails to translate הָאֲנָשִׁים (i.e., "the men"), though both JPS and LXX do.

<sup>336</sup> The ב prep. and niph. inf. const. בְּהִמּוּל ("in being circumcised") and the niph. pl. ptc. נִמְלִיִּים ("circumcised ones") add a subtle, though perhaps unintentional, verbal stem and tense symmetry to this final clause. LXX mimics this construction with the pres. pass. articular inf. τῷ περιτέμνεσθαι ("to be circumcised") and the indic. perf. pass. περιτέμνηται ("they have been circumcised").

<sup>337</sup> V. 22 in JPS reads: "But only on this condition will the men agree with us to dwell among us and be as one kindred: that all our males become circumcised as they are circumcised." V. 22 in LXX reads: μόνον ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθήσονται ἡμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοῦ κατοικεῖν μεθ' ἡμῶν ὥστε εἶναι λαὸν ἕνα ἐν τῷ περιτέμνεσθαι ἡμῶν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν καθὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ περιτέμνηται ("Only by this will they become like us, the men will live with us as one people [tribe], when we are circumcised, every male, even as they themselves have been circumcised"). For more on the verb changes between v. 15 and v. 22 (e.g., inf. in v. 15 is aor. pass. while in v. 22 it is pres. mid.), see Wevers, *Notes*, 568-569. Westermann's, *Genesis*, 542, incredulity is notable at this point. He asserts the following: "It is here, however, that historical probability ceases. It is most unlikely that at the beginning of the settlement a Canaanite city would have agreed to have its whole male population circumcised in return for increment by a nomadic group." In my estimation, Westermann's claim is based more on his assumptions rather than established fact, since no one knows the relative population proportions of the city of Shechem in comparison to Jacob's clan. In addition, given the nature of the narratives in Genesis, there are likely a number of prior a-historical features in Gen 34 (e.g., the character speeches themselves). For Westermann to make the assertion—i.e., "It is here, however, that historical probability ceases"—seems late at this point. Janzen, *Abraham*, 137, is perplexed by the Shechemites' assent. He asks, "Why would a stronger and more established people willingly adopt the ritual identity of this small group of newcomers?" Perhaps, v. 23 is the clue—i.e., to obtain more wealth. Though Jacob's clan may have been a "small group of newcomers," it was definitely not without resources and provisions as chapter 33 makes clear.

<sup>338</sup> Sarna, *Genesis*, 236-237, notes several omissions as well. He writes, "Of course, Hamor and Shechem do not disclose their private, selfish interest in the matter...[In addition,] Hamor has conveniently omitted the promise of landed property rights for the newcomers and has perfidiously inserted the assurance of

their initial offer: to *give* Jacob and his sons whatever they ask (vv. 11-12). Third, they fail to report the “if not” option that if the circumcision stipulation is rejected, Jacob and his sons will depart and *take* their daughter with them (v. 17). Of course to be that transparent could potentially undermine the deal. That they omit a few critical details is to be expected.<sup>339</sup> Frankly, what is astounding is the relative accuracy of their report, which lends credibility to their words.

Having made their case, father and son move swiftly to solidify popular support for the agreement. With clever, Machiavellian expertise, Hamor and Shechem put forward the possibility of future economic gain in order to acquire the resounding endorsement of all their kinsmen and neighbors. Shrewdly and adroitly, they ask, “Will not their livestock, their property, and all their animals be ours? [מִקְנֵהֶם וְקִנְיָנֵם וְכָל-בְּהֵמָתָם הֲלוֹא לָנוּ הֵם]” (v. 23a).<sup>340</sup> With deliberate cunning and resourceful skill, they conclude, “Only let us agree with them, and they will live among us [וְאִם יֵאָדָּר נִאֲוֹתָהּ לָהֶם וַיֵּשְׁבוּ אִתָּנוּ]” (v. 23b).<sup>341</sup>

As two deals are brought to a close, the story is filled with tension and full of paradox. On the one hand, in the rush to finalize the arrangement they reached with Jacob’s sons, Hamor and Shechem dupe their kinsmen and neighbors with words that conveniently omit vital facts. On the other hand, Hamor and Shechem have been deceived by the sons of Jacob. And why did Hamor,

---

dispossessing them of their belongings. As the occasion is a formal, public ratification of the agreement, Hamor is clearly guilty of double dealing.” Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 365-366.

<sup>339</sup> Sternberg, *Poetics*, 465, speaks of “suggestive disparities in arrangement, proportions, and emphasis.” Fewell and Gunn, “Tipping the Balance,” 203, also note the opportunistic speech of Hamor and Shechem. Wenham, *Genesis*, 314, detects some duplicity by Hamor and Shechem. He notes, “Certainly this disclosure of Hamor and Shechem’s double-dealing and the avarice of their fellow citizens tends to reduce our shock at the fate that is about to overtake them.” So, too, Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 159, who superbly opines, “Good marketing is used to convince the people.”

<sup>340</sup> JPS translation captures the economic enticement embedded in Hamor’s and Shechem’s words: “Their cattle and substance and all their beasts will be ours.” LXX imitates the Hebrew with automaton-like precision: καὶ τὰ κτήνη αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τετράποδα οὐχ ἡμῶν ἔσται; (“And will not their herds, and their possessions, and animals be ours?”).

<sup>341</sup> Oddly, JPS translates אִם as “if” rather than “only” or “surely.” BDB, 36. Another factor weighing against JPS is the cohort. niph. impf. 1<sup>st</sup> per. pl. verb נִאֲוֹתָהּ (i.e., “let us consent to [agree with]...”). LXX translates אִם as μόνον (cf. v. 22). In addition, by means of ὁμοιωθῶμεν, an aor. pass. subj. first per. pl. verb, LXX integrates the exhortative aspect of Shechem’s final appeal.

Shechem, and “the men of the city” fail to detect the deceptive traps that surround them? Conceivably, it is because all of them are driven by selfish motives: “the men of the city” are blinded by their greed and desire for additional wealth; Shechem is blinded by his love and passion for Dinah; and Hamor is blinded by his accommodating and acquiescent disposition toward his son Shechem.<sup>342</sup>

Being consumed by ignoble, selfish desires, these men are unable to detect any flaws or weaknesses in their own logic. Their self-preoccupation with personal gain effectively prevents careful consideration; they need no assistance; they fall into the trap and essentially trigger it themselves. Hence, the narrator comments poignantly, “And all who went out of the city gate heeded Hamor and his son Shechem [אֶל-חַמּוֹר וְאֶל-שָׁכֶם בְּנוֹ כָּל-יִצְאֵי שַׁעַר עִירוֹ] and every male was circumcised [וְיִמְלֹוּ כָּל-זָכָר], all who went out of the gate of his city [וְיִשְׁמְעוּ],<sup>343</sup> and every male was circumcised [כָּל-זָכָר כָּל-יִצְאֵי שַׁעַר עִירוֹ]”<sup>344</sup> (v. 24). Arguably, the fate that Hamor, Shechem, and their

<sup>342</sup> Savran observes that “deception of the foreigner” is a theme of Genesis. More significant, however, is his discussion about quoted speech patterns. Though not directly speaking about Gen 34, Savran correctly asserts, “Quotations are not used primarily to tell of the past for its own sake, but to recollect in the service of a present argument.” This feature is very conspicuous with Hamor and Shechem’s words, since they selectively recall details from their negotiations with Jacob’s sons in order to convince their kinsmen to accept the deal. In particular, the narrator presents Hamor and Shechem following two of Savran’s quote patterns: (1) “X quotes Y to Z (XYZ),” where father and son represent X (i.e., the speaker) quoting Y (i.e., Jacob’s sons) to Z (i.e., the men of the city”); and (2) “X quotes X to Y (XXY),” where father and son represent X (i.e., the speaker) quoting X (i.e., portions of their initial proposal) to Y (i.e., “the men of the city”). An important qualification to keep in mind, however, is that “[t]he overwhelming tendency of the narrator is to abridge the material repeated in quoted direct speech.” In view of that, the omissions by Hamor and Shechem may reflect nothing more than this tendency by the narrator to abridge rather than purposeful deceit as I have proposed. For these comments, other features of quoted speech, and how it functions in story analysis, Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 1-76, esp. 6, 18-25, 29.

<sup>343</sup> JPS also translates וְיִשְׁמְעוּ as “heeded.” LXX translates וְיִשְׁמְעוּ as εἰσῆκουσαν (i.e., “they hearkened, heard, heeded...”). Hamilton, *Genesis*, 365, 367, renders “all who went out of the city gate” and “all who went out of the gate of his city” as “[a]ll of the able-bodied men in the city” and “every able-bodied man in the city,” respectively.

<sup>344</sup> LXX makes three interesting modifications to the Hebrew text. First, וְיִמְלֹוּ כָּל-זָכָר is transformed into: καὶ περιετέμοντο τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν, πᾶς ἄρσῆν (i.e., “and they themselves circumcised their uncircumcised flesh, every male”). Second, the clause, כָּל-יִצְאֵי שַׁעַר עִירוֹ, is not repeated. Third, rather than שַׁעַר עִירוֹ (i.e., “the gate of his city”), LXX has τὴν πύλην τῆς πόλεως αὐτῶν (i.e., “the gate of their city”). Wevers, *Notes*, 570, thinks that “[t]he Greek is more sensible.”

kinsmen suffer is due in large part to their own ineptness and egocentric wills.<sup>345</sup> Consequently, the shame and dishonor that Shechem had foisted upon Jacob's family will shortly recoil and crash down on them due to Shechem's scandalous act with Dinah and the treachery of Jacob's sons.

*Scene Five: Executing the Plan; Carrying out the Sentence (vv. 25-29).*

Whereas character speech dominated the preceding two scenes, the omniscient narrator shifts his emphasis back to action as the story approaches its finale. With a detached style, devoid of passion, and focused principally on providing a summary report, he writes, "On the third day [בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי],<sup>346</sup> when they were still in pain [כְּאַבִּימָם בְּהִיּוֹתָם],<sup>347</sup> two of the sons of

<sup>345</sup> Regarding the Shechemites' willingness submit to circumcision, Kass, "Daughters and Sisters," 34-35, says, "The Shechemites, like Shechem himself, will submit to circumcision, but with no understanding of what it means, in itself and, especially, to the Israelites...the Shechemites circumcise themselves wholeheartedly for gain, not—as did Abraham—to gain wholeheartedness. What they gain, in fact is their own death and the ruin of their city." In Noth's view, *Pentateuchal Traditions*, 191, all of these events demonstrate that the Shechemites—i.e., "Canaanites"—"do not appear worthy of great respect. They are easily outwitted and overpowered (Gen. 34)." According to William H. Propp, "The Origins of Infant Circumcision in Israel," *HAR* 11 (1987): 360, "Genesis 34 is not a story about circumcision, but rather a story about the relations between Israelites and Canaanites...[it] is not a record of assimilation but a reaction to it presenting various attitudes with the voices of the protagonists."

<sup>346</sup> "On the third day" is an ambiguous temporal expression that can mean "after three days (e.g., "three days after Shechem slept with Dinah," "three days after they finished their negotiations with Jacob's family," or "three days after they circumcised themselves"). Unfortunately, LXX does not eliminate this vagueness, since it reads: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ("And it happened on the third day"). Despite this chronological ambiguity, a survey of the HB reveals that this common expression occurs in a number of pivotal moments in Jewish history. For example, consider the following: Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, or Isaac's Akeda [binding] (Gen 22:4); the Lord's appearance on Mt. Sinai (Exod 19:11, 16); offerings during the Festival of Booths (Num 29:20); the Gibeonite deception of Joshua and the invading Israelites (Josh 9:17); the attack on Benjamin by the other tribes (Judg 20:30); David's learning of the Amalekite attack on Ziklag, which momentarily led his people to question him (1 Sam 30:1); the messenger's report of Saul's death to David (2 Sam 1:2); when Jeroboam and Israel rejected Rehoboam as king and split from Judah (1 Kgs 12:12); when Hezekiah went up to "the house of the Lord" after his illness (2 Kgs 20:5, 8); the completion of the second temple (Ezra 6:15); Esther's appearance before the king to plead for her people (Esth 5:1); and the prophet Hosea's promise of salvation from the Lord (Hos 6:2). Besides the foregoing, the expression also occurs in less memorable circumstances, such as: Laban's learning of Jacob's flight (Gen 31:22); the restoration of Pharaoh's cupbearer and Joseph's charge to his unsuspecting brothers (Gen 40:20; 42:18); the time restrictions associated with the sacrifice of well-being (Lev 7:17-18; 19:6-7); Eliab's offering at the dedication of the tabernacle and the altar (Num 7:24); ritual purification (Num 19:12, 19; 31:19); and the mothers who dispute over the lone surviving child before Solomon (1 Kgs 3:18).

<sup>347</sup> LXX, which selects an idiomatic expression for "pain," reads: ὅτε ἦσαν ἐν τῷ πόνῳ ("when they were in pain" [from πόνος: "distress," "trouble," "labor," "hard work," "toil," "physical exertion," "exercise;" LSJ, 1448; LEH, 388]).

Jacob, Simeon and Levi,<sup>348</sup> Dinah's brothers, *took* their swords and came against the city unawares [שְׁנֵי־בְנֵי־יַעֲקֹב שָׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אָחִי דִּינָה אִישׁ חָרְבוּ וַיָּבֵאוּ עַל־הָעִיר בְּטָח<sup>349</sup> וַיִּקְחוּ], and killed all the males [כָּל־זָכָר]<sup>350</sup> (v. 25; italics added). True to form, one of the narrative's *Leitwörter* reappears when “two of Jacob's sons, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brothers, each one *took* his sword.”<sup>351</sup> The irony is riveting, since by *taking* what is already theirs (i.e., swords) they foreshadow what they are about to do: *take* back what has always been theirs and had never rightfully belonged to Shechem, that is, their sister Dinah. And to accomplish their cold-blooded and merciless goal, they kill “every male [כָּל־זָכָר],” every male who not long before

<sup>348</sup> Hamilton, *Genesis*, 369, mentions several commentators who subject this passage to historical analysis and believe that Simeon and Levi were perhaps inserted here in order to explain Jacob's later tribal condemnation in Gen 49:5-7. One author who argues vigorously for this conclusion as he discusses the „Das Aufkommen solcher Jakobsöhne-Traditionen” (“the emergence of such Jacob-sons' traditions”) is Sigo Lehming. In a thorough, well-written source-redaction analysis, Lehming asserts that Gen 34 originated when a redactor combined two ancient narratives to which later interpretations and glosses were also added. Concerning the relationship between Gen 34 and 49, Lehming states, „Damit haben wir eine Grundlage für die These, daß Gen 49 die Veranlassung dafür war, die Namen der beiden Jakobsöhne in die bereits kombinierte Erzählung einzutragen.“ (“With that [i.e., 'finding,' specifically, that there is no reason to assume that a dependency between Gen 34 and Gen 49 is impossible] we have a basis for the thesis that Gen 49 was therefore the reason to introduce the names of both sons of Jacob into the previously combined narrative.”) Sigo Lehming, „Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Gen 34,” *ZAW* 70 (1958): 242; see also his summary chart on page 248-249 which identifies the hypothetical narrative source components.

<sup>349</sup> Though the NRSV renders בְּטָח as “unawares,” when used as an adverb the noun means “quietly” or “securely.” BDB, 105. Speiser, *Genesis*, 265, defines the word as “*unopposed*. Heb. ‘in security,’ which describes not the confident mood of the city but the attackers' immunity from effective interference.” Westermann, *Genesis*, 534, n. 25a, too: “בְּטָח refers to Simeon and Levi, not to the city.” LXX concurs with this interpretation and uses ἀσφαλῶς (“in safety,” “in certainty”). LSJ, 266; LEH, 68. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 571. In other words, the brothers approach the city without any fear of reprisal, since “the men of the city” were incapacitated by their self-inflicted surgical procedure. The issue is not “awareness,” but the ability of “the men of the city” to respond to their attackers. For more on “feeling secure,” see Wenham, 315. Sarna, *Genesis*, 238, allows for more ambiguity here. He says, “Hebrew *betah* may connect with the verb, with the sense of “meeting no resistance” or “confidently”; or it may refer to the state of the city, with the sense of “unsuspecting, caught off guard.”

<sup>350</sup> JPS reads: “and slew all the males.” LXX reads: καὶ ἀπέκτειναν πᾶν ἀρσενικόν (“and they killed every male”). Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 168-173, suggests that the attack against all Shechemite males is because the brothers believed that all the city's men were complicit in Shechem's crime—at least to some degree—and that their action would preempt a retaliatory strike.

<sup>351</sup> Author's translation. JPS translation of this verse segment (“Simeon and Levi, two of Jacob's sons, brothers of Dinah, took each his sword”) follows the Hebrew text more literally than the NRSV.

had circumcised himself and had previously gone out of the city, but now will neither leave the city nor go anywhere in the land (cf. v. 24).<sup>352</sup>

Though the narrator clearly described the extent of the carnage—specifically, every male was killed—he leaves no doubt about the fate of the brothers' principal target. Accordingly, he states with exacting, surgical precision that “[t]hey killed Hamor and his son Shechem with the sword [וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־דִּינָה מִבֵּית שָׁכֶם וַיֵּצְאוּ] <sup>353</sup> וְאֶת־חָמוֹר וְאֶת־שָׁכֶם בָּנוּ

and went away [וַיֵּצְאוּ]” (v. 26; italics added). Even though Hamor and Shechem had honored the one condition that Jacob's sons added to the original proposal, Dinah's brothers do exactly as they had previously threatened to do which was to *take* their sister and go away (cf. v. 17).<sup>354</sup>

The narrator, however, has not finished describing the savagery and full extent of the assault: “And the other sons of Jacob came upon the slain [עַל־הַחֲלָלִים <sup>355</sup> בָּאוּ בְנֵי יַעֲקֹב בָּאוּ],  
and plundered the city [וַיִּבְזּוּ הָעִיר],<sup>357</sup> because their sister had been defiled [טָמְאוּ אַחֲוֹתָם]

---

<sup>352</sup> Wenham, *Genesis*, 315, wistfully notes the following: “The idea of talionic retribution (‘eye for an eye’) is hinted at in the words used. Simeon and Levi ‘took’ a sword, just as Shechem ‘took’ Dinah...But though there is an element of justice in their revenge, it is clearly disproportionate, as the narrative makes clear. No one in this tale escapes the narrator’s implied censure.” So, too, Sternberg, *Poetics*, 467, who is sympathetic to the narrator’s aim, but nonetheless recognizes that “the reprisal is out of all proportion to the crime.” Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 160, perceptively describes the societal impact of rape and the resultant “contradictory approach toward sexual violence” entailed by Simeon and Levi’s reprisal.

<sup>353</sup> Neither the NRSV above nor the JPS with its prosaic, “[t]hey put...to the sword,” preserves the Hebrew imagery of וַיִּקְחוּ לְפִי־חֶרֶב (“they killed by the mouth of the sword”). However, LXX does retain the visual aspect of the figure of speech with ἀπέκτειναν ἐν στόματι μαχαίρας.

<sup>354</sup> Fleishman, “Legal Significance,” 546, comments that “it appears from verse 26 that Dinah was in fact in Shechem’s home; this constitutes a further and serious violation of the honor of Dinah and her family.”

<sup>355</sup> הַחֲלָלִים (“the pierced,” “the fatally wounded,” or “the slain”), BDB, 319. LXX uses τοὺς τραυματίας (“the wounded”), LSJ, 1811; LEH, 479.

<sup>356</sup> The only instance when the expression, “the sons of Jacob,” begins a verse according to the Mp. In contrast, SP and Greek MSS include the *waw* conjunction.

<sup>357</sup> LXX renders וַיִּבְזּוּ as διήρπασαν, which is from διαρπάζω (“to tear to pieces,” “to efface,” “to spoil,” “to plunder,” or “to seize as plunder”). LSJ, 410; LEH, 108.

וְאֶשֶׁר];” literally, “because they had defiled their sister” (v. 27).<sup>358</sup> Whereas before Shechem was the one who had defiled their sister (cf. vv. 5, 13), now it seems that all “the men of the city” are accomplices in his reprehensible deed. Why? Perhaps, it is because they did not condemn Shechem and subsequently sanctioned the pact rather than withhold their approval. As a result, they receive the same punishment from Jacob’s sons as Shechem.

As he enumerates vivid detail after vivid detail, the narrator catalogs their violent booty: “They *took* their flocks and their herds, their donkeys and whatever was in the city and in the field וְאֶת־צֹאֲנָם וְאֶת־בְּקָרָם וְאֶת־חֲמֹרֵיהֶם וְאֶת־אֲשֶׁר־בְּעִיר וְאֶת־אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה לְקַחוּ” (v. 28; italics added).<sup>359</sup> The unconventional word order—the fact that all the direct objects precede the verb, which does not appear until the very end of the sentence—emphasizes the catastrophic devastation Jacob’s sons inflict upon Shechem, Hamor, and their city. Their taking, which began as they retrieved their sister, does not abate.

Despite the indiscriminate looting, their appetite for revenge is not yet satiated. In order to sear that image into the minds of his readers, the narrator offers a haunting depiction of the utter ruin the sons of Jacob have brought upon Shechem, Hamor, and their fellow townspeople: “All their wealth, all their little ones and their wives, all that was in their houses, they captured and made their prey וְאֶת־כָּל־חֵילָם וְאֶת־כָּל־טַפָּם וְאֶת־נְשֵׂיהֶם שָׁבוּ וַיִּבְּזוּ וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בְּבַיִת”

<sup>358</sup> Though LXX inserts Dinah’s proper name in this clause, it mimics the Hebrew text with its use of the third per. pl. verb form. It reads: ἐν ᾗ ἐμίαναν Διναν τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν (“because they defiled their sister”). Wevers, *Notes*, 572, observes that “[o]nly common sense makes it clear that the unstated subject of ἐμίαναν is an indefinite ‘they.’” In defense of Simeon and Levi, Sarna, *Genesis*, 238, opines, “The Narrator is at pains to stress that the brothers were stirred to action because of the defilement of their sister, not simply for the love of booty.” Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 163, notes that this is “the third time emphasis is placed on the rape as the controlling event: ‘because they-had oppressed their-sister’ (cf. vv. 5 and 13).”

<sup>359</sup> JPS masks the *Leitwort* theme (i.e., “take”) found in the Hebrew text with its translation: “They seized their flocks and herds and asses, all that was inside the town and outside.” LXX retains the Hebrew word order and thus keeps the verb (i.e., ἔλαβον) at the end of the sentence. F. C. Fensham, “GEN. XXXIV AND MARI,” *JNSL* 4 (1975): 87-90, points out a number of captivating parallels between Gen 34 and a letter in the Mari-texts in which the Turukkû make a pact with the inhabitants of a certain village, violate the agreement when they sack the village, and then proceed to carry off the women, children, and their possessions. Fensham also identifies important differences such as the motive for the attack (i.e., a famine for the Turukkû, Shechem’s violation of Dinah for the sons of Jacob) and literary style (i.e., “the bare outline of events” in the Mari letter, a well-crafted narrative in the HB).



(v. 29).<sup>360</sup> Not only do Jacob’s sons punish Hamor, Shechem, and their kinsmen, they also ransack their entire city—including every house, yes, even their fields—and *take* everything, make it their own, and thus effectively erase Hamor, Shechem, and their clan from the face of the earth. As this scene closes, their actions illustrate two of the story’s motifs: vindication of an honored one (here, Dinah, their sister) and the preservation of family identity and honor.<sup>361</sup>

*Scene Six: Jacob’s Displeasure, His Sons’ Rejoinder (vv. 30-31).*

An unusually terse denouement concludes the “two-sword” narrative. Yet despite its brevity, this postscript reveals the wide fissure that separates Jacob and at least two of his sons. In particular, as the narrator recounts their oral clash, the motives for their widely divergent assessments of the situation are disclosed: Jacob is anxious about his own and his family’s future survival; Simeon and Levi are distressed by the dishonor that Shechem inflicted on Dinah (and perhaps on the entire family as well).

With concise literary skill the narrator brings these matters to light by judiciously including only two more character speeches (or, more accurately, two character comments): Jacob’s denunciation of his sons’ deed and a stinging riposte from Simeon and Levi. With the first remark, the narrator describes both Jacob’s censure and his underlying rationale: “Then Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, ‘You have brought trouble on me by making me odious to the inhabitants of the land [בְּיָשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ]<sup>362</sup> לְהַבְאִישָׁנִי<sup>363</sup> אֶתִּי<sup>364</sup> עֲכָרְתֶּם אֹתִי], the Canaanites and the Perizzites [וּבְפִרְזֵי

<sup>360</sup> SP and S MSS move the *‘atnah* forward to שָׁבוּ. LXX translation accurately reflects the Hebrew text with its verb choices (i.e., ἡχμαλώτευσαν [“they captured” or “they took prisoner”] for שָׁבוּ [“they took captive”]; διήρπασαν for בָּבִי), though the selection of σώματα (“material substances”) for הַיָּלָם is unfortunate, since σῶμα denotes the physical body so frequently. LSJ, 1749; LEH, 466. Wevers, *Notes*, 572-573, claims that “Gen was also troubled by the word [i.e., חַיִל], and substituted σώματα ‘bodies.’” Wevers goes on to suggest that he thinks the term is a reference to slaves in this case.

<sup>361</sup> Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 165, reflectively notes at the conclusion of this scene, “Everybody is implicated in the oppressive and violent behavior of rape—a radical idea.”

<sup>362</sup> LXX appropriately translates the collective noun יָשֵׁב (literally, “the inhabitant;” qal masc. sg. ptc. of יָשַׁב) as a dat. pl. τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν (“the inhabitants”). As if an afterthought, Wevers, *Notes*, 574, remarks, “The translation is free though sensible...”

בְּכַנְעֵנִי]; my numbers are few [וַאֲנִי מֵתִי מְסָפָר],<sup>365</sup> and if they gather themselves against me and attack me [וְהִכּוּנִי וְנִאֲסְפוּ עָלַי],<sup>366</sup> I shall be destroyed, both I and my household [וַיִּבְיֵתִי וְנִשְׁמְדָתִי אֲנִי]”<sup>367</sup> (v. 30).

Ironically, Jacob’s words reveal that he—like Hamor and Shechem—is motivated in part by self-interest, which should come as no surprise given his previous history (e.g., Gen 27:1-40; 28:18-22); and though he expresses a high level of angst about the destruction of his house, the focus centers around him. He is, in a word, not really worried about Dinah, neither her honor nor the family’s honor, but rather about his continued existence. Simply put, he is fretting that he and his legacy will be rubbed out—erased from the face of the earth just as his sons have wiped out Hamor, Shechem, and their men.<sup>368</sup>

---

<sup>363</sup> Both the NRSV and JPS catch the imagery of לְהִבְאִישֵׁנִי (hiph. inf. const. of בָּאֵשׁ with ל prep., i.e., “to have a bad smell,” “to stink”) with “odious;” LXX does not with ποιηρόν (“toilsome,” “painful,” “grievous,” “useless,” “good-for-nothing,” “bad,” “worthless,” “base,” or “cowardly”). LSJ, 1447; LEH, 388. Sarna, *Genesis*, 238, sees this expression as an “[e]llipsis for ‘making my breath to stink.’” Fleishman states that “[i]ts meaning is ‘you have brought trouble on me *in order to* make me odious.’” Fleishman, “Legal Significance,” 552, italics added.

<sup>364</sup> LXX translates אֶתִּי עֲכָרְתֶּם as Μισητόν με πεποιήκατε (“You have made me hateful”). Both Sarna, *Genesis*, 238, and Speiser, *Genesis*, 266, view the basic meaning as “to muddy waters.” Westermann, *Genesis*, 535, n. 30a, defines it as: “To make taboo, to render impossible for dealing with others.” Wenham, *Genesis*, 316, says, “The traditional translation, ‘trouble,’ is too weak.”

<sup>365</sup> JPS reads: “my men are few in number.” LXX is: ἐγὼ δὲ ὀλιγοστός εἶμι ἐν ἀριθμῶ (“but I am few in number”).

<sup>366</sup> JPS interprets the consec. *waw* and its niph. verb (i.e., וְנִאֲסְפוּ) as expressing condition and thus translates this clause as: “so that if they unite against me and attack me...” Conversely, LXX συναχθέντες (aor. pass. pl. ptc.) could be translated “when they have gathered” or “after they have gathered,” either of which conveys a measure of future certainty in Jacob’s reprimand.

<sup>367</sup> LXX translates וְנִשְׁמְדָתִי (niph. pf. *waw* consec. of שָׁמַד) as ἐκτριβήσομαι (“I will have been rubbed out [or, “destroyed]”; from fut. indic. pass. of ἐκτριβω).

<sup>368</sup> Wenham, *Genesis*, 316, agrees with this assessment. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 165, correctly notes that “first person pronouns dominate his [i.e., Jacob’s] speech,” thus confirming Jacob’s primary concern, namely, himself. Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading,” 184, astutely observes that “Jacob is concerned only with the possible *consequences* of their [i.e., Simeon and Levi’s] behaviour [*sic*]; the *injustice* of their actions is not an issue he addresses.” Hamilton, *Genesis*, 371, remarks that Jacob’s “concerns are tactical and strategic, rather than ethical (as in 49:5-7).” Sheres, *Dinah’s Rebellion*, 100, n. 14, reprimands Jacob as well.

Conversely, Simeon and Levi find no common ground with their father on this matter. Their opposition to him is deep and passionately held, indeed, so much so, that they rebuke him, though not directly, but merely with a short, uncomplicated question: “Should our sister be treated like a whore? [הַכֹּזֶנֶה יַעֲשֶׂה אֶת־אֲחֹתֵנּוּ]”<sup>369</sup> (v. 31). Their query does not arise because there is a minor difference of opinion. On the contrary, the question dynamically embodies the outrage Simeon and Levi felt when they learned of Shechem’s misdeed. Though economical with its number of words, the question is a protest and speaks volumes because it shows that they and their father do not share similar convictions about this affair. Frankly, they find their father’s fearful apprehension distasteful, especially since the slaughter was justified in their eyes.<sup>370</sup> To be sure,

---

<sup>369</sup> Curiously, LXX changes the third per. sg. verb (יַעֲשֶׂה) to a third per. pl. verb (χρήσονται) and thus reads: ‘Ἄλλ’ ὥσει πόρνη χρήσονται τῇ ἀδελφῇ ἡμῶν; (“But should they be allowed to use our sister as a prostitute?”). Wevers, *Notes*, 574, says, “Gen does not have a question indicator, but from the context it must be an interrogative. Gen, however, changes the verb to the pl., thereby attributing guilt to more than one individual (Suchem).” Sarna, *Genesis*, 238, finds literary resonance in the question with the book of Jonah. He states, “As with the Book of Jonah, the closing rhetorical question provides an irresistible argument. The women of Israel are not to be regarded as objects of abuse. They cannot be dishonored with impunity.” Sternberg, *Poetics*, 475, suggests that “the grammar and the logic of the immediate context” allows one to read Jacob—rather than Shechem—as the antecedent. Though Sternberg’s interpretation is permitted, I do not find this proposal to be cogent. *Pace* Sternberg, I think Shechem is the unspecified antecedent in Simeon and Levi’s question, which, I will grant, may also indirectly repudiate Jacob without naming him.

<sup>370</sup> Fleishman, “Simeon and Levi Rebuke,” 112, concurs with this assessment. He concludes “that Simeon and Levi rebuked their father because of the rift that opened up in Jacob’s family as a consequence of the Shechem-Dinah issue. This rift between Jacob and his sons was caused by different views concerning the appropriate reaction to Shechem’s request to marry Dinah after he had taken her without the permission of her father, had sexual relations with her, and afflicted her (v. 2)...The high point of tension regarding this matter between Jacob on the one hand, and Simeon and Levi on the other, is reflected in Simeon and Levi’s reaction to their father’s reproach: ‘Should our sister be treated like a whore?’ (v. 31). In effect, they were rebuking their father: By their arrogant reply they meant to say: No! You are not justified in criticising [*sic*] our deeds. We are right. The fear you speak of must not deter us from avenging our sister’s honour [*sic*] and punishing Shechem for his crime. We have done our duty. You, who are Dinah’s father and the head of the clan, have not fulfilled your obligation.” Fleishman further contends that “they [i.e., Simeon and Levi] see their act of vengeance as justified even if it endangers the physical existence of all of Jacob’s family.” *Idem*, “Legal Significance,” 554. Fleishman also suggests that Jacob “accepted a marriage as the best solution under the difficult circumstances...[and that]...his silence was based on pragmatism.” *Idem*, “Shechem and Dinah,” 30-31. Bechtel—who is likewise sympathetic to Jacob and respects his conduct—believes that this rebuke by Simeon and Levi shows “that they do not regard Dinah as having been raped. Instead, they are pointing to the fact that she has become a marginal figure by engaging in sexual activity outside her society and without the possibility of bonding, since the sons are unwilling to give their sister to an uncircumcised outsider. For them the relationship threatens the cohesion of the tribal structure. It is to this threat that the sons react...Their vengeance, although it is generated by the group-oriented motive of preserving group integrity, actually jeopardizes its well-being and existence.” Bechtel, “What if Dinah,” 31-34, esp. 31, 34. Despite assenting with this final remark, I do not understand why the marriage of Dinah and Shechem “threatens the cohesion of the tribal structure,” while marriages between male Jacobites and Shechemite women who were captured after the slaughter does not. Is tribal cohesion only threatened when female

their query is a rejection of his values and a repudiation of his current trepidation. As they see it, they were right not only to deceive Shechem and his father (a character trait that ought to evoke Jacob's empathy in view of his own life), but also to execute them—that is, to erase them from the face of the earth—for violating and dishonoring their sister. Here, then, as the narrator concludes his ancient tale, the final motif—that is, vengeance is justified—makes a dramatic and prominent appearance as Jacob and his sons exit the stage.<sup>371</sup>

---

Jacobites marry male Shechemites? Is there no threat when male Jacobites marry female Shechemites? In light of Ezra 9-10, such a conclusion seems problematic. Of course, my conundrum assumes that post-conflict unions occurred between male Jacobites and female Shechemites. Though Pitt-Rivers makes a similar observation, "[C]aptured women who represent no threat to the faith are perfectly acceptable as concubines and even as wives," overall, I think he would support Bechtel's conclusion. For Pitt-Rivers, Gen 34 and, to some extent the entire book of Genesis, concerns "the limits of endogamy and exogamy." Pitt-Rivers, *Fate of Shechem*, 137, 138, 140, 154-71. Von Rad's assessment, *Genesis*, 334, of the exchange between Jacob and his sons is as follows: "To be sure, Jacob's role here is weak. His censure is more a peevish complaint. By contrast the answer of the two sons is proud and implacable; and the ancient reader, who felt more than we do the burning shame done to the brothers in the rape of Dinah, will not have called them wrong." So, too, Sternberg, *Poetics*, 474, whose reprimand of Jacob is without qualification: "Whatever its force elsewhere...Jacob's argument sounds shabby in the Bible's court of conscience. The ending rubs in the point by having his wordy and terror-driven onslaught countered by Simeon and Levi's proud and epigrammatic "Should he treat our sister like a harlot?" The voice of egocentricity and self-preservation finds itself opposed by the voice of idealism." Rashkow, "Hebrew Bible Translation," 231, offers this final assessment of Simeon and Levi: "Even though their actions are condemned, on one level Simeon and Levi are ultimately the heroes. They are portrayed as idealistic, and the reader is forced to decide whether the revenge was justified."

<sup>371</sup> Using social scientific criticism and reading Gen 34 in light of present-day Bedouin practices, Clinton Bailey asserts the following: "When Bedouin take vengeance for an attack on one of them, it is not with the intention of punishing the violator; it is to show everyone else how strong they are, and how they can make any violator suffer for ignoring their strength. Only when the violated Bedouin have accomplished this can they go on living in the desert; and only then, in their eyes, has justice been done.

"When Simeon and Levi answer Jacob's protest with the terse exclamation, 'Should our sister be treated like a whore?' they are really saying: 'Look father, we are new in this Promised Land that you are so keen to get established in; and if, at the very outset, we allow them to rape our sister with impunity, don't imagine that we'll be able to stay here for long!' In addition, if a woman is indeed violated, it can only mean that the perpetrator considered her menfolk too weak to worry about; that is, the reputation of her menfolk is not sufficient to deter violation. No Bedouin can tolerate this. That is why Simeon and Levi felt obliged to avenge the rape of their sister so ruthlessly."

Bailey further suggests that "Bedouin culture also explains the behavior of Hamor, Shechem's father, in coming directly to Jacob after the rape, in order to mollify him. Knowing that the violated party must dispel any impression of weakness, Bedouin will try to assuage the injured party's outrage by immediately acknowledging their folly in not having recognized the strength of the violated party and its ability to retaliate. Not to do so would compound the injury." Though Bailey's observations are perhaps helpful in their attempt to explain this passage, they assume a correspondence between ancient and present-day cultures, which is always tentative at best. For instance, it seems to me that if Simeon and Levi had adhered strictly to Bedouin practices, they would not have retaliated as they did, since Hamor followed the proper protocol after his son's offense. But as the text is, despite Hamor's attempt to mollify the offended party, Jacob's sons used his proposal as the means by which to punish him—even to the point of compounding the injury. For more on this topic, see Clinton Bailey, "How Desert Culture Helps Us Understand the Bible: Bedouin Law Explains Reaction to Rape of Dinah," *BRev* 7 (1991): 14-21, esp. 17-21.

### 2.2.3 Summary of the Canonical Provenance of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum*

Before I explore how the “two-sword” *traditum* is transmitted in the other portions of the HB, a review of the *traditum*'s literary provenance is appropriate in order to highlight the narrative's four motifs and summarize the argument thus far.

At the opening of this chapter I claimed that Gen 34 is the canonical provenance for the “two-sword” *traditum*. This ancient narrative, embedded within the Jacob-cycle stories of Genesis, recounts the incident between Shechem and Dinah and the subsequent ruse devised by the sons of Jacob in order to punish Shechem for his inexcusable deed with their sister. During the exegetical analysis, the narrator's literary acumen was stressed, especially his ability to craft the *Leitwörter* “give” and “take” into an antiphonal chorus that resonated throughout the tale. Not only did he repeatedly weave these two words into the story's plot, they also became a thematic feature of the chronicle. Besides noting the preceding trait, the analysis also pointed out that a number of common Hebrew literary stylistic attributes (e.g., character speech/action [Alter]; character identity/motive [Savran]) were employed ingeniously by the narrator to create a highly dramatic, tension-filled story.

When these impressive literary characteristics are considered—especially in light of the scholarly discussion about the “two-sword” pericope—four motifs emerged from an analysis of the narrative. First, though the specific offense of Shechem is vigorously disputed, his actions were abhorrent in the eyes of Jacob's sons. With their repudiation of him and strong defense of their retaliatory response to their father, it seems clear that Shechem's actions threatened their family identity and honor. Second, the conduct of Dinah's brothers further demonstrated that the abuse of an honored one will not be tolerated. If an honored one is harmed, loyal persons will act to vindicate or defend the abused or violated person. Third, the brothers' pre-emptive reprisal and their father's final concern revealed an emerging sense of national identity and honor. In addition, the rejection of the proposed merger between the precocious Israelites and the well-established Shechemites suggested that the Israelites were unwilling to sacrifice their own budding ethnicity; they had no interest in being assimilated. Fourth, the brothers' machinations and their father's

reluctance notwithstanding, Shechem's irreverent act and deplorable conduct justified vengeful retaliation. While these four themes cannot entirely define the "two-sword" *traditum*—it is likely that other elements could be extracted from this narrative—they do furnish a way to identify and track the *traditio* of this *traditum* in subsequent writings.

In sum, up to this point I have suggested that the story found in Gen 34 is an emotionally-charged, well-written narrative from the annals of early and ancient Jewish ancestors. This claim—being adequately corroborated by means of the literary exegesis—leads to the conclusion that Gen 34 is the canonical provenance for what I designate as the "two-sword" *traditum*. The analysis of this tradition also revealed at least four motifs that I will use to track how the "two-sword" *traditum* is refracted in the rest of the HB.

## **2.3 The Transmission of the "Two-Sword" *Traditum* in the Hebrew Bible**

### **2.3.1 Preliminary Observations**

Despite being an impressive saga based on its own literary merit, subsequent references to the earliest "two-sword" *traditum* rarely occur in the HB. This fact alone would at first appear to undermine my assertion that Gen 34 is the source for a significant biblical tradition. After all, if the story had been vital for HB theology, would it not have been retold in numerous places and clearly referenced on a regular basis?

This criticism is valid up to a point, but as I previously suggested in this chapter, the "two-sword" *traditum* is a minor biblical tradition. I also acknowledged in chapter one that the story does not rise up to the level of the more noteworthy HB tradition streams and derivative theology such as the call and migration of Abraham, the Jacob-cycle, Moses and the Exodus, the Davidic kingdom, and Zion theology. Yet my basic premise that the narrative about Shechem, Dinah, and Jacob's sons is the canonical source for the "two-sword" *traditum* is reasonable because the story's four motifs reappear in additional canonical writings.

My purpose in the remaining portion of this chapter is therefore to identify and examine any recurrences of the story in the HB, not to establish that the "two-sword" *traditum* was a

central, foundational HB tradition. My argument neither hinges on nor pivots around the canonical *traditio* of the *traditum*. Simply put, the survey below provides only a limited measure of support for this project's thesis as it examines how the story is refracted in the HB. The more critical, decisive evidence for the transmission of the "two-sword" *traditum* is found in the extracanonical sources (to be considered in chapter three) that not only explicitly allude to the Shechem episode but also routinely incorporate the story's motifs.

Before I begin this part of the investigation, however, a few words about my analytical strategy are indispensable. First, since the epithet—that is, the "two-sword" *traditum*—is my invention, I cannot utilize it to search the HB. Rather, my approach is to take advantage of the proper names of Simeon and Levi, the two sons of Jacob who were the principal executors, and perhaps architects as well, of the attack in order to identify other canonical occurrences of the *traditum*. Second, though their names appear frequently in the HB, much of the time they are used as a metonymic device for their respective tribes. In most of these cases, the references do not shed any light of the transmission of the "two-sword" *traditum*. Nonetheless, I will catalog all occurrences, references, and/or allusions to them in the HB in order to show that the search is both systematic and comprehensive.<sup>372</sup> Third, for strictly pragmatic reasons and in an effort to trace the stream of the "two-sword" *traditum* in the HB, I will: (a) conduct a survey of all references to Simeon and/or Levi in the HB that appear to have no direct connection with Gen 34 first; (b) examine the one reference where both brothers are named and that also seems to allude to or directly cite Gen 34 second; and (c) conclude with a review of several texts from the comprehensive survey that suggest a convincing, though admittedly subtle, relationship to Gen 34 due to a persistent, repetitive pattern of tribal behavior based on the ancient example of their eponymous tribal fathers.

---

<sup>372</sup> Biblical citations to Simeon and Levi and/or their descendants are based on a search of the NRSV. Using other versions would likely yield slightly different results. It is also important to mention that omissions always remain a possibility, due not to any intent to deceive, but to human error and search-engine failure, blunders that will need correcting once they are identified. Finally, the use of "ff." generally indicates that references to Simeon and/or Levi are found throughout the remainder of the chapter cited. For example, "Num 3:5ff." means that "Levi" and/or related terms (in this instance) begin in v. 5 and recur frequently throughout Num 3.

## 2.3.2 Hebrew Bible References to the “Two-Sword” *Traditum*

### 2.3.2.1 Survey of Generic References to Simeon and Levi in the Hebrew Bible

The first mention of either brother occurs when their births are recorded (Gen 29:33-34). Another type of reference to Simeon and Levi that depends directly on the preceding event is their inclusion in lists that catalog Jacob’s sons (e.g., Gen 35:22b-26; 48:5;<sup>373</sup> Exod 1:2; 1 Chr 2:1). In similar fashion, sometimes Simeon and Levi are named and then immediately followed by a list of their children (e.g., Gen 46:10-11; 1 Chr 6:1, 16; 23:6). Of course, passages that view the brothers as eponymous tribal ancestors naturally stress the organic dependence on or familial connection to them. To be sure, these texts frequently address genealogical matters whose purpose is to confirm the legitimate standing of later descendants within each respective tribe. For example, Exod 6:14a, 15 states, “The following are the heads of their ancestral houses:...The sons of Simeon: Jemuel, Jamin, Ohad Jachin, Zohar, and Shaul, the son of a Canaanite woman; these are the families of Simeon.” Then in verse 16 the descendants of Levi are recounted with a similar introductory formula: “The following are the names of the sons of Levi according to their genealogies: Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, and the length of Levi’s life was one hundred thirty-seven years.”<sup>374</sup>

Besides the passages that speak about early familial organic relationships, most of the remaining texts draw on their names either symbolically (i.e., to represent the tribe or its allotted territory) or in a derivative or ancillary sense (i.e., to identify a person’s ancestral father and/or subsequent tribal descendants). A classic example occurs when Moses’ assistants are named in the first chapter of Numbers, one assistant is listed from each of Jacob’s sons (i.e., from each tribe): “From Simeon, Shelumiel son of Zurishaddai” (Num 1:6).<sup>375</sup> The most common forms of

---

<sup>373</sup> Only Reuben and Simeon are named when Jacob “adopts” Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph born to him while in Egypt before Jacob migrated there.

<sup>374</sup> Another example of Simeon’s early family tree history is 1 Chr 4:24-38. Additional examples of Levi’s early family tree history include: Num 3:17 (“sons of Levi”); 16:1 (“son of Levi”); 26:59 (“Jochebed daughter of Levi;” mother of Aaron, Moses, and Miriam); cf. 1 Chr 6:38, 43, 47.

<sup>375</sup> Levi does not provide an assistant for Moses here, since Aaron—a descendant of Levi—is already serving in that capacity.



this type of reference are: “the tribe of Simeon,” “Simeon,” “Simeonites,” “the tribe of Levi,” “Levi,” or “Levite(s)” (e.g., Num 1:49; 2:12).<sup>376</sup>

Of course allusions to “the tribe of Levi” or “Levi” far outnumber those to “the tribe of Simeon” or “Simeon” because of Levi’s role as Israel’s priest, which was initiated when Moses descended Mt. Sinai and saw “that the people were running wild [אֶת־הָעָם כִּי פָרַע הוּא]”<sup>377</sup> (Exod 32:25). After listening to Aaron’s explanation and observing the people’s behavior, Moses immediately asked, “Who is on the Lord’s side? Come to me!” In response, “the sons of Levi gathered around him” and proceeded to put about three thousand of their brothers, friends, and neighbors to the sword (Exod 32:26-28). For this zealous deed, Moses declared to Levi, “Today you have ordained yourselves for the service of the Lord”<sup>378</sup> (Exod 32:29).

Thereafter the tribe of Levi held a unique position in Israel, which naturally increased the number of times this tribe is mentioned due to its priestly responsibilities such as: caring for the tabernacle, acting as the nation’s mediator before God, and later serving as overseers of the

---

<sup>376</sup> Other examples of “Simeon” or “the tribe of Simeon” in the HB include: Num 1:22-23; 10:19; 13:5; 26:12-14 (“descendants” and “clans of Simeon”); Deut 27:12; Josh 19:1, 8, 9; 21:4, 9; Judg 1:3, 17; 1 Chr 6:65; 2 Chr 15:9; 34:6; Ezek 48:24, 25, 33 (“the gate of Simeon”); and also the gentilic “Simeonites” found in Num 2:12; 7:36; 25:14; 26:14; 34:20; 1 Chr 4:42; 12:25; 27:16. Based on this survey, it is obvious that most allusions to Simeon in the HB are concerned with his descendants, both near and distant, and chiefly occur outside the book of Genesis. There is, however, one notable instance in the Joseph novella when Joseph took Simeon away from his brothers and held him hostage until they returned (Gen 42:24, 36; 43:23). Though perhaps insignificant, it is interesting to observe that in this instance Simeon is an individual person, rather than a paired entity, a pawn subject to the will of Joseph, his younger brother. In other words, at one point in the Joseph novella Simeon is neither “Reuben and Simeon” nor “Simeon and Levi,” but simply “Simeon” who alone—of all his brothers—is imprisoned by Joseph. Additional examples of “Levi,” “the tribe of Levi,” or “Levite(s)” in the HB include: Exod 2:1 (“house of Levi” and “Levite woman”); 4:14 (“your brother Aaron, the Levite”); 6:19, 25; Lev 25:32-33; Num 2:17 (“the camp of the Levites”); 3:6; 17:3 (“staff of Levi”); 17:8 (“house of Levi”); 26:57-58 (“clans of Levi”); 35:1-18; Deut 16:11, 14; 26:11ff.; 27:12; 33:8; Josh 13:33; 14:3ff.; 1 Chr 6:19 (“clans of the Levites”); 12:26; 21:6; 23:14; 24:20 (“sons of Levi”); 26:17; 27:17; Ezra 2:40; 9:1; 10:5, 15, 23; Neh 3:17; 10:9; 11:36; Ps 135:20 (“house of Levi”); 48:31 (“the gate of Levi”); Zech 12:13 (“house of Levi”). One surprising result of this survey is the discovery of the relative infrequency of these expressions in Leviticus—namely, the term “Levites” is found only in Lev 25:32-33—which seems odd given that the book is also known as “*Torat Kohanim*, the Priests’ Manual.” *HarperCollins Study Bible*, 151.

<sup>377</sup> LXX reads: τὸν λαὸν ὅτι διεσκέδασται (“that the people had been scattered abroad”). LSJ, 411; LEH, 108. Though R. E. Friedman sees a wordplay with *par’o(h)*—i.e., “Aaron has ‘Pharoahed’ the people”—William H. C. Propp believes “the similarity of words is incidental.” William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19-40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 562.

<sup>378</sup> Literally, “Your hands be filled today for the Lord [מְלֵאן יַדְכֶם הַיּוֹם לַיהוָה].” LXX retains the literalness of the Hebrew idiom with its translation: Ἐπληρώσατε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν σήμερον κυρίῳ.

temple. Thus when the HB authors/redactors used the expressions “Levi,” “the tribe of Levi,” the gentilic “Levite(s)” or the adjective “Levitical,” “Levi’s” function as Israel’s priest was often under consideration. An early instance in the Torah is recorded when Moses is instructed not to enroll the tribe of Levi, since as wards of “the tabernacle of the covenant” the Levites are to care for and camp around it rather than go to war (Num 1:44-53; cf. Num 2:17, 33). In light of these duties, texts in the HB that address Levi’s priestly role—whether as an individual priest or corporately—are common, especially in the Torah and Kethuvim.<sup>379</sup>

To be sure, this brief survey of general references to Simeon and Levi highlights some important traditions (e.g., ancestral or genealogical issues), but they are not central to the “two-sword” *traditum*. The one notable exception, however, is the initial call of the Levites in Exod 32 where they take vengeance on their comrades who “were running wild.” For their zealous deed, which mimics their ancestor’s conduct in Gen 34, they are rewarded with the priesthood.

### 2.3.2.2 Explicit Reference to the “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Hebrew Bible

As previously noted, direct reference of the massacre of Shechem and his clan by Simeon and Levi is a rare event in the HB. In fact, the only instance when it occurs is Gen 49:5-7.<sup>380</sup> At this point in Genesis, Jacob and his clan have migrated to Egypt. Following Jacob’s

<sup>379</sup> Other examples of passages that specifically address or allude to Levi’s priestly role include: Exod 38:21; Num 3:5ff.; 4:2f., 18f., 46f.; 7:5ff.; 8:5ff.; 16:7ff.; 18:1-32; 31:30, 47; Deut 10:8-9; 12:12, 18-19; 14:27-29; 17:9, 18; 18:1-8; 21:5 (“priests, sons of Levi”); 24:8; 27:9, 14ff.; 31:9 (“priests, sons of Levi”), 25; Josh 3:3; 8:33; 13:14; 18:7; 21:1ff.; Judg 17:7ff.; 18:3ff.; 19:1ff.; 20:4ff.; 1 Sam 6:15; 2 Sam 15:24; 1 Kgs 8:4; 12:31; 1 Chr 6:48ff.; 9:2, 14ff.; 13:2; 15:2ff.; 16:4; 23:2ff. (v. 24—“sons of Levi”); 24:6, 30-31; 26:20; 28:13, 21; 2 Chr 5:5-6, 12 (“levitical singers”); 7:6; 8:14-15; 11:13-14; 13:9-10; 17:8; 19:8-11; 20:14, 19; 23:2ff.; 24:5ff.; 29:4ff.; 30:15ff.; 31:2ff.; 34:9-13, 30; 35:3ff.; Ezra 1:5; 2:70; 3:8-13; 6:16-22; 7:7, 13, 24; 8:15-36 (v. 15—“descendants of Levi”; v. 18—“son of Levi”); Neh 7:1, 43, 73; 8:7ff.; 9:4-5, 38; 10:28-39 (v. 39—“sons of Levi”); 11:3, 15ff.; 12:1, 8, 22ff.; 13:5, 10, 13, 22ff.; Isa 66:21; Jer 33:18-22; Ezek 40:46 (“descendants of Levi”); 43:19; 44:10ff.; 45:5; 48:11-13, 22; Mal 2:4, 8 (“covenant with/of Levi”); 3:3 (“descendants of Levi”).

<sup>380</sup> Westermann, *Genesis*, 545, holds to a more subtle position regarding the link between Gen 34 and 49. He states, “The narrative finds an echo in the proverb about Simeon and Levi in Gen. 49:5-7 where they are the tribes that trace themselves back to the two brothers. The deed of which they are accused in 49:5-7 is only distantly related to that in ch. 34 (A). A knowledge of ch. 34 (A) may be presupposed in 49:5-7, but this is not necessary. In any case there is only a loose link between them which cannot be made more specific; part of the link is that in ch. 34 the deed of the brothers is condemned, in 49:5-7 the deed of the tribes.” Freedman, “Dinah and Shechem,” 60-61, admits that the connection between Gen 34 and 49 “cannot be demonstrated beyond question, nevertheless there is little or nothing against it.” He also tentatively suggests that Gen 48:22 “credits Jacob with the capture of Shechem (by sword and bow).” I concur with Freedman’s assessment about Gen 49:5-7, but think the Gen 48:22 allusion is too vague to establish with any

blessing on and adoption of Joseph’s two Egyptian born sons into Jacob’s family—presumably a necessary ritual to ensure their place within his clan and guarantee their inheritance, since Joseph’s wife was an Egyptian (Gen 48:1ff.)—Jacob summons all his sons to declare his last will and testament to them (Gen 49:1-2). After “blessing”<sup>381</sup> Reuben, his firstborn son (Gen 49:3-4), Jacob then addresses Simeon and Levi, his second and third sons and says to them,

---

confidence. Graetz, “Dinah the Daughter,” 308-309, identifies “two direct sources on Dinah” (i.e., Gen 30 and 34) and expands the canonical references to Gen 34 with “three additional intertexts” (i.e., Gen 49:5-7; Deut 22:28-29; and 2 Sam 13). Zakovitch, “Assimilation,” 190-191, takes an entirely different stance. On the one hand, he admits that there are “some undeniable similarities between these verses [i.e., Gen 49:5-7] and Genesis 34.” On the other hand, he positively avows, “In our view these verses do not refer to the events of Genesis 34. There is nothing in these verses themselves which suggests a connection with those events.” Rather, the saying found in Gen 49:5-7 “was originally an oracle intended to supply a theological explanation for the fact that the tribe of Simeon was assimilated to Judah and that the tribe of Levi had no land of its own.” Luke, *Studies*, 134, concurs with Zakovitch and claims that “the fact remained undeniable that they [i.e., the tribes of Simeon and Levi] were dislodged from the territory of Shechem, and it was necessary to find out a reason for it.” Luke extends this point further and develops it into two theological tenets when he states the following: “Thus, at the end, the narrative that began as a simple ethnological saga, becomes an eloquent proclamation of one of the cardinal tenets of biblical religion: the norms of divine justice will be applied to culprits even though these happen to be God’s chosen ones. Gen. 34 as well as the oracle in Gen. 49:5-7 accentuate, then, a truth that is most basic to the faith of Israel, namely, God’s lordship over history: Yahweh is himself active and operative in the historical vicissitudes of the tribes that constitute the sacred amphictyony, which is tantamount to saying that he has personally brought about the dispersion of Simeon and Levi.” Idem, 136-137. De Hoop, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (OstSt 29; Leiden—Boston—Köln: Brill, 1999), 521, who agrees with final conclusion of Zakovitch and Luke, puts forward the following thesis regarding the relationship between Gen 34 and 49:5-7: “Together with the narrative of Genesis 34 the saying [i.e., Gen 49:5-7] is considered to be the product of the ‘pro-Judah’ layer, which was created to give Judah the final preferential status over Simeon and Levi. The events that were narrated as the cause of this curse can hardly be considered historical. It appears that both, narrative and saying, seek to explain certain conditions which seem to escape our categories. The only thing with regard to history that can be concluded from the saying in Genesis 49 is that it seems to suppose that neither the tribe of Simeon nor Levi lived together anymore, but that both were scattered over Israel.” Noble, “A ‘Balanced’ Reading,” 193, like De Hoop, sees these verses as the repudiation of Simeon and Levi. But how Noble is able to determine Gen 49:5-7 reflects the narrator’s position and not Jacob’s is not explained. Everett Fox, *In the Beginning: A New English Rendition of the Book of Genesis* (New York: Schocken, 1983), 139, makes a fascinating comment on this passage. He states, “Surprisingly, it is for the present crime [i.e., the massacre of Shechem] and not the sale of Yosef that their father condemns them on his deathbed (49:5-7).” For a summary of the various viewpoints on the foregoing and an analysis of this passage, see Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 179-185, 293-297.

<sup>381</sup> That is, anticipating the future destiny of Jacob’s descendants. Speiser, *Genesis*, 370, observes the following about this appellation: “The traditional designation of this poem as the ‘Blessing of Jacob’ is a misnomer, since the pronouncements are not always favorable. Indeed, the first three sons are sternly reprimanded, and the very word ‘cursed’ is employed in vs. 7. The misleading label is based no doubt on vs. 27, where the stem *brk*, normally ‘to bless,’ is used; but that passage is manifestly from a different source.” For a thorough analysis and discussion on whether Gen 49 should be regarded as a collection of independent “tribal sayings,” “blessings,” “testamentary sayings,” or part of the Joseph “deathbed episode” composed of two-layers (i.e., one “pro-Judah,” the other “pro-Joseph”), see De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 26-80, 248-365, 451-631.

Simeon and Levi are brothers; / weapons of violence are their swords.<sup>382</sup> / May I never come into their council;<sup>383</sup> / may I not be joined to their company—<sup>384</sup> / for in anger they killed men,<sup>385</sup> / and at their whim they hamstrung oxen.<sup>386</sup> / Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce,<sup>387</sup> / and their wrath, for it is cruel!<sup>388</sup> / I will divide them in Jacob,<sup>389</sup> / and scatter them in Israel<sup>390</sup> (Gen 49:5-7).

<sup>382</sup> According to BDB (468), מִכְרָה is “probably the name of a weapon.” It is found only here and in Zeph 2:9. Speiser, *Genesis*, 365, states, “Heb. *mkryhm*, an old and stubborn puzzle. The form lends itself to a variety of derivations, none of which has proved convincing.” Luke, *Studies*, 134-135, makes an interesting claim when he says, “The Hebrew word rendered ‘knives’ remains obscure, but if it does mean knives, we will have here a reference to the instruments used for the circumcision of the inhabitants of Shechem.” De Hoop (*Genesis 49*, 103-09) surveys various proposals regarding the meaning of מִכְרָה and ultimately concurs with Luke’s conclusion. JPS translation of v. 49:5b [כְּלֵי הַמָּס מִכְרֵיהֶם] is: “Their weapons are tools of lawlessness.” LXX translates 49:5b as: συνετέλεσαν ἀδικίαν ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (“they end injustice [wrongdoing] by their choice”). LXX use of αἰρέσεως (“free choice, one’s own discretion;” LEH, 12; “a taking, choice, deliberate plan, purpose, heresy;” LSJ, 41) is fascinating and suggests that the weapon is not exclusively a literal one, but rather the brothers’ volition. De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 102-103, however, proposes that “the division into two words can be considered a wrong interpretation by the later correctors and copiers of the text...Therefore it seems justified to suppose LXX read originally ἐξαίρέσεως [“taking out, extraction”] instead of ἐξ αἰρέσεως.”

<sup>383</sup> BHS reads: בְּסֶחַם אֶל־תָּבֵא נַפְשִׁי. LXX reads: εἰς βουλήν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔλθοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

<sup>384</sup> BHS reads: בְּקִהְלָם אֶל־תִּחַד כְּבֹדִי. Speiser, *Genesis*, 365, notes, “[T]he only problem is a grammatical one: the pronominal prefix [of the verb] is feminine, whereas *kābōd* is always (and *kābēd* usually) masculine; in fact, Sam. [i.e., Samaritan Pentateuch] has here the masculine prefix. But the preceding parallel verb is feminine, which may have caused the error by attraction.” LXX reads: καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει αὐτῶν μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἥπατα μου (“my liver,” “my insides”). De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 111, views the translation “In their gathering my glory shall not rejoice” as “quite probable.” For more discussion on this topic, see idem, 109-111.

<sup>385</sup> BHS reads: כִּי בְאַפָּם הִרְגוּ אִישׁ. LXX reads: ὅτι ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἀπέκτειναν ἀνθρώπους.

<sup>386</sup> BHS reads: וּבְרִצְנָם עִקְרוּ־שׁוֹר. LXX reads: καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνευροκόπασαν (“to cut the sinews of,” “to hamstring,” “to hock” [LSJ, 1170-1171; LEH, 315]) ταύρων. De Hoop, *Genesis 49*, 97-101, translates v. 6b as “they hamstrung a bull,” which he interprets as a metaphor or allusion to Shechem who was a prince. Cf., idem, 351-352, 514-521.

<sup>387</sup> BHS reads: אָרוּר אַפָּם כִּי עָז. LXX reads: ἐπικατάρατος ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν, ὅτι αὐθάδης (“arrogant,” “stubborn;” LEH, 70; “self-willed, wilful, dogged, stubborn, contumacious, presumptuous, remorseless, unfeeling;” LSJ, 275). Abraham Tal, “The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling; Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 189-216, esp. 205-210, points out that the Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch occasionally alters the MT in order to preserve the honor of Israel. For example, rather than cursing his sons’ anger, Jacob praises them with the words “their anger is mighty.” Despite this intriguing change, I consider the probable timeframe for composition of the Samaritan Targum (i.e., likely no earlier than the third century C.E.) too late either to influence or to provide significant insight into the religious cultural background for Luke’s gospel and thus the “two-sword” *traditum* as well.

<sup>388</sup> BHS reads: וְעִבְרָתָם כִּי קִשְׁתָּהּ. LXX reads: καὶ ἡ μῆνις αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐσκληρύνθη.

<sup>389</sup> BHS reads: אַחֲלֶקֶם בְּיַעֲקֹב. LXX reads: διαμεριῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰακωβ.

<sup>390</sup> BHS reads: וְאַפְרִצְנָם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל. LXX reads: καὶ διασπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἰσραήλ.

With solemn words that portend schism for these two tribes, Jacob condemns Simeon and Levi's act of revenge and retaliation against Hamor, Shechem, and the men of their city. On account of their callous retribution, not only did they pervert justice, but also, according to Jacob, sealed the fate of their descendants who will be divided and scattered. His declaration thus indicates that the behavior of Simeon and Levi has cast the die for what will eventually come to pass. In short, their actions have set their respective tribal genetic predispositions and have ironically adumbrated their yet unrealized destiny; and since their descendants will be like their eponymous ancestors, Jacob's words foresee their future scattering among the other tribes.<sup>391</sup>

Stephen A. Geller makes a similar point in his analysis of "the Sack of Shechem." According to him, Gen 34 "foreshadow[s] events in the life of later Israel, the people, whose eponymous ancestor is the patriarch."<sup>392</sup> Geller also asserts that patriarchal narratives, like the one in Gen 34, "have this typological aspect" that reflects the rabbinic understanding that "the deeds recounted of the fathers are indicative of what will occur to their descendants' (*ma'ase avot simman lebanim*)."<sup>393</sup> For Geller, this typological aspect is seen in that the Canaanites

---

<sup>391</sup> Jacob's repudiation of Simeon and Levi in his last testament reflects a common trait of biblical narrative, namely, biblical narratives often admonish its subjects not long after appearing to depict them favorably. This feature is present not only when one compares Gen 34 with 49, but is also found even within the Gen 34 narrative itself. For example, in an essay worth pondering at length while she considers the question, "Is there any text you would reject?" Ellen F. Davis, "Critical Thinking: Seeking an Inner Biblical Hermeneutic," *ATHR* LXXXII:4 (2000): 733-751, observes in the midst of her analysis that "one of the most grave ethical problems posed by the Old Testament is the Deuteronomic party line, 'The only good Canaanite is a dead Canaanite.'" As she discusses the challenge of such a rigid position in light of conflicted biblical narratives, Davis perceptively observes, "The perfidy of the Canaanites is deeply embedded in biblical tradition. Its first unambiguous narrative appearance is Shechem's rape of Jacob's daughter Dinah (Gen. 34). Yet even at that early point, the violent retaliation of Dinah's brothers is called into question, on strategic if not moral grounds: 'And Jacob said to Simeon and to Levi, You have caused me trouble, by making me stink among the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanite and the Perizzite—and I being few in number! And they will band against me and strike me, and I shall be eliminated. I and my house' (Gen. 34:30)." Fleishman, "Legal Significance," 558-559, argues that "Jacob's words 'I will divide them in Jacob, I will scatter them in Israel' (Gen 49,7b) can be understood as a punishment for Simeon and Levi's words 'Shall our sister be treated as a whore?' (Gen 34,31). It is a punishment for acting against Jacob, who saw in these words the pinnacle (*sic*) of Simeon and Levi's rebellion against his legal and moral authority, to direct the internal and external relations of the clan. Jacob punished them with a legitimate punishment which was expected in the ancient Near East. He denied their right to an inheritance, a right given to every legitimate descendant unless his father takes away that right."

<sup>392</sup> Stephen A. Geller, "The Sack of Shechem: The Use of Typology in Biblical Covenant Theology," *Proof* 10 (1990): 1-15, esp. 2.

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

“stand for the principle of merging; in other words, *immanence*. Their special function in Deuteronomic covenant religion is to aid in formulating the counter principle...divine *transcendence*.”<sup>394</sup> And since “[s]o abstract an idea needs all the concretization it can get,”<sup>395</sup> the narrative in Gen 34 fulfills that role at least in part.

But whereas Geller’s chief aim is to demonstrate that the Canaanites act on a typological level in Deuteronomic theology as “a mantle for an idea, a *necessary* fiction...[in order to represent]...people who cross over all legitimate boundaries separating man and god,”<sup>396</sup> my aim is to show that Gen 34 is the canonical provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum*, a tradition that is refracted in the HB and other Jewish writings and also serves as the backdrop for Luke’s sword-logion. In my estimation, the typological connections Geller attempts become more compelling when they are linked with the fourth motif of vengeance or justified retaliation. In Gen 34, vengeance is justified in the eyes of Jacob’s sons. Here in Gen 49, vengeance is questioned by their father Jacob once again. It also seems plausible that the issues of family and national identity are embedded in Jacob’s testamentary pronouncements, since he prophetically addresses his sons who are not only living heirs but who also symbolize the future descendants of their respective tribes.

In sum, the “two-sword” *traditum*—which can be traced to Gen 34—reappears in Gen 49 when Jacob presents his last will and testament. This conclusion seems reasonable, since Jacob’s instructions to his sons—and to Simeon and Levi in particular—point to a disparate family identity, an emerging national identity, and a concern with justice over the proper use of vengeance that remains unresolved despite the outcome of the earlier incident with Shechem.

---

<sup>394</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>395</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>396</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

### 2.3.2.3 Implicit References to the “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Hebrew Bible

Strictly speaking, there is no other distinct mention or unambiguous allusion to Gen 34 outside of Genesis 49:5-7. Yet despite the lack of any clear allusion to Gen 34 when Israel's scriptures are scrutinized, connections to that patriarchal narrative are almost certainly embedded within other canonical texts. Stated differently, most HB texts that conceivably indicate some sort of association with Gen 34 do not, on the one hand, explicitly mention the vicious conduct of Simeon and Levi against Shechem. On the other hand, there are numerous passages that discretely draw attention to a recurring tribal propensity for violence, which was first exhibited by these two brothers. The following survey therefore serves not only to establish tribal patterns of behavior and thus connect the pericopes with Simeon and Levi, but also to solidify the existence of the “two-sword” *traditum*.<sup>397</sup> In other words, the thematic elements of the “two-sword” *traditum* will surface as these pericopes are examined and reveal a striking tribal pattern that suggests a literary link to the precedent-setting conduct of their eponymous ancestors, Simeon and Levi.

Before I trace the refraction of that tradition in the HB, a brief comment about the investigative method will prove advantageous. While this survey could have followed a variety of strategies (e.g., chronological, estimated narrative significance), I have opted to examine passages that speak of Simeon first and then consider texts that refer to Levi second. In both cases, the texts are addressed in the order in which they appear in the canonical OT without consideration of other variables, since the primary objective is to track the “two-sword” *traditum* as it is refracted in the HB. At this point, I am concerned neither with its organic evolution nor its developmental timeline.

---

<sup>397</sup> Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 9-22, used a similar strategy to develop what he called “the Levi-Priestly Tradition (LPT).” Specifically, he claims that “the biblical roots of the notion that Levi was rewarded with the priesthood for his violence at Shechem” are based on “a synoptic reading of Genesis 34; Exod 32:25-29; Num 25:6-13; and Deut 33:8-11.” He also suggests “that the four Pentateuchal texts were used already in that fashion by the author of Mal 2:4-7.” For more on the origins of the Levites and the relationship between Gen 34, Gen 49:5-7, Exod 32:25-29 and Deut 33:8-11, see Götz Schmitt, „Der Ursprung des Levitentums,” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 575-599. Cf. Hans-Jürgen Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte: Die Angaben der Stammessprüche von Gen 49, Dtn 33 und Jdc 5 über die politischen und kulturellen Zustände in damaligen „Israel“* (BZAW 95; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1965), 4-44, 67-72.

For anyone who is relatively familiar with Israel's history, it is not shocking to notice that there are relatively few references to Simeon and his descendants beyond the commonplace notations regarding this tribe that were discussed earlier.<sup>398</sup> In fact, as one reads through the HB, references to Simeon decrease markedly. There are, however, two texts that are suggestive of Simeon's violent ancestral background. The first one is found in Judges 1. The book of Judges opens with the people of Israel inquiring of the Lord, "Who shall go up first for us against the Canaanites, to fight against them?" (Judg 1:1). By some unknown means the Lord selects the tribe of Judah (Judg 1:2). Judah then solicits the aid of Simeon with the following proposition: "Come up with me into the territory allotted to me, that we may fight against the Canaanites; then I too will go with you into the territory allotted to you" (Judg 1:3). The tribe of Simeon accepts this proposal and joins Judah in the ensuing battles during which they put the city of Jerusalem "to the sword" and defeat "the Canaanites who inhabited Zephath, and devoted it to destruction [נִיחַרְיָמוֹן]" (Judg 1:4-19, esp. vv. 8, 17).

The second text that shows a possible link between Simeon's heirs and their ancestor's violent conduct at Shechem is found in 1 Chr 4:24-43. Though most of the passage is concerned with the record of Simeon's descendants, vv. 39-43 describe the Simeonites as being pre-emptive warriors who "attacked their tents and the Meunim<sup>399</sup> who were found there, and exterminated them [נִיחַרְיָמוֹם] to this day...and they destroyed [נִיכֹן] the remnant of the Amalekites that had escaped."

While these texts do not expressly refer to the events recorded in Gen 34, the conduct of Simeon's descendants is evocative of what happened at Shechem. To be sure, the geographical proximity of their tribal allotments likely played a role in Judah's decision, but the fact that Judah chose Simeon hints—but only very subtly—that Judah was confident of Simeon's military

---

<sup>398</sup> See n. 376.

<sup>399</sup> Or, "lodgings." Jacob M. Myers, *1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 12; Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), 27.



proWess, a confidence perhaps bolstered by the shared knowledge of an eponymous ancestor known for his ferocious warrior instincts. Even if the preceding point is granted only grudgingly, the language used to describe the extent of Simeon's conquests is also suggestive of Shechem's massacre, for Simeon does not simply defeat an enemy. On the contrary, Simeon "devoted [the Canaanites] to destruction," "exterminated them," and "destroyed the remnant of the Amalekites" just as their ancient father and his brothers had done to Shechem and his clan. These factors also suggest at least two motifs of the "two-sword" *traditum*: Israel's national identity and justified vengeance, though the specific cause for the attack is not noted.

Whereas the HB seldom mentions Simeon and the conduct of his later descendants, the depiction of Levi and his descendants in the HB is significantly more pronounced than that of Simeon. Indeed, the very first passage, Exod 32:25-29, is characteristic of a number of pericopes that call attention to the zealous predisposition of Levi's descendants. Since this pericope was discussed previously, there is little need to rehearse it again except to mention that Levi's abhorrence of iniquity was so intense that the men of this tribe were even willing to kill their "brother," "friend," and "neighbor"—a deed for which this tribe was rewarded with Israel's priesthood.

The next occasion when Levi's ardent devotion reappears is the story of Phinehas in Num 25:1-18.<sup>400</sup> The prelude to Phinehas' righteous indignation and outrage is the sexual misconduct of the people of Israel and their idolatry of Baal of Peor. In response, the Lord instructs Moses who in turn orders "the judges of Israel...[to] kill any of your people who have yoked themselves to the Baal of Peor" (Num 25:5).<sup>401</sup> Just as Moses finished his charge, an Israelite man "came and brought a Midianite woman into his family" (i.e., apparently took a daughter from among the foreigners) even as "the whole congregation of Israel...[was]...weeping

---

<sup>400</sup> Though this pericope might have been eventually included in my survey of Levi's descendants, I make no claim of inevitable discovery, since none of my search terms (e.g., "Levi," "Levite(s)," "Levitical") occur in it. Instead, I owe its identification and subsequent inclusion to Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 14-16.

<sup>401</sup> Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 300, makes the following connection: "The distinctive language of Numbers 25:1-5 inevitably recalls the only other incident where the verb *hoqi'a* 'to impale' is employed. Reference is to the impaling of the descendants of Saul by the Gibeonites." Cf. Num 25:4; 2 Sam 21:6, 9.

at the entrance of the tent of meeting” (Num 25:6). Though Moses said nothing to the man—possibly due to his own marriage to a Midianite woman (Exod 2:15b-22; cf. Exod 18:1-12)—“[w]hen Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest [a Levite], saw it,” he left the congregation, followed the man into another tent, and proceeded to impale both the man and his wife (Num 25:7-8).

Despite several difficulties with this pericope,<sup>402</sup> the narrator’s conclusion is clear: Phinehas is given “my covenant of peace [בְּרִיתִי שְׁלוֹם]”<sup>403</sup> and “a covenant of perpetual priesthood [בְּרִית כְּהֵנָת עוֹלָם],” since “he was zealous for his God [קָנָא לֵאלֹהֵיוֹ],”<sup>404</sup> and made atonement [וַיִּכַּפֵּר]<sup>405</sup> for the Israelites” (Num 25:12-13). Phinehas, like his eponymous ancestor Levi, was intolerant of any intermarriage between an Israelite and a foreign daughter, though this time it is because the bond led to idolatry whereas the offense before was Shechem’s defiling of Dinah.<sup>406</sup>

---

<sup>402</sup> E.g., the word for “tent” in v. 8 (הַקֶּבֶד) occurs only here in the HB and is not the usual one for “tent” (אֹהֶל), which is found in v. 6. Whether the “tent” of v. 8 was for public ritual activities, private use, or something else altogether is unclear. Besides the preceding ambiguity, the expression “through the belly [אֶל-קִבְדָּתָהּ]” is peculiar. For more discussion, see Levine, *Numbers*, 287-288; cf. *HarperCollins Study Bible*, 249-250 explanatory notes.

<sup>403</sup> “An unusual construct formation...[that can be rendered]...as a double accusative, taking the two nouns as appositional: ‘Behold I am granting him my covenant, fellowship.’” Levine, *Numbers*, 289.

<sup>404</sup> Hengel says, “The name ‘Zealot’ (קָנָא) for Phinehas is placed in God’s mouth and should be regarded as an honorary title. The name ‘son of the Zealot’ should be seen as referring to Levi, whose zeal with regard to fornication is attested in Gen 34 and quoted in the Midrashim.” Hengel, *Zealots*, 159-160. Hengel also concurs with my assessment of this story and its connection with Gen 34. Op. cit., 178-179, 187-188. Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 185-196, supports the proposed link between Gen 34 and Num 25 (and Num 31 as well). He also contends that Exod 32 serves as the crucial passage that explains why Jacob’s curse against the tribe of Levi in Gen 49:5-7 is reversed or overturned.

<sup>405</sup> “The Piel of the verb describes several actions, ranging from performing rites of expiation, to granting atonement (an act reserved for God), and, as here, to securing God’s forgiveness through expiation.” Levine, *Numbers*, 290.

<sup>406</sup> Wenham, *Genesis*, 316, too, sees parallels between Gen 34 and Num 25. For example, he says, “[T]he brothers’ action here is not viewed as unequivocally evil, for the later action of Phinehas is seen as extremely meritorious, and the follow-up attack by all Israel is expressly commanded by God. As Jacob’s sons here foreshadow the actions of their descendants, this seems to imply the narrator’s qualified approval.” Pitt-Rivers, *Fate of Shechem*, 167, ardently maintains that “[t]he lesson [of Gen 34 and Num 25] is clear. Sexual hospitality is not only not to be given [as happened with Dinah], it may not be received

When seen against the behavior of Simeon and Levi in Gen 34, it is ironic that Phinehas, a Levite, kills a Simeonite (Num 25:14); brothers, who once stood together against Shechem's outrage, now find themselves enemies. It is also ironic—in light of the deception of Shechem by Jacob's sons—that after Phinehas kills Zimri and Cozbi, his Midianite wife, the Lord tells Moses to “defeat” the Midianites, for they have harassed you by the trickery with which they deceived you [בְּנִכְלִיָּהֶם אֲשֶׁר־נִכְלָו לָכֶם] in the affair of Peor” (Num 25:18).<sup>407</sup> Deception by Simeon and Levi is acceptable, since it avenged a wrongful act. Deception by the Midianites is unacceptable, since it led to polluted marriages and flagrant idolatry.

The third passage that commends Levi for his godly passion is Deut 33:8-11.<sup>408</sup> In this brief encomium presented as part of Moses' final testament, the tribe of Levi is extolled for several virtuous acts: loyalty at Massah and Meribah (Exod 17:1-7; Num 20:1-13); standing with Moses against their idolatrous kin (Exod 32:25-29); teaching the Lord's ordinances and laws; and serving as faithful priests. Of particular note is Moses' final request of the Lord on behalf of Levi: “Bless, O Lord, his substance, / and accept the work of his hands; / crush the loins of his adversaries, / of those that hate him, so that they do not rise again” (Deut 33:11b). Here, Moses praises Levi for his past zealous acts and also encourages similar behavior in the future “so that

---

either, not even (the text finally adds, vv. 6-8, 14-18) in the form of the Midianite Cozbi, daughter of Zur, who is brought into the Israelite camp by the Simeonite prince she has seduced.”

<sup>407</sup> The word for deception in Gen 34:13 is בְּרִמָּה. Here in Num 25, the root for both the noun and verb is נִכַּל, which is the same word used when Joseph's brothers conspired to kill him (Gen 37:18). Cf. Levine, *Numbers*, 291.

<sup>408</sup> Along with other commentators C. J. Labuschagne, “The Tribes in the Blessing of Moses,” in *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis*, Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at London, 1973 (*OtSt* 19; ed. A. S. Van Der Woude; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 97-112, observes that the tribe of “Simeon is lacking” in Deut 33. In his estimation, “the different order of the tribes in Deut. xxxiii is determined by geographical factors, and not by genealogical ones as in Gen. xlix (the sons of Leah, the sons of the two slave-women, the sons of Rachel).” He attributes Simeon's absence from “the Blessing of Moses” to Simeon's lack of territory at the time the poem was composed (i.e., the beginning of David's reign in Hebron for the southern tribes). Labuschagne also concludes that “the name of Levi was omitted by the [original?] composer of the poem for the simple reason that the Levites had no territory of their own.” Whereas Simeon was never reintroduced, Labuschagne argues that “[the Levi-blessing's] present position shows that it has been inserted in the Judah-blessing according to the literary device of split and insert, probably by a levitical redactor who missed Levi among the tribes here.” In contrast, Eduard Neilsen, “The Levites in Ancient Israel,” *ASTI* 3 (1964): 18, 20, puts forward the thesis that Deut 33 is of “northern origin,” “dates back to pre-monarchical times,” and is the “place of origin for such a priestly class...[that]...should be linked up with the message of Moses more than with any definite local area.”

they [i.e., those who profane the Lord or defile Israel] do not rise again.” Simply put, Levi is held up as an exemplary, noble model for maintaining righteousness, a characteristic that was first seen in the tribe’s eponymous ancestor and a battle standard taken up by subsequent descendants. In sum, Moses honors Levi for his singular pursuit of purity in the past and invokes God’s blessings with hope for a similar future.<sup>409</sup>

The longest text to exhibit traces of the “two-sword” *traditum* is Judges 17-21. This five chapter block is actually composed of two independent episodes. The first one (17-18) is chiefly about the military exploits of Dan; the second one (19-21) rehearses the attack of Israel against their kinsman from the tribe of Benjamin.<sup>410</sup> Both literary units describe awful conduct by the people of Israel. The second account, however, is particularly shocking and appalling with its graphic depiction of internecine violence. It truly is—as Phyllis Trible calls it—a “text of terror.”<sup>411</sup>

Admittedly, it is a challenge to extract compelling evidence for the “two-sword” *traditum* from Judg 17-18. Nevertheless, since both stories are framed by some version of the narrator’s recurring, somber refrain, “In those days there was no king in Israel; all the people did what was right in their eyes” (Judg 17:6; cf. Judg 18:1; 19:1; 21:25), this repetitive literary expression holds the two units together. In view of that literary device, it seems appropriate to scrutinize both stories in order to tease out additional verification of the “two-sword” *traditum*.

The narrative in Judges 17-18 begins when Micah, the Ephraimite, confesses to his mother that he had taken her silver. Upon learning of his transgression, she entreats the Lord to

---

<sup>409</sup> In my estimation, the connection between this passage and Gen 34 is very subtle, perhaps the most subtle one examined. However, this is a pivotal passage for Kugler’s argument. He writes, “While Genesis 34 presents Levi as such a zealot, and Exod 32:25-29 and Num 25:6-13 indicate that his descendants won the office by their sword-bearing action, only this passage [i.e., Deut 33:8-11] brings together Levi the individual, a violent passion for purity, and a consequent elevation to priestly leadership. And it adds to the resources for the LPT the notion that Levi was especially occupied with the law and wisdom in its instruction.” For this and additional comments on Deut 33:8-11, see Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 16-18.

<sup>410</sup> Nielsen, “Levites,” 20-25, believes that Gen 34, 49:5-7, and Judg 17-21 support the notion that “a secular tribe of Levi” existed at one time, a conclusion that seems particularly strengthened by the incidents reported in Judg 17-21. For further comments on the relation of Gen 34, 49:5-7, Deut 33:10, and Judg 17-21 in light of Deuteronomistic History theory, see Eissfeldt, “Die levitischen Traditionen in Gen 34 und 49, Dtn 33 sowie Jdc 17-18 und 19-21,” 76-79.

<sup>411</sup> Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984). For her analysis of Judges 19-21, see “An Unnamed Woman: The Extravagance of Violence,” *idem*, 65-91.

bless her son, dedicates the silver to the Lord, and commissions a silversmith to make an idol. Micah then places the idol—along with “an ephod and teraphim”—into his shrine<sup>412</sup> and appoints one of his sons to act a priest (Judg 17:1-5). Some time later a Levite from Bethlehem in Judah meets Micah. After some negotiations, the Levite agrees to become his personal priest. Micah is pleased to have retained the services of the Levite, since Micah is convinced the Lord “will prosper [וַיִּטֵּיב]”<sup>413</sup> him (Judg 17:7-13).

Around that time the Danites initiate a search for territory by sending out five scouts who stay at Micah’s house during their exploration of the land.<sup>414</sup> Once they recognize “the voice of the young Levite” and learn that he is Micah’s priest, they ask him to bless their mission. Specifically, they want to know if their “mission will succeed” (Judg 18:1-5). In response, the Levite says, “Go in peace. The mission you are on is under the eye of the Lord” (Judg 18:6).

After leaving Micah’s house the spies travel north to the city of Laish. Once there, they observe that the people are “living securely [וַיִּשְׁבְּתוּ לְבִטָּח],”<sup>415</sup> that they are “quiet and unsuspecting [שָׁקֵט וּבִטָּח],”<sup>416</sup> lacking nothing on earth [וְאֵינֶם מְקַלְמִים דְּבָר בְּאֶרֶץ],<sup>417</sup> and possessing wealth [וַיִּוְרֶשׁ עֲצָר]”<sup>418</sup> (Judg 18:7). The spies also take note that the people of Laish

---

<sup>412</sup> JPS: “house of God.”

<sup>413</sup> LXX: (Codex Alexandrinus [hereafter A]) ἠγαθοποίησεν (“he did good”); (Codex Vaticanus [hereafter B]) ἀγαθυνεῖ (“he will do good”).

<sup>414</sup> JPS: “While in the vicinity of Micah’s house.”

<sup>415</sup> LXX: (A) καθήμενον ἐν ἐλπίδι (“dwelling in [with] hope/expectation”); (B) καθήμενον ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι. (“dwelling on hope/expectation”).

<sup>416</sup> Or, “undisturbed and securely;” BDB, 1052-1053. LXX: (A) ἡσυχάζοντας ἐν ἐλπίδι (“living quietly in [with] hope”); (B) ἡσυχάζουσα (“living quietly”). For meaning of ἡσυχάζω, see LSJ, 779.

<sup>417</sup> Literally, “there was no humiliating speech in the land.” LXX: (A) μὴ δυναμένους λαλῆσαι ῥῆμα (“incapable of speaking a [slanderous?] word”); (B) οὐκ ἔστιν διατρέπων ἢ καταισχύνων λόγον ἐν τῇ γῆ (“there is no perverse or humiliating speech in the land”). For meaning of διατρέπω, see LSJ, 416 and LEH, 111.

<sup>418</sup> The Hebrew expression is unclear. Literally, it is: “heir of restraint.” BDB, 439, 783. LXX: (A) no equivalent expression present; (B) κληρονόμος ἐκπιέζων θησαυροῦ (“heir of oppressing [inordinate?]”).

do not have close neighbors. In other words, they have no one who could or would come to their aid if attacked.

Having completed their reconnaissance, the spies return home and encourage their people to act with dispatch and take the city (Judg 18:8-10). Shortly thereafter, “[s]ix hundred men of the Dan clan, armed with weapons of war [כְּלֵי מִלְחָמָה],” assemble and begin their trek north to Laish. On their way, the five spies tell their kinsmen about the treasure at Micah’s house (i.e., the silver idol, ephod, and teraphim). Once they hear about this booty, they enter his house, seize the silver images, and also convince the young Levite to accompany and serve them as their priest (Judg 18:11-20). After raiding Micah’s home, the Danites resume their journey to Laish. With his neighbors alongside, Micah pursues the Danites but is ultimately dissuaded from retaliating by their hostile threat to kill both him and all who live in his house and by their sheer strength (Judg 18:21-26). Bolstered by this conquest and conducting their military operations under the auspices of a Levite priest who had already declared on the previous mission that the Lord was with them, the Danites put the people of Laish “to the sword [לְפִי־חֶרֶב]”<sup>419</sup> and burned down the city (Judg 18:27).

Before I consider the second block of material from the final chapters of Judges, it is important to point out how the story found in Judges 17-18 is suggestive of the “two-sword” *traditum*. In the first place, there is obviously the presence of the Levite priest. On the one hand, that fact in and of itself is not terribly compelling. On the other hand, his presence, when considered in light of other factors, increases the likelihood that this narrative is a later re-enactment—albeit a muted one—of an ancient tradition first recorded in Gen 34. These additional factors include: (1) the eerie parallel between the “quiet and unsuspecting” people of Laish and Shechem who did not expect any harm from Jacob’s sons after negotiating the terms

---

wealth”). For meaning of ἐκπιέζω, see LSJ, 516. Cf. Judg 18:9 where the spies exhort their kin to “enter in and possess the land [לְבֹא לְרֶשֶׁת אֶת־הָאָרֶץ].”

<sup>419</sup> LXX: (A and B) ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας (“by the edge/mouth of the sword”).

of his marriage to Dinah (cf. Gen 34:21, 25; Judg 18:7, 10, 27);<sup>420</sup> (2) the use of the sword to kill (cf. Gen 34:25; Judg 18:27); and (3) the lack of any deliverer or avenger for either race (cf. Gen 35:5; Judg 18:28). In sum, this vignette contains a number of features that resonate with the slaughter of Shechem by Simeon and Levi.

The preceding conclusion is persuasive only insofar as one accepts the proposed links, which are, to be sure, speculative. In contrast, the resonance between Gen 34 and the story in Judg 19-21 is not nearly as far-fetched. Indeed, even the vocabulary—i.e., עָנָה and נִבְלָה — suggests the connection.<sup>421</sup> The narrative opens with an abbreviated version of the previously noted refrain: “In those days, when there was no king in Israel...” (Judg 19:1a). Besides this thematic element, there are two other features that further link this narrative with the preceding one. Both stories occur in “the hill country of Ephraim” and concern a Levite from “Bethlehem in Judah” (cf. Judg 17:1, 7-8; 19:1).

Whereas these narrative associations are significant for the literary structure of Judges, other traits are much more important for this project in that several details seem to echo the Gen 34 narrative. For instance, as the narrator starts to reveal the specific background regarding the soon-to-be realized internecine atrocity, he remarks that the Levite’s “concubine became angry with him [נִתְזַנְּתָה עָלָיו פִּילְגָשִׁי]”<sup>422</sup> (Judg 19:2a). Rather than repudiate her for her conduct—which one might expect of a Levite in light of their penchant for righteous indignation (e.g., Levi,

---

<sup>420</sup> The root בָּטַח is used both here and in Gen 34:25. In a similar way, the Simeonites also attack a peaceful neighbor, destroy them, and then proceed to settle in their land (1 Chr 4:39-43; cf. Judg 18:28-31).

<sup>421</sup> According to Keefe, “Rapes of Women,” 85f., both *innāh* and *nēbālāh* show an uncanny link between Gen 34, Judg 19, and 2 Sam 13, three narratives that demonstrate the deplorable connection between rape and social disintegration into war. Specifically, about the violent rape of the Levite’s concubine by the men of Gibeah, she writes, “In Judges 19, a woman is both raped and dismembered; the division of her body into twelve pieces serves as a prelude to and a symbol for a civil war between the twelve tribes of Israel...The namelessness and political insignificance of all the actors in this story point towards the social chaos of which the story will tell.”

<sup>422</sup> The Hebrew literally reads, “And his concubine played the harlot on/against him.” Why the NRSV opted to follow Codex Alexandrinus is not explained. The *HarperCollins Study Bible* study note (401, n 19.2) says, “Israelite law did not allow for divorce by the wife. “She became an adulteress by walking out.” JPS: “Once his concubine deserted him...” LXX: (A) καὶ ὠργίσθη αὐτῷ ἡ παλλακὴ αὐτοῦ (“and his concubine became angry with him”); (B) καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ παλλακὴ αὐτοῦ (“and his concubine left him”).

Phinehas)—her husband went after her “to speak tenderly to her [עַל-לִבָּהּ]”<sup>423</sup> (Judg 19:3). Ironically, these words are also reminiscent of Shechem’s words to Dinah after he “lay with her by force” (Gen 34:2-3).<sup>424</sup> But this time the words are ascribed to a Levite who speaks tenderly to his concubine who had left in anger in contrast to Simeon and Levi who spoke deceitfully to Shechem, their adversary.

The Levite eventually reaches his concubine’s father’s house and after several days of conviviality the Levite leaves with his concubine and begins his journey back home (Judg 19:3b-10). Though the text does not explicitly state that the Levite and his father-in-law were re-negotiating the terms of marriage, it is not implausible to think of that as one possibility. If so, the Levite was once again acting in a way that is suggestive of the negotiations between Shechem and Jacob’s sons.

Yet irrespective of what may or may not have transpired while the Levite was at his father-in-law’s house, when the Levite returns home, he and his entourage bypass Jebus (i.e., Jerusalem), since it is a city of foreigners, and decide to spend the night in Gibeah of Benjamin (Judg 19:11-14). Surprisingly, no resident Benjaminite offers him any lodging. But a fellow Ephraimite, an old man who happened to be living in Gibeah at the time, invites the Levite, his servant, his concubines and their animals to spend the night at his house (Judg 19:15-21).

That night “the men of the city, a perverse lot [אֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר אֲנָשֵׁי בְנֵי-בְלִיעַל]”<sup>425</sup> came to the old man’s house and demanded that he “[b]ring out the man who came into your house, so that we may have intercourse with him [וְיָדָעֵנּוּ]”<sup>426</sup> (Judg 19:22). The owner of the house tries to

---

<sup>423</sup> JPS: “to woo her...” LXX: (A and B) τοῦ λαλῆσαι ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς (“to speak to her heart”).

<sup>424</sup> Cf. Gen 34:3—“and [Shechem] spoke tenderly to her [וַיְדַבֵּר עַל-לֵב הַנַּעֲרָ].”

<sup>425</sup> JPS: “the men of the town, a depraved lot.” LXX: (A) καὶ ἰδοὺ οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως υἱοὶ παρανόμων (“and then the men of the city, sons of lawlessness [violence]”); (B) καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως υἱοὶ παρανόμων (“and then men of the city, sons of lawlessness [violence]”).

<sup>426</sup> Literally, the Hebrew reads: “so that we may know him.” JPS: “so that we can be intimate with him.” LXX: (A and B) ἵνα γινώμεν αὐτόν (“so that we may know him”).



dissuade his neighbors from doing “this vile thing [את־הַנְּבִלָה הַזֹּאת]”<sup>427</sup> and callously offers his own virgin daughter and the Levite’s concubine as sops to these perverse men. With complete disregard for their well-being, he tells the men to “[r]avish them and do whatever [they] want to them [וְעֵנּוּ אוֹתָם וַעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינֵיכֶם]”<sup>428</sup> (Judg 19:23-24). Unbelievably, the old man shamelessly tells his neighbors to do “what [is] right in their own eyes;” and there being no king in Israel, his personal decree fits the times (cf. Judg 17:6; 21:25).<sup>429</sup>

Yet as disgusting as the old man’s behavior was, the Levite’s conduct is even more appalling. For, when the men of Gibeah did not listen, “the [Levite] seized his concubine [וַיִּחַזַק הָאִישׁ בְּפִלְגָשׁוֹ]” and tossed her out of the house and into the street. For the remainder of that night the men of the city “raped her, and abused her [וַיַּחַדְּלוּ אוֹתָהּ וַיַּחַדְּלוּ לָהּ].”<sup>430</sup> After they finished making sport of her, they released her. Upon her return to the old man’s front door, she fell down (Judg 19:25).

The next morning the Levite found her in front of the door and when she did not respond to his command to “[g]et up,” he put her on his donkey and returned home (Judg 19:27-28). Once

<sup>427</sup> JPS: “do not perpetrate this outrage.” LXX: (A and B) μὴ ποιήσητε τὴν ἀφροσύνην ταύτην (“may you not commit this folly”).

<sup>428</sup> Literally, the Hebrew says: “Humble [Afflict] them and do to them [whatever is] the good in your eyes.” JPS: “Have your pleasure of them, do what you like with them...” LXX: (A and B) καὶ ταπεινώσατε αὐτάς καὶ ποιήσατε αὐταῖς τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν (“and humble them and do to them the good in your eyes”).

<sup>429</sup> Whereas I view the old man’s conduct unequivocally abhorrent, Frymer-Kensky—who in like manner describes Gen 18-19 and Judg 19 as “two horrible tales”—notes that “the man of Gibeah’s offering of his daughter and the Levite’s concubine to the men of Gibeah (Judges 19)” reflects the rule that “the father has full determination of his daughter’s sexuality.” In both situations (i.e., Gen 18-19 and Judg 19), “these men were attempting to cope with an emergency situation in which they felt their lives at risk, but the narrative considers them within their rights to offer their daughters, and Lot, in particular, is considered the one righteous in Sodom.” While the narrative—based on legal and philosophical assumptions—may consider “these men...within their rights,” just because something is legal, does not necessarily imply that it is moral in my opinion. For further discussion, see Frymer-Kensky, “Case of Sex,” 92-93.

<sup>430</sup> LXX: (A) καὶ ἔγνωσαν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῇ (“and they knew her and they abused her”); (B) καὶ ἔγνωσαν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐνέπαιξον αὐτῇ (“and they knew her and they abused her”). For the meaning of ἐμπαίζω (“to abuse,” “to make sport of,” or “to mock”), see LEH, 146, and LSJ, 543.

there, “he took a knife, and grasping his concubine [וַיִּחַזַק בְּפִילֵגְשׁוֹ] cut her into twelve pieces, limb by limb [וַיִּנְתְּחָהּ לְעֲצָמֶיהָ],<sup>431</sup> and sent her throughout all the territory of Israel” (Judg 19:29). Tragically, the Levite finalized the wanton rape and abuse of his concubine. As he did the night before, “he seized his concubine [וַיִּחַזַק בְּפִילֵגְשׁוֹ]” and with conduct wholly consistent with venerable Levitical priestly tradition, the Levite took his knife<sup>432</sup> to complete the dismemberment of his female sacrifice before he shipped her body parts throughout the land. Finally, he instructed those who distributed her fragments to ask, “Has such a thing ever happened since the day that the Israelites came up from the land of Egypt until this day? Consider it, take counsel, and speak out” (Judg 19:30).

To be sure, the Levite’s inflammatory words are reminiscent of his ancient father, Levi, who also expressed rage over what had happened to his sister Dinah; and just as Levi and his brothers used a ruse to exact revenge, this Levite is so angry at those who abused his concubine that he too will deceive all Israel into an internecine massacre of epic proportion and thereby justify the vengeance he seeks. Without fail, he honors—if not out rightly, at least symbolically—a ritual whose origin goes back to the tribe’s eponymous father, was furthered by his descendants at Sinai, and later solidified for posterity by Phinehas. In short, the Levite wields a knife in order to punish those who ought not to have done such “a vile thing” (cf. Gen 34:7; Judg 19:23-24, 30). Like Levi, he seeks to punish those who treated his concubine like a whore (cf. Gen 34:31; Judg 19:25). Yet, ironically, this time, the Levite curiously fails to include himself as one who is also worthy of retribution, since he too treated his concubine like a whore when he put her out on the street.

---

<sup>431</sup> Literally, “he divided her joints to her bones.” JPS: “and [he] cut her up limb by limb...”

<sup>432</sup> *BHS* uses מַאֲכֵלֶת (“knife” or “cutting instrument,” BDB, 38), not the typical Hebrew word for “sword [חֶרֶב].” LXX: (A) μάχαιραν (“sword”); the same word is used in Gen 34:25; (B) ῥομφαίαν (“sword”), the same word is used in Judg 18:27.

After learning of the events at Gibeah and receiving the Levite's graphic package, the people of Israel assemble at Mizpah bearing arms. Following his injunction to "[c]onsider it, take counsel, and speak out," they query the Levite about this incident. With astute rhetorical skill, the Levite quickly attests to the affair. His report, however, is noticeably both a misrepresentation and laconic.<sup>433</sup> On the one hand, no one would dispute his assertion that "[t]he lords of Gibeah rose up against [him], and surrounded the house at night...and raped his concubine until she died" (Judg 20:5). Nor would anyone contest the description of his subsequent action that he cut up his concubine and sent her twelve fragments throughout Israel as a sign of their "vile outrage [הַנְּבִלָה וְזָמָה וְנִבְלָה]"<sup>434</sup> (Judg 20:6). On the other hand, his claim that "[t]hey intended to kill [him]" seems true only insofar that one grants that his concubine's fate would have been his had he fallen into their hands (Judg 20:5).

Once the sons of Israel hear the Levite's testimony they decide to conscript an army in order "to repay Gibeah of Benjamin for all the disgrace [הַנְּבִלָה וְזָמָה וְנִבְלָה]"<sup>435</sup> that they have done in Israel" (Judg 20:10). When the Israeli army finally reaches and surrounds Gibeah they inquire

---

<sup>433</sup> Indeed, the Levite's summary speech—though not quoted speech—exhibits several classic traits that Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 21ff., 29ff., emphasized. For example, there is the tendency for subsequent rehearsals by the narrator to be shorter. In addition, the Levite's speech is not simply reported speech, but speech for the furtherance of some present purpose.

<sup>434</sup> Or, "wickedness and senselessness [disgrace]," if one does not take the expression as a hendiadys. JPS translates this expression as: "an outrageous act of depravity." LXX: (A) ἀφροσύνην ("folly"); (B) ζεμα καὶ ἀπόπτωμα ("lewdness, fermentation, boiling [ζεμα a transliteration of the Hebrew; LEH, 194; cf. LSJ 54] and error, misfortune;" LEH 54; LSJ, 214). Keefe, "Rapes of Women," 86, n. 5, notes well the problems associated with the expression, "the outrage of Gibeah." She states, "Commentators like to refer to the episode in Judges 19 as 'the outrage of Gibeah.' Outrage is presumably the reaction of all those who receive a piece of the dead woman's body: 'And all who saw it said, "Such a thing has never happened or been seen from the day that the people of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt until this day; consider it, take counsel, and speak"' (Judg 19:30). But what exactly is the object of this outrage? That there is scholarly discussion as to whether the greater outrage was the mob's rape of the woman or their breach of hospitality in regard to the men makes one suspect rampant androcentrism. Beyond these choices, the ambiguity in this response, 'such a thing has never happened or been seen,' might well refer to the outrageous horror of a piece of a woman's body arriving in town. Indeed, reading out of a perspective where the body of woman is sacred, the Levite's act of calculated dismemberment may be the most disturbing outrage of all."

<sup>435</sup> JPS: "all the outrage." LXX: (A) πᾶσαν τὴν ἀφροσύνην; (B) πᾶν τὸ ἀπόπτωμα.

about the nature of the “crime [רָעָה]”<sup>436</sup> (Judg 20:12). They also want the men of the city to “hand over those scoundrels [בְּנֵי־בְלִיעַל]”<sup>437</sup> (Judg 20:13). Yet just as before, the Benjaminites refuse to listen (Judg 20:13; cf. Judg 19:25).

After the Benjaminites reject the counsel and advice of their kinsfolk, the other tribes of Israel attack. Despite two initial setbacks, these tribes defeat the Benjaminites during the third assault in a “fierce battle.” In all, approximately twenty-five thousand “arms-bearing men, all of them courageous fighters” of Benjamin die. Besides “put[ting] the whole city [of Gibeah] to the sword [אֶת־כָּל־הָעִיר לְפִי־חֶרֶב]”<sup>438</sup> the sons of Israel “turned back against the Benjaminites, and put them to the sword [לְפִי־חֶרֶב וְיִכּוּם]”<sup>439</sup>—the city, the people, the animals, and all that remained” (Judg 20:18-48, esp. vv. 34-35, 37, 46, 48)—and in doing so execute a vengeful retaliation against some of their own people.

Here, once more, Levi rallies his brothers to punish the other—though this time “the other” is his own kin (as it was at Sinai and in the wilderness)—for an egregious, vile, evil act; and just as his eponymous ancestor Levi used subterfuge to achieve his objective, this Levite carries on the grand family tradition in like manner by means of his own factual omission and misstatement (Judg 20:5-6). But whereas the violence ended once Simeon and Levi and their brothers slaughtered Shechem, the violence is not yet complete in this latter episode. For, in contrast to Simeon and Levi who refused to allow their daughter Dinah to be given to a foreigner,

<sup>436</sup> JPS: “this evil thing.” LXX: (A) ἡ κακία αὕτη (“this evil”); (B) ἡ πονηρία αὕτη (“this wickedness, vice, evil;” LEH, 388; “this oppression, baseness, knavery, wickedness;” LSJ, 1447).

<sup>437</sup> Literally, “sons of worthlessness.” LXX: (A) τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς (“the ungodly men”); (B) τοὺς ἄνδρας υἱοὺς παρανόμων (“the men, sons of lawlessness”).

<sup>438</sup> LXX: (A) καὶ ἐπάταξαν ὅλην τὴν πόλιν ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας (“and they struck the whole city with the sword’s mouth”); (B) καὶ ἐπάταξαν τὴν πόλιν ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας (“and they struck the city with the sword’s mouth”).

<sup>439</sup> LXX: (A and B) καὶ ἐπάταξαν αὐτοὺς ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας (“and they struck them with the sword’s mouth”).

these descendants—based on their bizarre sense of loyalty to national (tribal, corporate?) identity and honor—refused to give their own native daughters to their Benjaminite brothers because of an oath, “No one of us shall give his daughter in marriage to Benjamin” (Judg 21:1; cf. vv. 7, 18).

As a result, and flowing out of an distorted sense of compassion, not only do the tribes of Israel put one of their own cities to the sword (i.e., Jabesh-gilead), they also direct the surviving, unmarried Benjaminites to take foreign daughters as wives, to watch and take whatever young women from Shiloh they desired—in a word, to do as Shechem himself had done (Judg 21:20-21; cf. Gen 34:1-3).<sup>440</sup> Then, if perchance, any of the foreign fathers complain about their abducted daughters (as did Jacob and his sons to Hamor and Shechem), the Israelites were to defend the actions of the Benjaminites and say, “Be generous and allow us to have them; because we did not capture in battle a wife for each man. But neither did you incur guilt by giving your daughters to them” (Judg 21:22)—a generosity and reciprocity demanded of the men of Shiloh that, strangely enough, the sons of Israel were unwilling to grant to Shechem.

Levi’s penchant for bearing arms is further attested in 2 Chr 23:1-7 when the Levites were called upon to protect Joash, the rightful heir to his father’s throne, from his grandmother Athaliah, one of Omri’s granddaughters. In this instance, a Levitical security force was needed because Joash—the seven-year-old son of Ahaziah who was to be crowned king after being hidden for six years by his sister Jehoshabeath—was the target of Athaliah’s rage (2 Chr 22:2, 10-12; cf. 2 Chr 24:1ff.). In order to fulfill their mission and perform their duty, the Levites were instructed to “surround the king, each with his weapons in his hand; and whoever enters the house shall be killed” (2 Chr 23:7), an obligation that they fulfilled when Athaliah entered “the house of the Lord” and dared to approach the newly anointed king (2 Chr 23:12-15). Although there is no explicit reference to Levi, their tribal father, the story resonates with their ancestral

---

<sup>440</sup> For a discussion on marriage by abduction, see Fleishman, “Shechem and Dinah,” 12-32, esp. 21ff. for remarks on Judg 21.

heritage that Levites take up the sword and punish evil-doers—thereby displaying a penchant for national identity and honor and at the same time justifying vengeance.<sup>441</sup>

The final passage to consider is Ezra 9-10. When compared to all of the preceding texts, this pericope probably exhibits the weakest connection with the events narrated in Gen 34, except for perhaps Deut 33:8-11. And though the link is very subtle and thus extremely tentative, arguably, it remains feasible. The account in Ezra 9-10 is foregrounded against the rebuilding and dedication of the Jerusalem temple by the exiles who had returned to Judah and also re-instituted the Passover celebration (Ezra 6:13ff.). After these historic and joyful events, Ezra is commissioned by Artaxerxes<sup>442</sup> to return to Judah with “any of the people of Israel, their priests, or the Levites” and re-establish proper temple worship. Besides authorizing Ezra to restore traditional Jewish religious practices in the temple, Artaxerxes also provides extraordinary financial support, vessels for use in temple rituals, and even authorizes Ezra to choose temple servants and appoint judges and other state officials to manage the affairs in Judah, which he completes with dispatch upon his arrival (Ezra 7-8).

After carrying out these duties some officials notify Ezra of a disturbing offense: “[t]he people of Israel, the priests, and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands with their abominations...for they have taken some of their daughters as wives for themselves and for their sons” (Ezra 9:1-2). This revelation stuns Ezra who immediately tears his clothing, pulls out hair from his head and beard, and offers a corporate prayer in which he confesses the iniquities of the people (Ezra 9:3-15; cf. Neh 13:23-31; Ezek 44:9-27). In response to his lament, many people—including priests and Levites—weep alongside him, admit their complicity, and decide to separate themselves from their foreign wives during a national assembly. To fulfill this vow, the foreign wives and their children are sent away in order to honor

---

<sup>441</sup> Cf. Neh 4:7-23 when Nehemiah divided the workers—some who were priests and some who were not—into two groups: half who “worked on construction” and half who “held the spears, shields, bows, and body-armor.” In addition, “each of the builders had his sword strapped at his side while he built.”

<sup>442</sup> If Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.E.), Ezra returned to Judah in 458 B.C.E. If Artaxerxes II (404-358 B.C.E.), Ezra returned in 398 B.C.E. For more on the date of Ezra’s return, see *HarperCollins Study Bible*, 710-711 study notes.

the Mosaic commandments, extract the people from this idolatrous foreign influence, and thus rid the land of its godless pollution (Ezra 10:1-44; cf. Deut 7:1ff).

To be sure, this narrative makes no direct reference or allusion either to Simeon or Levi. Yet the decree to separate themselves from their foreign wives and promise by the people of Israel to honor the Mosaic statute—neither to take foreign daughters as wives nor give their daughters as wives to foreigners—is redolent of Gen 34, Exod 32, Num 25, and Judg 19-21. If the people, the priests, and the Levites truly revere both their national and tribal heritage, then all of them must obey Moses, and some of them—particularly the Levites—must imitate their eponymous ancestor who would not permit Shechem’s wrongful deed go unpunished. Though the people, the priests, and the Levites during Ezra’s time did not use a literal sword to punish the offenders as did Simeon and Levi—and as Phinehas and all Israel later did as well—they did take up a symbolic (metaphoric, spiritual) sword and sever the illicit bond they had made via their marriages to foreign daughters. In other words, their vengeance via divorce decrees—while not physically violent this time—is justified. Ultimately, then, just as it was with Simeon and Levi who refused to give their daughter—that is, their sister Dinah—to Shechem and chose to cut him off from her, so it was during the early days of the Second Temple when the people, the priests, and the Levites sent away the foreign daughters and chose to keep their own daughters instead.

#### **2.3.2.4 Summary of References to the “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Hebrew Bible**

The preceding stories about Levi’s descendants and their aggressive deeds, which are more often than not prompted by a sense of righteous indignation, regularly call to mind several motifs of the “two-sword” *traditum*. First, there is the persistent focus on Israel’s national identity, which appears in the story about Phinehas as he displays no tolerance for the idolatrous practices of the Midianites and will not accept any intermarriage with them (Num 25:1-18). It is also seen when Ezra calls upon the people to put away their foreign wives (Ezra 9-10). The motif about vindication of an honored one stands out in the story of the Levite (Judg 19-21) as does family identity or honor. In this instance, however, it is probably better to think of clan or tribal

identity as the resolute Benjamites initially stand united against all their distant kin before they are ultimately brought to the edge of extinction. Finally, the most commonly-recurring element that connects these pericopes with the “two-sword” *traditum* is the matter of vengeance or justified retaliation. Whether looking at the initial call of the tribe of Levi at Mt. Sinai (Exod 32:25-29), Phinehas’ outrage against those who committed idolatry with Baal of Peor (Num 25:1-18), Moses’ praise of their singular devotion to the Lord at Massah and Meribah (Deut 33:8-11; cf. Exod 17:1-7; Num 20:1-13), or the Levite’s rallying of the nation’s attack against the Benjaminites for the rape of his concubine (Judges 19-21), all these stories appear to sanction or justify violent retribution for reprehensible and despicable misconduct. Even more notable is also the fact that, in each case, the retaliation is against Israel’s own people, which reinforces the tradition’s focus on national identity and the apparent need for ethnic purity if the nation is to be preserved.

## 2.4 Chapter Summary and Review

The three central aims of this chapter were: (1) to establish Gen 34 as the canonical provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum*; (2) to identify critical issues associated with this pericope during the exegesis in order to scrutinize the first aim; and (3) to trace the transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum* as it is refracted through the remainder of the HB. The first objective made use of narrative criticism during an exegetical analysis that stressed the pericope’s literary features and identified four motifs. That investigation demonstrated that the story found in Gen 34 was a memorable saga from the ancient annals of Jewish history because of its notable artistic traits such as: *die Leitwörter* (i.e., the antiphonal refrains of “give” and “take”); intricate character speech exhibited during the tense clan negotiations; decisive retaliatory action by Jacob’s sons; the narrator’s disclosure of the characters’ motives—literary devices described by Alter and Savran, as well as the incorporation of four prominent motifs.

While the first objective was being completed, the second objective considered previous scholarship used in the analysis of Gen 34 and brought attention to issues that such research stressed. The critical methods ranged from conventional approaches such as source, redaction



and form criticism to post-modern, feminist, and reader-response criticism. Some of the more prominent questions that prior exegetes addressed included the following: (1) What do עֲנָה, טָמֵא, and נִבְלָה mean? (2) What was the nature of Shechem's offense? Was it rape? Did he dishonor Jacob and his family? (3) Who were the villains of the story? (4) Why was Jacob silent? (5) Did Simeon and Levi overstep the boundaries of retributive justice? (6) What does the final exchange between Jacob and Simeon and Levi indicate about their familial relationships? (7) Could the Jacobites and Shechemites coexist peacefully? (8) Why is Dinah given no voice throughout the story?

Obviously, the aforementioned research dealt with a plethora of issues, but none of it explicitly addressed my proposition that Gen 34 is the canonical provenance for the “two-sword” *traditum*. If anything, the research survey implicitly corroborated my thesis, since a number of scholars pointed out that Gen 34 displays a remarkable correlation with subsequent tribal conduct and shows evidence of being linked to other HB pericopes (e.g., Wenham, Keefe, Kugler, Hengel). This conclusion was reinforced by the tradition's four motifs that were embedded in later HB passages. Taken together, these facts led to the conclusion that Gen 34 was the point of origin for an important hagiographic tale in Jewish lore whose motifs frequently resurfaced in subsequent pericopes.

After highlighting the literary triumph of this tale from the Jacob-cycle and considering other research as well, I investigated the story's ensuing reiterations in the HB in order to carry out the third objective of this chapter. Since no clearly recognizable “two-sword” *traditum* had been previously identified and thoroughly explored—Kugler's work notwithstanding—it was necessary to use the names of the eponymous ancestors (i.e., Simeon and Levi) in order to detect texts that could potentially serve as transmitters of this secondary HB tradition. At the conclusion of that exploration, only one explicit reference to the narrative and the “two-sword” *traditum* was found in Gen 49 when Jacob offered his last testament to his sons. Conversely, it

was determined that the remaining references to the account were implicit at best—sporadic and muted to varying degrees.

The link to the initial story, however, went beyond simplistic name associations with the eponymous ancestors. The connection to that earliest ancestral anecdote was established by pointing out a number of recurring features such as: similar conduct (e.g., putting enemies to the sword, attacking unsuspecting foreigners, use of deception), passionate religious zeal, a penchant for swift retribution and retaliation, a disdain for mixed marriages, and maintaining orthodox purity—both on the clan and national level. The connection with the “two-sword” *traditum*’s provenance was further strengthened by identifying four motifs that later HB pericopes share with Gen 34. The result of my investigation led me to conclude that later HB anecdotes concerning the descendants of Simeon and Levi echoed and refracted the initial ancestral chronicle.

Of course the level of confidence placed in any of these alleged connections varies widely. Arguably, the link to the eponymous ancestors seems obvious without too much cajoling in some cases (e.g., Exod 32; Num 25; Judg 19-21; 2 Chr 23). Whereas for other texts (e.g., Deut 33; Judg 1, 17-18; 1 Chr 4; Ezra 9-10), the link is more subtle and requires a higher degree of imagination by the reader. All in all, then, the transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum* in the canonical OT is intermittent and derivative. It is also dependent on granting a good deal of latitude when proposing a connection between the *traditum*’s organic roots and the conduct of later descendants of Simeon and Levi.

But even though the case for the “two-sword” *traditum* may appear insufficient and/or inconclusive at this juncture, it is important to recall that this project’s thesis is not solely dependent on the transmission of the tradition in canonical literature. On the one hand, the canonical HB is foundational for this endeavor, since the HB serves as the tradition’s provenance. On the other hand, its transmission in the HB is important, but derivative at best, and while the subsequent pericopes may not appear to play a prominent role in the *traditio* of the “two-sword” *traditum*, they serve a vital, supportive function in the valorization of Simeon and Levi. More

importantly, they contribute to the formation of a “two-sword” ethos or religious, cultural backdrop of the first century C.E. In sum, beyond the *traditum*’s provenance in Gen 34, the remaining HB texts function primarily to reinforce my thesis and sustain it only insofar one is willing to accept the connections with the story’s thematic elements that I identified and described.

Looking back and ahead, then, the objective of this chapter was to examine the source of the “two-sword” *traditum* and trace its refraction through the HB. The aim of next chapter is to locate and map out the development of the “two-sword” *traditum* as it is refracted in the extracanonical literature during the late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods. In order to accomplish that objective it is important not only to note the occurrences of the “two-sword” *traditum* in these other writings (e.g., the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Josephus) but also to describe the tradition’s evolution as it is transmitted. This task is foundational for the project’s thesis, since it is in the extracanonical literature that the valorization of Simeon and Levi reaches its zenith, which will ultimately provide the religious and cultural background for interpreting Luke’s sword-logion.

## 2.5 Excursus: Did Shechem Rape Dinah?

This issue is hotly debated and scholars are unusually divided in their response to this question. For example, consider Frymer-Kensky who observes:

[E]ven though the word עָנָה is often translated “rape,” it rarely corresponds to forcible rape but rather implies the abusive treatment of someone else. In sexual contexts, it means illicit sex, sex with someone with whom one has no right to have sex...[T]here are instances where it means rape: in Judges 19-20, where the concubine in Gibeah was raped to death, and in the story of Amnon and Tamar, in which he is said to have overpowered her (2 Sam 13:12-13), and in Lamentations, in which the women of Zion are said to have been raped (Lam 5:11). But forcible rape is not always the issue. Some cases are ambiguous (e.g., Deut 22:28-29; Gen 34)...[Furthermore, t]he verb does not always have sexual connotations; in non-sexual contexts it means to treat harshly, exploitatively, and/or abusively (e.g., Gen 16:6, 9; 31:50; *inter alia*).<sup>443</sup>

---

<sup>443</sup> Frymer-Kensky, “Case of Sex,” 89-102, esp. 93, 100, n. 9. Another scholar who is not convinced that עָנָה necessarily entails rape is Ellen Van Wolde. See “Does ‘INNĀ Denote Rape? A Semantic Analysis of a Controversial Word,” *VT* 52 (2002): 528-544; idem, “The Dinah Story: Rape or worse?” *OTE* 15/1 (2002): 225-239. (The latter essay is an intense diatribe against Jacob’s sons and a staunch feminist reading that excoriates the narrative for its suppression of Dinah.) Cf. Keefe, “Rapes of Women/Wars of Men,” 81, n. 2;

Relying in part on the work of Frymer-Kensky, Bechtel also raises the same question, “Does the story really intend to indicate that Dinah is raped?” At the outset, Bechtel notes that when:

Genesis 34 is interpreted from a twentieth-century predominantly “individual-oriented” perspective, it is automatically assumed that Shechem rapes Dinah, that all the males in the story treat Dinah as an ‘object’, that Hamor and Shechem act deceitfully toward her family, that Jacob abandons her, and that she becomes the victim of both Shechem and her own family.<sup>444</sup>

Bechtel steadily maintains via: (1) a “modern definition of rape;” (2) seeing Israel as a “group-oriented society;” (3) that “[t]he verb *’nh* (‘to put down’) reflects the process of status manipulation inherent in shaming;” and (4) comparing other uses of *’nh* in the HB, that it is unlikely that Shechem raped Dinah.<sup>445</sup> Contra Bechtel is Yamada who believes that even though Bechtel’s “analysis of group dynamics in Genesis 34 is helpful,” he finds her interpretation of Shechem’s actions, including her analysis of עָנָה, “inadequate.” In his estimation, “[t]he three successive verbs in v. 2 suggest escalating violence.” In addition, he says, “Bechtel’s translation also does not take into account the violent potential within the root עָנָה.”<sup>446</sup> Agreeing with Frymer-Kensky and Bechtel, but against Yamada is Lipka who relies in large part on the work of Bechtel, Fewell and Gunn (for bibliographic information on Fewell and Gunn, see n. 271). Like them, Lipka does not believe Dinah was raped because “none of these arguments [that favor sexual coercion (see below)] is convincing.” Rather, “Shechem’s illicit sexual act with Dinah is characterized

---

89, n. 8. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 352, n. 5, asserts, “What Shechem has done to Dinah is not rape her, but humble or shame her.”

<sup>444</sup> Bechtel, “What if Dinah,” 19.

<sup>445</sup> *Ibid.*, 19-36, esp. 19-31.

<sup>446</sup> Yamada, “Dealing with Rape,” 149-165, esp. 151, n. 9. On the use of three successive verbs, Fleishman, “Simeon and Levi,” 102-104, 112, argues that “[t]he three verbs used ‘he took her, he lay with her, and he afflicted her’ ...[ and their ambiguity are]...explained as part of a marriage custom among the Canaanites.” Ultimately, Fleishman concludes that “Shechem did not rape Dinah” but “more likely...abducted her to wed her.” Cf. Wenham, *Genesis*, 306, n. 3.a. In a later article, Fleishman, “Shechem and Dinah,” 13, 27, continues to affirm that “Dinah was not raped.” He also concludes that “Shechem married her, but we think that this was an alternative means of marriage: by abduction.” Von Rad, *Genesis*, 331, seems to concur with Fleishman’s conclusion when he states, “The verb which is usually translated ‘humble’ (*’innā*) indicates the moral and social degrading and debasing by which a girl loses the expectancy of a fully valid marriage...apparently he [i.e., Shechem] had already abducted Dinah.”

exclusively as a transgression against communal boundaries.” Contra Wenham, the Mp, et al., Lipka also suggests that “the sexual encounter between Shechem and Dinah relates more closely to that described in Exodus 22.15-16 than to the sexual encounter described in Deut. 22.28-29 or, for that matter, to the rape of Tamar in 2 Samuel 13.”<sup>447</sup>

In contrast to the authors in the preceding paragraph who either disavow rape or allow for greater ambiguity and fluidity regarding the meaning of **וַיִּנָּח**, a number of other scholars contend that Shechem raped Dinah. For example, even though Sarna does not use the word “rape,” his comment on v. 2 all but implies it. He says, “Three Hebrew verbs of increasing severity underscore the brutality of Shechem’s assault on Dinah.”<sup>448</sup> Robert Davidson suggests that the NEB translation (i.e., “lay with her and dishonoured [*sic*] her”) is “a somewhat literal translation which might be better rendered ‘forcibly raped her’.”<sup>449</sup> For Coats, there are two rapes though the story’s focus is “not on the rape of Dinah by Shechem, but on the rape of Shechem by the brothers of Dinah.”<sup>450</sup> In an excellent review of recent contributions on this topic, Richard Davidson argues rather convincingly that Shechem did, in fact, rape Dinah. According to him, “the rapid succession of the three verbs” in v. 2, the grammatical construction of v. 2, (i.e., “using the verb *šākāb* in its transitive sense plus the direct object *’otah*,” which indicates Shechem “laid her” rather than “laid with her”), the lack of any blame specifically directed at Dinah, and the overall context of Gen 34 leads him to conclude that “forcible rape is in view.” Later, Richard Davidson tempers his conclusion when he says, “Although the evidence points toward forcible rape on the part of Shechem, the evidence is admittedly not coercive. But even if Dinah did consent to have sex with Shechem, it still would constitute, in today’s terminology, statutory or power rape.”<sup>451</sup>

---

<sup>447</sup> Lipka, *Sexual Transgression*, 184-99, esp. 184, 187, 197.

<sup>448</sup> Sarna, *Genesis*, 234.

<sup>449</sup> Robert Davidson, *Genesis*, 195.

<sup>450</sup> Coats, *Genesis*, 234.

<sup>451</sup> Richard Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh*, 512-518; cf. 305, 317, 340, 359.

Parry likewise concludes that “Genesis 34 is about the rape of an unbetrothed Israelite girl by a *Hivite* man. *It was a triple-layered crime.*”<sup>452</sup> My chief reservation about Parry’s conclusion is his tendency to look upstream from legalistic texts (e.g., Exod 22:15-16; Deut 22:25-29), which may not have been applicable at the time of the offense. To be fair, however, he does offer reasons for viewing Gen 34 as a retelling of an earlier story within the broader landscape of Old Testament meta-narratives—albeit understood with dispensationalist undertones (e.g., the use of expressions such as “the Patriarchal period and the Mosaic period”)—as he points out both continuities and discontinuities. Rashkow not only believes Dinah was raped, but as woman was “really castrated,” since “an elaborate narrative strategy” suppresses female sexuality.<sup>453</sup> Martin Kessler, too, maintains that Shechem raped Dinah.<sup>454</sup>

Despite being sympathetic to Kessler’s conclusion that Dinah was raped, Scholz would probably view his emphasis on the story’s moral implications as an example of obfuscating rape. For Scholz, interpreters obfuscate Dinah’s rape with their “focus on the men,” “source criticism,”

---

<sup>452</sup> Parry, *Old Testament Story*, 146. For Parry’s full discussion on the nature of Shechem’s crime and the relationship between Gen 34 and the OT, op. cit., 137-153, 196-204, respectively.

<sup>453</sup> Rashkow, *The Phallacy of Genesis: A Feminist-Psychoanalytic Approach* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 104-106. Cf. idem, “Hebrew Bible Translations,” 225-233, where Rashkow shows how Shechem’s “act of violence is lost” in sixteenth century English translations in their effort to villainize “the indefensible actions of the Jews, Simeon and Levi.”

<sup>454</sup> Martin Kessler, “Genesis 34—An Interpretation,” *RefR* 19/1 (1965): 3. He also asserts that the story entails important moral implications for Israel: “With the opening of Gen. 34 we see Dinah stepping outside her conventional circle to meet some of the local girls, an illustration of the attraction of Canaanite civilization to Israel. Shechem, a local prince (*nasi*) took a liking to her and raped her, an action which enraged Jacob’s sons sufficiently to kill not only the offender but the entire male citizenry of the town.” Later, as Kessler completes his analysis, he states, “What does the narrator have in mind? In other words, what was the ‘moral’ of his tale—assuming that this story, too, was written as ‘a parable for its own time?’ In this story we see Israel *vis-à-vis* Canaan, facing the problem of intermarriage (which the narrator strongly opposes)...The narrator does not condemn intermarriage explicitly, but he does sound a serious warning; it is as if he says: See how immoral the Canaanites are! Remember the shame they inflicted upon us at Shechem! The hearer is left to draw his own conclusions in the matter, but the story has already predisposed him against intermarriage...In fact, the narrator seems to justify, albeit tacitly, the Israelites’ fierce revenge; as far as he was concerned, Shechem’s evident subsequent generosity cannot undo his untraditional, immoral act of violating an Israelite girl. Israel, having intended to become permanent settlers, was alarmed at this first encounter with the Canaanites as (intended) permanent neighbors. The alarm had been sounded, and, though intermarriage was not always condemned *per se*, a foundation was laid for subsequent polemic against it.” Op. cit., 7-8. Jeansonne, *Women of Genesis*, 88, echoes some of Kessler’s sentiments when she says, “By presenting the complexities of the situation between the family of Dinah and the family of Shechem, as well as by placing this narrative in the context of Jacob’s struggles in the land, the narrator compels the reader to reflect upon the precarious nature of the promise of land and descendants to the Israelites.” Cf. Kunin, *Logic of Incest*, 136-139, who also addresses the issue of intermarriage and exogamy.

“tribal history,” and “xenophobia.” Even recent feminist approaches (e.g., Jeansonne, Keefe, Rashkow) are guilty of obfuscating rape according to Scholz.<sup>455</sup> On the whole, Scholz’s research is apposite and I agree with her assertion that “interpretations of Genesis 34 marginalize, subordinate, ignore, or misrepresente [*sic*] the rape of Dinah in various ways...,” because despite Dinah’s silence, she “is present throughout the story.”<sup>456</sup>

However, I am not entirely convinced that interpreters obfuscate or “evade” Dinah’s rape to the extent that Scholz claims. For instance, rather than “obfuscating rape,” is it possible that Dinah’s rape is a less important—N.B. “less important” is not the same as “unimportant”—concern for many interpreters primarily because it is a focus neither for the narrative nor for the interpreters? To be sure, the interpreters’ foci that Scholz discusses may obfuscate the rape (see p. 91, n. 255 above), but that term appears to impugn the interpreters’ motives to some degree and is thus a bit tendentious, misleading, and pejorative. I also wonder if my stress on the story’s literary artistry—which includes some aspects of tribal history—would place me alongside other interpreters whom she accuses of obfuscating Dinah’s rape despite my conviction that Shechem did rape Dinah (see n. 255). In my opinion, Shechem’s act—that is, the rape or humbling of Dinah, Simeon and Levi’s sister—justified the retaliatory attack in her brothers’ mind (e.g., consider Sternberg’s repudiation of Shechem and his apparent respect for Simeon and Levi), which explains at least in part why this story was revered in Jewish lore and her brothers’ conduct was rehearsed in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. In short, that reprehensible deed, demanded retribution, which her brothers carried out.

Consequently, for the record and in defense of this project, I affirm that I am neither intentionally nor unintentionally obfuscating Dinah’s rape. *Pace* Scholz, the principal aim of this project is found elsewhere. Hopefully, by avowing the likelihood of Dinah’s rape from the outset

---

<sup>455</sup> Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 91-127. Cf. *idem*, “Was it Really Rape in Genesis 34? Biblical Scholarship as a Reflection of Cultural Assumptions,” in *Escaping Eden: New Feminist Perspectives on the Bible* (eds. Harold C. Washington, Susan Lochrie Graham, and Pamela Thimmes; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 182-198.

<sup>456</sup> Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 178, 168.

(see n. 254) I will not be charged with “obfuscating rape,” but will instead be placed alongside Burton L. Visotzky who did not receive Scholz’s opprobrium even though he suggested that “we read the story of Dinah’s rape as something that might not be her version of the story.” After presenting several alternate ways to interpret Dinah’s tale (e.g., “an archetype of the ‘girl and boy from opposing tribes fall in love’ tale;” “Dinah was *raped*,” and “[t]he story is her point of view as well as the male narrator”), Visotzky examines the moral dilemmas this story presents, especially those related to the conduct of Jacob as a father, Simeon and Levi as sons, brothers, and tribal males, and the intersection of two disparate cultures.<sup>457</sup>

Before concluding this excursus, four more related works are worth mentioning. First, James E. Miller, “Sexual Offenses in Genesis,” *JSOT* 90 (2000): 41-53, perceptively observes that if Gen 34 does report an instance of rape, both occurrences of rape in Genesis—both here and in chs. 18-19—“result in the destruction of the larger population in which the rape occurred...[and]...belong to the narrative strand commonly known as J.” Second, for an assessment of “several modern interpretations which focus on Dinah as a subject, not as an object” in light of third century rabbinic texts, see Naomi Graetz, “Dinah the Daughter,” in *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*, (FCB<sup>2</sup>; Athalya Brenner, ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 306-317. Third, for patterns and trends concerning the interpretation of Gen 34 from 150-1600 C.E., which would further support Scholz’s thesis, see Joy A. Schroeder, *Dinah’s Lament: The Biblical Legacy of Sexual Violence in Christian Interpretation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 11-55. Fourth, for a moral exposition on the topic of rape and female sexuality, including discussion on how a personal story, religious culture and politics intersect, see Leon R. Kass, “Regarding Daughters and Sisters: The Rape of Dinah,” *Commentary* 93 (1992): 29-38.

---

<sup>457</sup> Burton L. Visotzky, *The Genesis of Ethics: How the Tormented Family of Genesis Leads Us to Moral Development* (New York: Crown, 1996), 193-203. Cf. Scholz, *Rape Plots*, 122, n. 193



## Chapter Three:

# The “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods

“It is interesting that works from the Hellenistic and Roman periods praise the activity of Simeon and Levi. For example, Philo praises Simeon and Levi as ‘the hearers and pupils of sound sense’ who overthrew the Shechemites, who were ‘still occupied in the pleasure-loving, passion-loving toil of the uncircumcised’ [*De migratione Abrahami*, 224]. Philo also speaks of Simeon and Levi as ‘the champions who stand ready to repel such profane and impure ways of thinking’ [*De mutatione nominum*, 200]. Other sources such as the *Testament of Levi*, *Jubilees*, and Judith praise Simeon and Levi for their zeal and compare them to Phinehas (Num. 25:6-15). In all these cases Simeon’s and Levi’s behavior assumes paradigmatic significance when the issue is guarding Israel’s purity at all costs.”<sup>458</sup>

### 3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I proposed that Gen 34 was the source of the “two-sword” *traditum*. By focusing on the conduct of Simeon and Levi, four motifs were identified and derived from an exegesis of that ancient patriarchal text. The thematic elements were subsequently tracked as they reappeared in conjunction with the story’s heroes in the HB. In this chapter I will examine how the “two-sword” *traditum* is refracted through later Jewish writings as it is reworked and rewritten in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings during the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. As the tradition is followed in these documents, an evidentiary substratum that is the cultural, intertextual background standing behind the anomalous “two-sword” logion in the Gospel of Luke will emerge.

Before beginning that task, a few introductory comments about the approach and objective of this chapter are necessary. First, in order to corroborate the claim that the “two-sword” *traditum* forms part of the religious and cultural background of the first century of the

---

<sup>458</sup> Hamilton, *Genesis*, 372-373.

Common Era I will limit the survey to texts whose timeframe would reasonably allow them to shape or reflect that milieu. With that in mind, I will examine compositions in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings dating from the second century B.C.E. to the second century C.E.<sup>459</sup> Although a few documents seem to fall outside these boundaries, these time limits are broad enough to include writings that reflect shared perspectives of that time period, but not too expansive that their evidentiary value becomes highly suspect, since document dating is an inexact science. In addition, I will survey these writings chronologically within each classification or category (i.e., the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, and, finally, other Jewish writings).<sup>460</sup>

---

<sup>459</sup> E.g., I excluded later rabbinic writings such as *Gen. Rab.* and the Talmuds (Yerushalmi and Babli), since they date from the late fourth century C.E. or later. I also excluded the targumim (*Tg. Onq.*, *Tg. Neof.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*), since they are typically dated from the end of the third century C.E. or later. In addition, these targumim do not generally modify Gen 34 in substantive ways. For example, *Tg. Onq.* shows virtually no reworking of Gen 34; *Tg. Neof.*, too, translates the story with few revisions until the last verse (Gen 34:31) when a “moral of the story” addition is inserted: “The two sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, answered and said to Jacob their father: It is not fitting that they should say, in their congregations and in their schools [uncircumcised] have defiled virgins and worshippers [of idols] the daughter of Jacob. But it is fitting that they should say in the congregations of Israel and in their school house: uncircumcised were slain on account of a virgin, [worshippers of idols] because they defiled Dinah the daughter of Jacob; so that after all this, Shechem, the son of Hamor, may not be proud in his soul or exalted in his heart and say: Like a woman who has no man (lit., son of man) as an avenger of humiliation, so was it done to Dinah, our sister, like (as though she were) a lost woman, a prostitute.” Shirley Lund and Julia A. Foster, *Variant Versions of Targumic Traditions within Codex Neofiti I* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 155-156. Even though *Tg. Neof.* is late, this lone expansion nonetheless shows ongoing confirmation of the “two-sword” motifs (i.e., justified vengeance, concern for family/national identity and honor, and vindication of an honored one). See also B. Barry Levy, *Targum Neofiti 1 A Textual Study: Introduction, Genesis, Exodus* (Studies in Judaism 1; Lanham—London: University Press of America, 1986), 210-212; and Alejandro Diez Macho, *Neofiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (Tomo I Génesis; Madrid—Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968), 593. For discussion on *Tg. Onq.* and Gen 34, see Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text* (Denver: Ktav Publishing House, 1982), 201-204. For a helpful introduction on rabbinic literature, see G. G. Porton, J. Neusner, et al., “Rabbinic Literature,” in *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (eds. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter; Leicester: InterVarsity, 2000), 889-909. Ultimately, the decision to restrict the timeframe was also made for a pragmatic reason: circumscribing the project made it more doable.

<sup>460</sup> Based on my research, apostolic or early church fathers rarely allude to the Shechem and Dinah episode. There is no mention of it in the *Did.*, *1-2 Clem.*, *inter alia*. Prior to the mid-third century C.E., the only example I could locate—and even here it is only an indirect allusion—is from Tertullian in his *Answer to the Jews*, chapter X. After referring to Jacob’s blessing on Simeon and Levi, Tertullian extrapolates from the text to propose that the two sons represent the scribes and the Pharisees. See Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325* (ANF 3; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1903), 165. See also Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 1953), 123. The only other possible allusion to the Dinah episode during the Ante-Nicene period is found in Pseudo-Clement’s *Two Epistles concerning Virginity*. Few scholars regard these letters as genuine and they are disputed (perhaps, shortly before St. Cyprian [d. 258 C.E.]). A linguistic link with the Shechem episode may occur in chapter XI of the second letter as the author proscribes incestuous relations based on the story of the rape of Tamar by Amnon because “he ‘wrought uncleanness in Israel.’” See Roberts and Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (ANF 8), 53, 64. Later church leaders will refer to the story, but they move off in a different trajectory often emphasizing Dinah’s impropriety in going out to see the other women of the region.

Second, the primary objective of this chapter is to identify, trace, and describe the evolution of the “two-sword” *traditum* in Jewish writings from the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. In most cases only texts where a clear allusion to the “two-sword” *traditum* is apparent are examined. For my purposes, a clear allusion occurs when a passage specifically mentions Simeon or Levi (or Shechem or Dinah) and one or more of the four literary motifs is also confirmed. In other words, it is the constellation of one or more of the story’s characters and at least one of the literary themes that will furnish the evidentiary basis of the transmission of “two-sword” *traditum* in these documents. Accordingly, I will rarely deal with passages that describe tribal perspectives regarding the Simeonites or Levites. Neither am I interested in texts that concern the priestly roles of the Levites nor their disputes with the Zadokites or other competing entities. Nevertheless, a few exceptions appear, but these mainly occur when the passage echoes one or more of the four literary motifs or themes of the “two-sword” *traditum* (i.e., family identity and honor, vindication of an honored one, national identity and honor, and justified vengeance) and also seems to suggest some connection with the city of Shechem, and/or Simeon, Levi, and their descendants.

Third, since the texts under consideration were widespread and appear relatively well-known, they formed the cultural and religious framework for the first century C.E. to a large extent. In view of that I further contend that these writings influenced how Jesus’ disciples understood his instructions reported in Luke 22:35-38 and provide the basis for interpreting this idiosyncratic passage despite lacking any explicit reference or even allusion to the “two-sword” *traditum*.

In sum, my purpose is to focus on the refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum* in extracanonical writings that supply a cultural context by which to understand Luke’s *Schwertwort*. This chapter will therefore investigate how the hagiographic story about Simeon and Levi and the four motifs derived from Gen 34—which were subsequently traced throughout the remainder of the HB in chapter two—reappear and are adapted in apocryphal, pseudepigraphal, and other

---

For a survey of later Jewish and Christian interpretations, see Parry, *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethics*, 95-122.

Jewish writings. Stated differently, and to borrow the words of Alan Robinson, the combined aims for chapters two and three are: (1) “to link strands of material which have a common source or purpose;” and (2) “to estimate the effects of the traditions upon the people for whom they were written.”<sup>461</sup> Looking ahead briefly, chapter four will use the results of these two objectives as a basis for an exegesis of Luke 22:35-38.

## 3.2 The Apocrypha

In this first section I outline the *traditio* of the “two-sword” *traditum* in two writings of the Apocrypha: Judith, and *4 Maccabees*. These Deuterocanonical books supply early evidence for the transmission and refraction of the ancient Shechem episode. As the story is retold and adapted in these writings, the folklore derived from the feats of Simeon and Levi is magnified considerably. Two other writings of the Apocrypha (i.e., Sirach and 1 Esdras) are more oblique in their allusion to the story of Gen 34 and the exploits of Simeon and Levi. While Sirach and 1 Esdras are important to analyze, they are peripheral documents and not central to the argument. Consequently, since these references are less explicit and display little, if any, direct connection, they are examined in the appendix at the conclusion of this chapter.

### 3.2.1 Judith (Second to First Century B.C.E. <sup>462</sup>)

The book of Judith (hereafter Jdt) makes an explicit reference to the events of Gen 34 and thus has a direct connection with the “two-sword” *traditum*. The first six chapters of Jdt describe Nebuchadnezzar’s military campaigns across Persia as his army—under the leadership of general Holofernes—heads west toward Israel. As Holofernes’ army approaches, the people store provisions and begin to entreat the Lord for deliverance by praying and fasting (Jdt 4:4:1-5,

---

<sup>461</sup> Alan Robinson, “Process Analysis Applied to the Early Traditions of Israel: a Preliminary Essay,” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 550-551.

<sup>462</sup> The dates for books of the Apocrypha are only approximations. If a question mark (“?”) follows a date, it indicates a higher degree of uncertainty for the proposed date. For more details on the dates, see e.g., *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (eds. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter; Downers Grove—Leicester: InterVarsity, 2000), 58-64.

8-15). In addition, the high priest Joakim orders the cities of Bethulia and Betomesthaim to prepare for the attack by seizing the nearby mountain passes (Jdt 4:6-7).<sup>463</sup>

After Holofernes hears of their war preparations he summons the Ammonite commanders in order to learn more about the Judeans and their fortifications (Jdt 5:1-4). At the conference, “Achior, the leader of all the Ammonites,” rehearses the history of the Israelites for Holofernes and advises him that he will be able to succeed on the battlefield only if the Israelites have sinned (Jdt 5:5-21, esp. vv. 20-21).<sup>464</sup> Holofernes rejects Achior’s counsel, binds him, and leaves him before the city of Bethulia (Jdt 5:23-6:13). When the people of Bethulia see Achior they bring him into their city where he is questioned by Uzziah, a descendant of the tribe of Simeon (Jdt 6:14-18). The people are grateful for Achior’s candid report and “praise him highly” (Jdt 6:19-21).

After dispensing with Achior, Holofernes begins his campaign against the city of Bethulia. Following the advice of the Edomites and Moabites, he surrounds the city and his army seizes control of the springs (Jdt 7:1-18). As the city’s water supply dwindles and their distress escalates, the Israelites lose their resolve and decide to surrender. Uzziah, however, urges them to wait five days to see if God will answer their pleas for help (Jdt 7:19-32).

During this interval, Judith—an honorable widow of whom “no one spoke ill”—hears about this dispute between the citizens and the rulers and calls together the town leaders, including Uzziah (Jdt 8:1-10). She reprimands them for putting God to the test and exhorts them to remain faithful to him despite the dire circumstances (Jdt 8:11-27). In response, Uzziah affirms her message, praises her for being “a God-fearing woman,” and asks her to pray for rain (Jdt 8:28-31). Yet rather than merely praying for rain so that their thirst might be quenched, Judith says, “I am about to do something that will go down through all generations of our descendants”

---

<sup>463</sup> The location of the city of Bethulia is unknown. Some have suggested that it might be Bethel or Shechem. The city of Betomesthaim is likewise unknown.

<sup>464</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all excerpts from the Apocrypha follow the NRSV and are taken from *The Harper Collins Study Bible with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books* (ed. Wayne A. Meeks; New York: HarperCollins, 1993). The principal aim of this chapter is to identify and describe the transmission and evolution of the “two-sword” *traditum* in Jewish writings during the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. Since that objective centers on literary issues, textual critical matters are deemed immaterial except when they impact the *traditio* of the tradition.

(Jdt 8:32). Though she refuses to reveal her plans and counsels them not to inquire further, she promises that the Lord will deliver them before the five days have elapsed (Jdt 8:33-34).

Emboldened by Judith's display of courage, Uzziah and the other rulers say to her, "Go in peace, and may the Lord God go before you, to take vengeance on our enemies" (Jdt 8:35). After receiving their blessing, Judith seeks God's assistance by praying:

O Lord God of my ancestor Simeon, to whom you gave a sword to take revenge on those strangers who had torn off a virgin's clothing to defile her, and exposed her thighs to put her to shame, and polluted her womb to disgrace her; for you said, "It shall not be done"—yet they did it; so you gave up their rulers to be killed, and their bed, which was ashamed with the deceit they had practiced, was stained with blood, and you struck down slaves along with princes, and princes on their thrones. You gave up their wives for booty to be divided among your beloved children who burned with zeal for you and abhorred the pollution of their blood and called on you for help, O God, my God, hear me also, a widow (Jdt 9:2-4).

By recalling the legendary deed of Simeon in the opening of her prayer, Judith's words envisage victory over the Assyrians. Just as the sons of Jacob could not allow Shechem's abhorrent conduct to go unpunished, she, too, with God's help, will punish the arrogant Assyrians with the sword, though the specific details of her plan remain hidden.

Having recounted the celebrated deed of her eponymous ancestor Simeon and praised God for his inscrutable judgment at the beginning of her prayer, Judith continues her appeal and seeks God's present favor against the Assyrians:

Look at their pride, and send your wrath upon their heads. Give to me, a widow, the strong hand to do what I plan. *By the deceit of my lips* strike down the slave with the prince and the prince with his servant; crush their arrogance by the hand of a woman. For your strength does not depend on numbers, nor your might on the powerful. But you are the God of the lowly, helper of the oppressed, upholder of the weak, protector of the forsaken, savior of those without hope. Please, please, God of my father, God of the heritage of Israel, Lord of heaven and earth, Creator of the waters, King of all your creation hear my prayer! *Make my deceitful words* bring wound and bruise on those who have planned cruel things against your covenant, and against your sacred house, and against Mount Zion, and against the house your children possess. Let your whole nation and every tribe know and understand that you are God, the God of all power and might, and that there is no other who protects the people of Israel but you alone! (Jdt 9:9-14, italics added).

Once more, Judith's prayer reverberates with the story of Gen 34. Not only do her words reference that event, they also reveal that she intends to employ their strategy of deceit to defeat the enemy (cf. Gen 34:13).

After concluding her entreaty, Judith washes, puts on festive clothing, and makes herself as attractive—and seductive—as possible (Jdt 10:1-8). She then leaves Bethulia and is soon captured by the Assyrians (Jdt 10:9-12a). With deceitful words and her mesmerizing beauty, she tells her captors that she wants to see Holofernes so that she might tell him how to defeat the Israelites “without losing one of his men” (Jdt 10:12b-13). The soldiers bring her to Holofernes with dispatch; all are struck by and beguiled by her beauty and words; and eventually she beheads Holofernes after attending a banquet (Jdt 10:14-13:9a). Judith returns to Bethulia, reports her deed, and exhorts the citizens to attack the Assyrians who are panic stricken once they discover Holofernes' decapitated body (Jdt 13:9b-14:19). After the Israelites kill the Assyrians, they celebrate their victory and honor Judith for her righteous deed (Jdt 15:1-13).

The relationship with the “two-sword” *traditum* is unmistakable in Jdt. Judith, a descendant of Simeon, invokes the tale of her ancestor as she seeks God's goodwill in order to preserve Israel's national identity and honor, which Assyria threatened with annihilation. And not only does she recall Simeon's deed—“to whom [God] gave a sword to take vengeance on those strangers who had torn off a virgin's clothing to defile her” (Jdt 9:2)—she also makes use of Simeon's strategy of deceit in order to defeat Israel's enemy (cf. Jdt 9:9, 13; 10:11-13; 11:5-19; Gen 34:13-17). Accordingly, just as the words of Jacob's sons “pleased Hamor and Hamor's son Shechem,” so too do Judith's words please “Holofernes and all his servants” (Jdt 11:20; Gen 34:13, 18). Also noteworthy is Judith's mention of “[God's] beloved children who burned with zeal”—words that resonate with the retribution carried out by the tribe of Levi and Phinehas (cf. Exod 32:25-29; Num 25:1-18; Deut 33:8-11).

Yet what is even more fascinating than these obvious connections is the way in which the story is embellished.<sup>465</sup> No longer does Simeon take his sword, in Judith's prayer he is given a sword by God (cf. Gen 34:25; Jdt 9:2). Whereas God is not even mentioned by name in Gen 34, Simeon's vengeance becomes God's vengeance in Jdt (cf. Jdt 16:2, 17). Moreover, the brothers' deed, which is pulled off by deceit and receives Jacob's condemnation, is here viewed as an appropriate and just tactic in order to defend Israel and receives the praise of people (cf. Gen 34:30-31; Jdt 15:8-15). Judith's deceit—via both words and dress—is even celebrated in her hymn of praise (Jdt 16:5-9). Vengeance is not only justified, it is justified by whatever means are necessary, including deceit. Parry also points out several omissions in Jdt: “the circumcision of the Hivites,” “their desire to legitimise [*sic*] the relationship of Shechem and Dinah,” and “Jacob's condemnation of the deed.”<sup>466</sup> Arguably, these deficiencies appear to strengthen the case that human vengeance is justified. To be sure, the motif of justified vengeance is amplified in Jdt.

One additional modification or amplification is also perhaps worth mentioning. When Jdt rehearses the heroic deeds of Judith, she appears to take on the persona of “an angry Dinah.” Like Dinah, Judith goes out to the enemy's territory, but rather than remain passive and become a victim, Judith—a later embodiment of Dinah—acts as an aggressor and wreaks havoc upon

---

<sup>465</sup> Regarding the nature of editorial changes, Kugel rightly cautions, neither “reflection on recent history” nor “ideology” is the only motive that “cause[s]...authors to add new elements to a biblical story or refashion a biblical hero. There was another common motive for doing so: biblical exegesis.” Kugel also notes that “the additional material may not be the author's at all. Instead, the interpolation may simply represent a traditional interpretation, one that had gained wide circulation long before and was therefore well known to the author (and intended readership) of the Second Temple text in question. In retelling the biblical story, this author may even have included the interpolation quite unconsciously, for it had become, in effect, *part of the story*.” Kugel, “The Story of Dinah,” 1-2. In contrast, Louis H. Feldman suggests that “there is generally a pattern to such changes in the work of a given writer, particularly if we can surmise for what purpose and for what audience he is writing; and, if so, it is, indeed, more likely that the author has made these modifications in order to present a given point of view and to preach a lesson or to defend his people against attacks.” Louis H. Feldman, “Remember Amalek!” *Vengeance, Zealotry, and Group Destruction in the Bible according to Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union, 2004), 147, n. 227. While authors certainly make use of rhetoric—both written and oral—to persuade their audiences and promote their ideologies, I am more dubious than Feldman about detecting the author's ideological intentions even when “patterns” are identified. In my estimation, “patterns” sometimes say more about the investigative methods and assumptions of the researcher than they do about the original author, for it is not uncommon to find whatever one is looking for.

<sup>466</sup> Parry, *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethics*, 90. Cf. “Summary of Second Temple Jewish Interpretations of Genesis 34,” op. cit., 94-95. According to Hengel, “[t]he first named radical expression of this [i.e., zeal] appears in the [i.e., Jdt's] interpretation of the ‘zeal’ of Jacob's sons Simeon and Levi in avenging the violation of their sister (Gen 34).” Hengel, *Zealots*, 178.



Israel's adversaries. In other words, not only does Judith identify with Dinah, she also seeks to rectify Dinah's violation by actively engaging men who intend to harm her and her people.<sup>467</sup>

In sum, Jdt indisputably transmits the "two-sword" *traditum* during the late second or early first century B.C.E. Not only does the book view Simeon's (and Levi's) feat as an act of bravery to be emulated, but also exhibits at least two of the tradition's motifs: national identity and honor; and justified vengeance. In addition, if "honored one" is expanded to include corporate entities, such as Israel, a case can be made for including another motif: vindication or defense of an honored one. One final point, the "two-sword" *traditum* undergoes significant changes that buttress the original tale as it is retold and refracted in Jdt.<sup>468</sup>

### **3.2.2 4 Maccabees (Mid-First to Early Second Century c.E.)<sup>469</sup>**

There is one reference to the events of Gen 34 in the book of *4 Maccabees* (hereafter *4 Macc.*). This allusion occurs in an early block of material that extols the power of reason to control passions and emotions, which is the book's principal theme (cf. e.g., *4 Macc.* 1:1-14, 19, 29-35; 2:4-7, 14-24; 3:1-5; 5:35; 6:30-35; 7:1-4, 12-16; 13:1-7, 16; 16:1; 18:2).

Like the broader context of the entire tome, the immediate setting for the passage concentrates on reason's mastery over passion and emotions. After making the case that reason

---

<sup>467</sup> Richard Valantasis pointed out this interesting gender and role dynamic between Dinah and Judith.

<sup>468</sup> Luke, *Studies*, describes the later influence of the tale about Simeon and Levi as follows: "The memory of the bloody conflict between the Shechemites and the tribes of Simeon and Levi remained alive in Israel in the age of the amphictyony, and the story-tellers who were of course nationalistic and proud of their military prowess manifested above all by the occupation of Palestine, as they handed down the story, made also some innovations and additions." Luke goes on to suggest that "[t]hough according to Israelite belief the cruelty and treachery of Simeon and Levi had its justification, the fact remained undeniable that they [i.e., the tribes of Simeon and Levi] were dislodged from the territory of Shechem, and it was necessary to find out a reason for it." That reason, according to Luke, is found in "the narrative that began as a simple ethnological saga, [which] becomes an eloquent proclamation of one of the cardinal tenets of biblical religion: the norms of divine justice will be applied to culprits even though these happen to be God's chosen ones." Op. cit., 134-135. Whereas Luke views the story as a means to explain the loss of land by these two tribes, Jdt makes use of the story to justify vengeance and maintain (reclaim?) Israel's identity and honor as well as keep the land.

<sup>469</sup> Besides the NRSV, I also consulted H. Anderson, "4 Maccabees: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophic Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:531-564.

controls sexual lust (e.g., Joseph with Potiphar's wife), gluttony, drunkenness and greed, the author contends that reason puts limits on our emotional feelings for parents, spouses, children, friends, and even enemies, so that we are able to do what is in their best interest and for their overall good and well-being (*4 Macc.* 2:1-14). The author then claims that "reason rules even the more violent emotions: lust for power, vainglory, boasting, arrogance, and malice" (*4 Macc.* 2:15-16). In order to corroborate this point, two examples are put forward. First, Moses controlled his anger when he "was angry with Dathan and Abiram" (*4 Macc.* 2:17; cf. Num 16:1-35, esp. vv. 13-15). Second, Jacob's rebuke of Simeon and Levi after they slaughtered the Shechemites also demonstrates that reason can control anger (*4 Macc.* 2:19-20).

This allusion to the events narrated in Gen 34 is extremely brief. There are no details about Shechem's defilement of Dinah, Jacob's reaction, the negotiations, or the brothers' deceitful rejoinder. The only specific element from the story is conveyed in a question: "Why else did Jacob, our most wise father, censure the households of Simeon and Levi for their irrational slaughter of the entire tribe of the Shechemites, saying, 'Cursed be their anger?'" (*4 Macc.* 2:19). In actual fact, Jacob's words are not even part of the Gen 34 narrative. Instead, they are part of his testament which is found in Gen 49:7.

In view of these details, it seems obvious that the story about Simeon and Levi is subservient to the author's greater purpose: to demonstrate that "devout reason is sovereign over the emotions" (*4 Macc.* 1:1). It may also appear that there is neither a compelling interest in the "two-sword" *traditum* nor any of its motifs, since virtually nothing from story in Gen 34 is discussed—indeed, Jacob's curse in Gen 49:7 is the only bit of information mentioned. Further investigation, however, suggests that national identity and honor is a critical matter and perhaps family identity and honor as well.

Though the book's recurring, self-proclaimed aim and philosophical discourse leave the impression that personal (individual?) rather than corporate identity and honor is at stake, ancestral and ethnic matters are actually a crucial part of the author's discourse. Consider, for example, some of the author's concluding oration. After a lengthy retelling of the martyrdom

suffered by Eleazar and the seven brothers and their mother (*4 Macc.* 6:1-17:6), the author's encomium to the triumph of reason reaches a crescendo as he presents an astonishing assessment of their final moments:

If it were possible for us to paint the history of your religion as an artist might, would not those who first beheld it have shuddered as they saw the mother of the seven children enduring varied tortures to death for the sake of religion? Indeed it would be proper to inscribe on their tomb these words as a reminder to the people of the nation: "Here lies buried an aged priest and an aged woman and seven sons, because of the violence of the tyrant who wished to destroy the way of life of the Hebrews. They vindicated their nation, looking to God and enduring torture even to death" (*4 Macc.* 18:7-10).

The author's accolades continue as he portrays their "contest" as "divine" (*4 Macc.* 17:11). Their test by "virtue" is rewarded with "immortality in endless life" (*4 Macc.* 17:12; cf. v. 18; 18:23). "The tyrant [i.e., Antiochus Epiphanes; cf. *4 Macc.* 17:23; 18:5] was the antagonist, and the world and the human race were the spectators" (*4 Macc.* 17:14). Despite facing terrifying threats, they refused to compromise and endured the tyrant's rage. On account of that:

These, then, who have been consecrated for the sake of God, are honored, not only with this honor, but also by the fact that because of them our enemies did not rule over our nation, the tyrant was punished, and the homeland purified—they having become, as it were, a ransom for the sin of our nation. And through the blood of those devout ones and their death as an atoning sacrifice, divine Providence preserved Israel that previously had been mistreated (*4 Macc.* 17:20-22; cf. 18:4).

And because they would not "abandon their ancestral customs," they conquered the tyrant (*4 Macc.* 18:5).

Undoubtedly, the author of *4 Macc.* uses the legendary conduct of Eleazar and the seven sons and their mother to bolster the book's primary objective: to prove reason's power over passion and emotions via philosophical discourse. But as he pursues this goal, the motifs of the "two-sword" *traditum* come into view. First, the theme of identity and honor—both family and national—emerges as *4 Macc.* draws to close. The martyrs' response when facing certain death not only proves that reason rules over emotions like fear, but also brings honor to themselves, their families, and the nation as a whole (*4 Macc.* 17:1-6, 10-11, 20, 23-24; 18:1-3). In short, through death, both family and national identity and honor are preserved.

Second, the martyrs' action vindicates an honored one (i.e., the nation), because Israel—which had “previously had been mistreated”—is “preserved” (4 *Macc.* 17:22). But whereas Simeon and Levi defended their sister Dinah by violent means and later received Jacob's rebuke (4 *Macc.* 2:19), in this instance, Israel is vindicated when Eleazar, and the seven sons and their mother accept torture and death. For, according to 4 *Macc.* and in stark contrast to *Jdt*, the use of retributive justice by individuals is restricted by reason—if not outright prohibited. Justified vengeance (i.e., violent retaliation) is God's prerogative. Rather than avenging wrongs, rational believers—like Eleazar and the seven sons and their mother—suffer martyrdom with courage and hope (cf. 4 *Macc.* 6:1-18:24). For God's faithful people trust in the One who gives “the crown to its own athletes” (4 *Macc.* 17:15). Finally, 4 *Macc.* link with the “two-sword” *traditum* is further strengthened by its mention of “the zeal of Phinehas” (4 *Macc.* 18:12).

### 3.2.3 Summary of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Apocrypha

The “two-sword” *traditum* is refracted in the Apocrypha in a number of ways. Both *Jdt* and 4 *Macc.* include an indisputable reference to the Gen 34 narrative. The motif of identity and honor—both national and family—is also found in both documents. The vindication or defense of Israel (i.e., an honored one) is certainly stressed as 4 *Macc.* concludes. The theme of justified vengeance is considered in *Jdt* and 4 *Macc.*, though they view it rather differently. Besides these broad features, *Jdt* and 4 *Macc.* mention Phinehas whose connection with the “two-sword” *traditum* was put forward in chapter two. All in all, specific allusions to the “two-sword” *traditum* in the Apocrypha, though present, are relatively brief when they occur. However, a stronger case can be made for the “two-sword” motifs, which are integral components of *Jdt* and 4 *Macc.*

Finally, two general observations that characterize the *traditio* of the *traditum* and the modifications that it undergoes are worth mentioning. First, very few of the story's original details are refracted through the Apocrypha. For instance, there is only a brief reference to Jacob's curse in 4 *Macc.* Though *Jdt* transmits a few more details, there are significant omissions (e.g., circumcision, the negotiations) and alterations (i.e., God provides the sword to Simeon). Second,

the story is primarily employed in an illustrative capacity. In other words, it is a means to an end (e.g., justified vengeance in *Jdt*; extolling reason in *4 Macc.*). Being used in this capacity, the tale and tradition are embellished to some degree as the tradition's motifs recur. Of course, even though Simeon and Levi are revered as heroes who act righteously in *Jdt*, the author of *4 Macc.* suppresses whatever feelings of admiration he might have for the two brothers and instead opts to focus on Jacob's curse in order to promote a more narrow goal—the elevation of and reverence for reason.

### 3.3 The Pseudepigrapha

In this section I map out occurrences of the “two-sword” *traditum* as it is refracted in the Pseudepigrapha: *Jubilees*, *Aramaic Levi*, *Testament of Levi*, *Theodotus*, and *Joseph and Aseneth*.<sup>470</sup> As will become apparent, the pseudepigraphal texts transmit this tradition with much verve as they imaginatively retell the Dinah story and magnify the hagiographic lore of Simeon and Levi and further emphasize the story's four motifs. One writing in the Pseudepigrapha, the *Testament of Simeon*, does not make a clear allusion to the “two-sword” *traditum*. Consequently, it, like *Sirach* and *1 Esdras*, will be examined in the appendix at the end of the chapter.

#### 3.3.1 *Jubilees* (Second Century B.C.E.)<sup>471</sup>

An extremely condensed version of the story about Dinah and her brothers' response to Shechem is narrated in *Jub.* 30:1-6.<sup>472</sup> The author of *Jubilees* (hereafter *Jub.*) modifies the story

---

<sup>470</sup> In an insightful essay, Charlesworth makes the case that “we must dismiss any residue left by the once dominant contention that they [i.e., the pseudepigraphal writings] were insignificant products of Jewish groups on the fringes of a Normative Judaism.” He also concludes—correctly in my estimation—that: (1) “the tendency of the authors of the Pseudepigrapha was not to replace but to heighten Torah;” and 2) “early Jewish lore deposited in the Pseudepigrapha reveal how much Palestinian Jews cherished the biblical tales.” Addressing the preceding misconception is especially relevant for this study because of the importance I place on the refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum*. In Charlesworth's words, I do not believe it was a tradition promulgated by fringe elements, but rather was a widely known and “cherished biblical tale,” including Luke and his community. James H. Charlesworth, “In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; eds. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 24, 40-41.

<sup>471</sup> I principally rely on Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, for estimated dates on the writings from the Pseudepigrapha.

considerably with abbreviations, omissions, and interpolations. For example, in Genesis, “Dinah...went out to visit the women of the region...When Shechem...saw her, he seized her and lay with her by force” (Gen 34:1-2). In *Jub.*, Dinah is “snatched away to the house of Shechem...And he lay with her and defiled her, *but she was little, only twelve years old*” (*Jub.* 30:2, emphasis added).<sup>473</sup>

Shechem’s request to get her as his wife, the reactions of Jacob and his sons, the negotiations, including the deceitful counteroffer by Jacob’s sons, are all collapsed into one verse:

“And [Shechem] begged his father [i.e., Hamor] and her brothers that she be given to him as a wife, but Jacob and his sons were angry at the men of Shechem because they defiled Dinah, their sister. And so they spoke treacherously with them and defrauded them and seduced them” (*Jub.* 30:3; cf. Gen 34:3-24).

In addition, the fact that the men of Shechem voluntarily submitted to circumcision is noticeably absent<sup>474</sup> as the narrative immediately moves on to the story’s climax:

---

<sup>472</sup> *Jubilees* describes the revelations given to Moses on Mt. Sinai. The opening chapter announces “the apostasy and ultimate restoration of [God’s] people” while the remaining forty-nine chapters offer highly edited versions of Genesis and the first portion of Exodus. “Jacob is the central figure” and “only four of his sons are singled out for special attention”—Joseph, Reuben, Judah, and Levi. Of these four, Joseph receives the most attention (*Jub.* 34, 39-40, 42-46). Reuben’s misdeed serves as a platform to proscribe incest (*Jub.* 33). Judah repents for his misconduct with Tamar (*Jub.* 41). Both Levi and Judah receive a blessing from their grandfather Isaac; Levi receives the priesthood for a variety of reasons (*Jub.* 30-32). For these comments, additional features of *Jub.*, and other introductory and background information, see O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:35-51. James C. VanderKam also agrees with my overall assessment of *Jub.*’ editorial liberties regarding Gen 34 and Levi, in particular. VanderKam says, “Although the author here expands considerably on the information in the *Genesis* story (at the same time contracting the narrative itself) to the great benefit of Levi especially, he has at least based this incident in Levi’s life on a slender foundation of scriptural givens. Specifically, he reproduces all or parts of *Gen.* 34:1-2, 4-5, 12, 24-26.” See James C. VanderKam, “*Jubilees*’ Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 362. The literature on *Jub.* is extensive. Two recent resources include: (1) James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), esp. 11-22, 67-72, 117-118; and (2) Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 117; Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2007). For a brief discussion on *Jub.*’ use of the Dinah story, see Parry, *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethic*, 88.

<sup>473</sup> I have relied on Wintermute’s translation of *Jub.* found in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:20-142. I also consulted R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis: Translated from the Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902).

<sup>474</sup> After rejecting James VanderKam’s claim that the omissions “are not...a result of our author’s wish to be concise,” and R. Plummer’s assertion that “the omission has no significance at all,” Doron Mendels suggests three reasons why the author of *Jub.* omits any reference to circumcision: (a) “to whitewash Levi;” (b) “to demonstrate that a Jew may not marry a non-Jew under any circumstances;” and (c) “the Samaritans were—as the literature of the period suggests—identified by the Jews with the wicked Shechemites of Gen 34, and our author may have wished to emphasize that in the past they had never undergone the process of Judaization.” See Doron Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature*:

And Simeon and Levi entered Shechem suddenly. And they executed judgment upon all the men of Shechem and killed every man they found therein and did not leave in it even one. They killed everyone painfully because they had polluted Dinah, their sister (*Jub.* 30:4; cf. Gen 34:25-29).

Like Jdt, *Jub.* then adds a word about the divine sanction that stands behind the brothers' response; they "annihilate with a sword...because the judgment was ordered in heaven" (*Jub.* 30:5; cf. Gen 34:30-31). "The Lord handed them over...so that [the sons of Jacob] might destroy them with the sword and execute judgment against them" (*Jub.* 30:6).

After offering this abridged version of Gen 34, the author of *Jub.* interrupts his representation of the legend and introduces two paraenetic goals. First, he launches into a diatribe in order to remind and persuade his fellow Israelites that intermarriage with foreigners is strictly prohibited.<sup>475</sup> From his perspective, the source of this casuistic law goes back to Shechem's reprehensible misdeed with Dinah whom he had "defiled" and "polluted" (*Jub.* 30:2-4); and not only was prince Shechem guilty, all of the men of Shechem were complicit in his crime as well "because they caused a shame in Israel" (*Jub.* 30:5). Therefore, they were rightly annihilated and put to the sword by Simeon and Levi "so that nothing might therefore happen in Israel to defile an Israelite virgin" (*Jub.* 30:6).

The invective against intermarriage continues unabated for the next thirteen verses. The author's stance is relentless and uncompromising. Anyone who gives "his daughter or his sister to any man who is from the seed of the gentiles, let him surely die, and let him be stoned"—along with the woman (*Jub.* 30:7).

---

*Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987), 72-73. Hengel, *Zealots*, 178, also notes that "[t]he circumcision of the Shechemites is suppressed, as it is in Josephus' *Antiquities*." According to Kugler, *From Priest to Patriarch*, 144, "The author, it seems, set out to compose a new charter for Hasmonean-era Judaism that would have great credibility, founded as it was on a claim to antiquity, heavenly revelation, and transcription by one of Israel's greatest heroes."

<sup>475</sup> "The story as a whole is presented in *Jub.* as a paradigm against intermarriage." Segal, *Jubilees*, 292. If I understand Segal correctly, *Jub.* 30, as is much of *Jub.*, is a "rewritten story" ("narrative" [i.e., Gen 34]) supplemented with a "legal passage" that prohibits intermarriage. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 160-161, concurs: "By intensifying the penalties for exogamy, and laying their consequences on all of Israel, the author made clear his view on the matter: it [i.e., 'marriage with non-Jews'] was a great threat to the community and was to be avoided at all costs."

[T]here is no remission or forgiveness [for the community] except that the man who caused defilement of his daughter will be rooted out...And it is a reproach to Israel, to those who give and those who take any of the daughters of the gentile nations because it is a defilement and it is contemptible to Israel (*Jub.* 30:10, 13; cf. v. 14; 22:20; 25:5, 9).

Failure to follow this injunction will bring “plague upon plague and curse upon curse, and every judgment, and plague, and curse will come” (*Jub.* 30:15). The author’s highly-charged oratory reaches its apogee when he declares:

Therefore I command you, saying, “Proclaim this testimony to Israel: ‘See how it was for the Shechemites and their sons, how they were given into the hand of the two children of Jacob and they killed them painfully. And it was righteousness for them and it was written down for them for righteousness’” (*Jub.* 30:17; cf. v. 12).

In short, the Israelites must follow the example of Simeon and Levi and proscribe intermarriage, barring it under any circumstances.

After justifying Israel’s mandate against intermarriage with foreigners, the author then uses Gen 34 in order to promote and defend the Levitical priesthood (*Jub.* 30:18-23).

Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was zealous to do righteousness and judgment and vengeance against all who rose up against Israel...And on the day that the children of Jacob killed Shechem he [antecedent is unclear: God? Jacob? Cf. *Jub.* 32:24-26] wrote (on high) for them a book in heaven that they did righteousness and uprightness and vengeance against the sinners and it was written down for a blessing (*Jub.* 30:18, 23).

This reward is for Levi alone—not Simeon and Levi—even though both brothers “did righteousness.” The priesthood belongs to Levi not only because he acted righteously in defense of Dinah, but also—as we are later told—because he was blessed by his grandfather Isaac, received a dream from God in which he was ordained as a priest, and was chosen by lot to receive the tithe (i.e., “the portion of the Lord”) when his father Jacob counted backwards from Benjamin (*Jub.* 31:11-17; 32:1-9).<sup>476</sup>

---

<sup>476</sup> For more on *Jub.*’ role in elevating Levi to the priesthood, see James Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings,” *HTR* 86 (1993): 1-64, esp. 5-7; and Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 139-169. See also VanderKam, “*Jubilees*’ Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest,” 359-373. As to why Simeon could not receive the priesthood, VanderKam astutely observes: “Simeon could hardly be the recipient of an eternal blessing because he later disqualified himself by marrying a Canaanite woman. See *Jub.* 34:20: ‘...the name of Simeon’s wife was Adebbaa, the Canaanitess...’ (cf. *Gen.* 46:10; *Exod.* 6:15). As the next words show, Levi seems not to have done much better in this regard, but the writer does rescue him from a marital indiscretion: ‘...the name of Levi’s wife was Melcha, one of the daughters of Aram—one of the descendants of Terah’s sons...’ (34:20). *Jub.* 34:21 adds, after listing the wives of Jacob’s sons:



The author brackets his paraenetic discourse when he returns to complete his narration of the Shechem episode. The extent of the punishment that the inhabitants of Shechem receive is described as the captured spoils of the battle are catalogued: “their sheep and their oxen and their asses and all their herds and all their goods. And they brought forth everything to Jacob, their father” (*Jub.* 30:24). In place of the final exchange between Jacob and Simeon and Levi, the author simply mentions the incident and amends the story when he remarks that “[Jacob] was afraid of those who inhabited the land” (*Jub.* 30:25; cf. Gen 34:30-31; 35:5).

There can be no dispute that *Jub.* alludes to and embellishes the “two-sword” *traditum*. Though the story is reduced to eleven verses using the most generous counting method (*Jub.* 30:1-6, 12, 17, 23-25; cf. Gen 34:1-31), it is repeatedly alluded to and/or cited. It also serves as the basis for the author’s two-point address: prohibition against intermarriage and the endorsement of the Levitical priesthood.<sup>477</sup> In addition, all four of the “two-sword” motifs are clearly present. Except for the decisive action of Simeon and Levi, the identity and honor of Jacob’s family would have suffered because the men of Shechem “caused a shame in Israel” (*Jub.* 30:5). Therefore, Jacob’s two sons declare: “We will not give our daughter to a man who is uncircumcised because that is a reproach to us” (*Jub.* 30:12). The recurring appellation that Dinah is “the daughter of Jacob” and “their sister” further indicates that family identity and honor is threatened (*Jub.* 30:2-4, 24). And not only is family identity and honor in jeopardy, national identity and honor is also vulnerable unless the Israelites prohibit intermarriage with foreigners (*Jub.* 30:7-17, esp. vv. 7, 13, 17).

---

‘Simeon, after changing his mind, married another woman from Mesopotamia like his brothers.’ Num. 25:14 identifies the Israelite whom Phinehas, Levi’s descendant, executed at Shittim as ‘Zimri son of Salu, head of an ancestral house belonging to the Simeonites.’ For a positive statement about Simeon, see *Jud.* [*sic*; i.e., *Jdt.*] 9:2.” VanderKam, op. cit., 362, n. 10. For a survey of Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Robert C. Stallman, “Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JSP* 10 (1992): 163-189.

<sup>477</sup> VanderKam points out that “Levi’s reputation in particular receives a tremendous boost in *Jubilees* vis-à-vis Genesis.” Specifically about *Jub.* 30:5, VanderKam says, “Not only was he [i.e., Levi], therefore, applauded for his efforts, but his zeal became a cause for his elevation to the priesthood.” James C. VanderKam, “Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; eds. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 123.

The “two-sword” motif of vindicating or defending an honored one becomes apparent when the author describes the reason for Jacob and his sons’ anger: the men of Shechem “defiled Dinah, their sister” and “polluted her, their sister” who was only “twelve years old” (*Jub.* 30:2-4). As their sister, they will not allow her to be mistreated, “defiled,” or “polluted.” Another motif is confirmed because Simeon and Levi’s vengeance is justified; it is “righteousness for them” (*Jub.* 30:5-6, 17). Jacob honors his two sons “because they did righteousness and uprightness and *vengeance* against all the sinners...” (*Jub.* 30:23; cf. v. 18; emphasis added).

In sum, *Jub.* makes an explicit reference to and cites amended portions of the earliest source of the “two-sword” *traditum* (i.e., Gen 34). It also incorporates all four motifs in its narrative. The link with the “two-sword” *traditum* is further reinforced by the author’s rejection of intermarriage, which resonates with the books of Ezra (and 1 Esdras, see chapter appendix), and his praise of Levi’s “zealousness to do righteousness and judgment and vengeance against all who rose up against Israel” (*Jub.* 30:18), which echoes the admirable behavior of the Levites and Phinehas (Exod 32:25-32; Num 25:1-18).<sup>478</sup>

### **3.3.2 Aramaic Levi (Third to Second Century B.C.E.?<sup>479</sup>)**

*Aramaic Levi* (a.k.a. *Aramaic Testament of Levi* or *Aramaic Levi Document*) is a reconstructed document which some scholars believe precedes and thus serves as one source for the *Testament of Levi*. Only fragments of *Aramaic Levi* (hereafter *Ar. Levi*) survive from the Cairo Geniza, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Mt. Athos manuscript of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>480</sup> Due to its fragmentary nature, *Ar. Levi* has no more than limited value in corroborating the transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum*.

---

<sup>478</sup> Segal, *Jubilees*, 292-295, concurs.

<sup>479</sup> On the place of *Ar. Levi* in the Levi priestly tradition and the document’s date, see Kugler, *From Priest to Patriarch*, 130-135.

<sup>480</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-59. According to Kugler, “4Q213-214...are the only unquestioned witnesses to *Ar. Levi*. The Cave 4 fragments hold the preeminent claim to antiquity and reliability, while the youthfulness of the Cairo Geniza manuscript impairs its reliability, philological considerations raise doubts about the Mt. Athos manuscript additions, and the miniscule size of the 1Q21 fragments undermine their usefulness.” After analyzing the textual evidence, Kugler concludes that *Ar. Levi* is from “Second Temple Judaism...[and]...is

Only two excerpts from *Ar. Levi* address the Shechem incident. The first one from the

Cairo Geniza reads:

**Cambridge Geniza Text Col. A** <sup>15</sup>[...] region of Is[rael...] <sup>16</sup>so that all [...] <sup>17</sup>to act in this way against [...] <sup>18</sup>Jacob my father and Reu[ben my brother...] <sup>19</sup>and we said to them [...] <sup>20</sup>you want our daughter, so that we all would become br[others] <sup>21</sup>and partners, you must circumcise your penis, <sup>22</sup>so that you may appear like us and become sealed <sup>23</sup>like us with the [true] circumcision. Then we will be your [...]

**Col. B** <sup>15</sup>[...] my brother always <sup>16</sup>[...] who were in Shechem <sup>17</sup>[...] my brothers and his brothers. This is <sup>18</sup>[...] in Shechem, and whatever <sup>19</sup>[...for committing] crimes. So <sup>20</sup>Judah told them that I and Simeon <sup>21</sup>my brother had gone to [...] to Reuben <sup>22</sup>our brother, who [...] <sup>23</sup>and Judah jumped forward [to l]eave the flock.<sup>481</sup>

The text offers little that links it with the “two-sword” *traditum* other than its obvious connection with Gen 34. Because the fragment is very brief and the lacunae are common, most conclusions are highly speculative. Two points, however, can be stated with confidence: first, the brothers’ stipulation for circumcision is not absent as it is, for example, in *Jdt*, *4 Macc.*, and *Jub.*; and second, the Shechemites committed some sort of offense.

Whereas the preceding passage undoubtedly refers to Gen 34, the allusion in the second reference from the Dead Sea Scrolls is less clear. It reads:

**4Q213 Frag. 2** <sup>17</sup>[...] committing sin [...] as wife. She will profane her name and her father’s name <sup>18</sup>[and the name of] her husband [...] and shame. Every <sup>19</sup>[vir]gin who has corrupted her reputation also brings shame on her parents

---

considerably different from the *Aramaic Testament of Levi* known to past scholarship. It contains a single vision...and many smaller, but no less significant differences vis-à-vis *Testament of Levi*.” *Op. cit.*, 34, 59. For comprehensive data and a thorough discussion of the *Ar. Levi* fragments discovered at Qumran, including transcriptions, document reconstructions, and translations, see George J. Brooke, John Collins, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 1-72, Plates I-IV. For additional notes on *Ar. Levi* fragments, see de Jonge, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 129-131.

<sup>481</sup> This translation is from Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 252. In Kugler’s reconstructed *Ar. Levi*, this passage is *Ar. Levi* 1-3. His translation is: “<sup>1</sup>.....[ ]°°° that [ ] to do according to the determination in all [ ] Jacob, my father, and Reu[ben, ] and we said to them °[ ]°°° [ ] they found pleasure in our daughter, and we will all be bro[thers] and friends. <sup>2</sup>Circumcise the foreskin of your flesh and appear like [us], and you will be sealed like us with the circumcision of [ ]°° and we will be for y[ou ] Two and a half columns missing <sup>3</sup>[ ] my brother(s) in every time [ ]° who were in Shechem [ ] my brother(s), and he showed this [ ] in Shechem, and what °°°[ ] do]ers of violence and Judah told them that I and Simeon my brother had gone to [ ]°° to Reuben our brother who °°°[ ]°° Judah started forward [to l]eave the sheep.” Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 63-64. Kugler agrees with my assessment that this passage refers to the Shechem incident. He says, “[I]t is nearly certain that it retells the events of Genesis 34...[although]...the biblical story is embellished here with considerable detail.” For this comment and Kugler’s other explanatory notes on the text and translation, *op. cit.*, 64-68.

and all her kinfolk <sup>20</sup>[...] her father. The name of her disgrace will never be erased from all her people <sup>21</sup>[...] for all generations [...]<sup>482</sup>

Though a compelling link to the venerable source of the “two-sword” *traditum* is absent, this pericope nonetheless hints of a possible connection, since the fragment shows an undeniable interest in family identity and honor, one of the “two-sword” motifs. Whatever the sin, a woman (wife) “profane[s] her name, her father’s name, [and the name of] her husband.” If a virgin wrecks her reputation, she “brings shame on her parents and all her kinfolk.”

In sum, *Ar. Levi* is a fragmentary document. One fragment shows an unmistakable link to the “two-sword” *traditum* because of its specific allusion to the Gen 34 narrative. The other fragment makes no reference to the Shechem incident, but does reaffirm one of the tradition’s motifs: family identity and honor. Both texts demonstrate the continued *traditio* of the “two-sword” *traditum*.

### 3.3.3 Testament of Levi (Second Century B.C.E.<sup>483</sup>)

The *Testament of Levi* is the third entry in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (hereafter *T. 12 Patr.*).<sup>484</sup> It is an important component of the midrashic stories of the *T. 12 Patr.*

---

<sup>482</sup> Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 258. Kugler’s translation of 4Q213 Frag. 2 is: “from the wom[a]n to [ ]°. And now °[ ]°° the pla[g]ues of [ ]<sup>17</sup> the ones incurring guilt [ ] you (or wife?). And she profanes her name and the name of her father <sup>18</sup>[ ] husband(s?) to bu[r]n her [ ]° °°°° [ ] and (the?) shame. And every <sup>19</sup>virgin who ruins her name, and the name of her fathers, she also causes shame to all her brothers <sup>20</sup>[and to] her father. And the reputation of her revilement will not be wiped our from among all her people forever. <sup>21</sup>[ ]° for all the gnerations of eternity. °°[ ]°° holier (purer?) than the people <sup>22</sup>[ ]° °°[ ] a holy tithe, an offering to God from....” Of this fragment, Kugler says, “The fragment records a speech, directed probably to Levi, regarding the impropriety of exogamous relationships.” He also observes that “[t]he fragment shares a good deal with *Jub.* 30:5-17,...[a text that]...roundly condemns exogamous relationships (30:5-17) after an account of the sack of Shechem (30:1-4).” *Ibid.*, 36. Cf. *op. cit.*, 78-85, for Kugler’s explanatory notes on the text and translation of this passage (designated *Ar. Levi* supp. 22-27), which is part of Levi’s vision in his reconstructed *Ar. Levi*.

<sup>483</sup> This date is from H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:777-778. Reaching a very different conclusion about the date of the *T. 12 Patr.* is de Jonge. He initially thought that “the Testaments...were written c. 200 A.D....perhaps tak[ing] c. 190 A.D. as the lower limit, and c. 225 A.D. as the upper limit for the date of their composition.” De Jonge, *Testaments: A Study*, 125, cf. 128. However, a few years later, de Jonge accepted an earlier timeframe from the “middle or second half of the second century A.D.” De Jonge, “The Interpretation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Recent Years,” in *idem*, ed., *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 184.

<sup>484</sup> Modeled on the last testament of Jacob in Gen 49, the *T. 12 Patr.* “purport to be the final utterances of the twelve sons of Jacob.” Though many scholars believe that the *T. 12 Patr.* is dependent on a hypothetical

in part because of its role in the elevation of Levi and its related promotion of the Levitical priesthood.<sup>485</sup> The book also draws the attention of scholarly research due to its relationship to *Ar. Levi* and *Jub.*<sup>486</sup> However, what is more vital for this project is that *Testament of Levi*

---

Aramaic or Hebrew document, "the most reliable manuscript evidence is a Greek form of the text." Fragments of the book are also found in several languages (e.g., Armenian, Slavonic). For these observations and additional background information on the *T. 12 Patr.*, and *T. Levi* in particular, see H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:775-781; de Jonge, ed., *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 45-143, 161-192; and idem, *Testaments: A Study*, 9-52, 83-96, 110-131, including notes on 132-139, 163-169. Despite the presence of Christian interpolations, many scholars assume a Jewish provenance for the *T. 12 Patr.* Opposing this mainstream position, de Jonge originally rejected and argued against the theory that the *T. 12 Patr.* were Jewish documents with Christian interpolations—a theory espoused and popularized by R. H. Charles *inter alia*. According to de Jonge, a Christian author or authors used a wide range of Jewish haggadah literature, Or. Levi (i.e., Original Levi), Or. Naphtali (i.e., Original Naphtali), a shared source also used by *Jub.*, Stoic philosophy, Hellenistic novels, and the LXX to craft the *T. 12 Patr.* which exhort Christians to virtue and ethical conduct. De Jonge, *Testaments: A Study*, esp. 117-128. However, after further reflection, self-critique in response to his responders, other discoveries and research (e.g., Dead Sea Scrolls), de Jonge—though still vigorously defending his basic conclusion (i.e., the *T. 12 Patr.* were written/redacted by Christian author[s])—modified his position a bit and admitted the following: "It is quite conceivable that the Christian author(s) was (were) only the last of a series of collectors and redactors of Testament material, which was transmitted in writing as well as orally, gradually grew in size during the ages and was adapted to various needs." De Jonge, "Interpretation in Recent Years," 187. My own sense is that this dispute is predicated on highly subjective presuppositions, for if one is looking for Christian interpolations, they can be found and corroborated on the one hand. On the other hand, if one is not seeking to find Christian interpolations, other explanations are readily available. For example, Tjitze Baarda indicates the difficulty of interpreting such disputes when he makes the following observation: "Whether Paul borrowed these words [i.e., 'but the wrath has come upon them finally' (1 Thess 2:16c; cf. T. Levi 6:11)] from the Testament of Levi or whether a Christian editor, c.q. interpolator, has introduced the phrase of Paul into the Testament, is still a matter of debate..." As Baarda reflects on this matter he offers and then scrutinizes three possibilities: (1) "the author of the TL [i.e., *T. Levi*] is dependent on Paul;" (2) "Paul is dependent on TL;" or (3) there is "a common source" used by Paul and *T. Levi*. Though Baarda—as "a personal preference"—ultimately favors option (2) or some other text very similar to the Greek *T. Levi* as Paul's source, he wisely adds the following caution: "This is, of course, a mere guess and it has the weakness of all conjectures that it cannot be proven." See Tjitze Baarda, "The Shechem Episode in the Testament of Levi: A comparison with other traditions," in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. van der Woude* (eds. J. N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1992), 1-2, 59-73. For de Jonge's extended rejoinder and contribution to this debate, see idem, "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in idem, *Studies on the Testaments*, 193-246. For further discussion on the Christian interpolations, see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 171-220, esp. the chart found on 191-195 where the interpolations are marked with a dagger. For the history of research on the *T. 12 Patr.* and the limitations and weaknesses of the critical methods used in the attempt to discover the origin of the *T. 12 Patr.*, see H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977). Cf. de Jonge, "Interpretation in Recent Years," 183-192.

<sup>485</sup> For further discussion on this topic, see e.g., Kugel, "Levi's Elevation," 1-64, esp. 7-10; idem, "The Story of Dinah," 1-34; Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 171-220; and Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York—Oxford: Oxford University, 1993), 30-37.

<sup>486</sup> Kugler and Kugel illustrate two competing positions well as they discuss the relationship of *Jub.* and *T. Levi*. According to Kugler, the author of an "Original *Testament of Levi* [i.e., *T. Levi* minus Christian interpolations]...used some text-form of *Aramaic Levi* as his principal source: *Aramaic Levi* provided the overall structure for his work." *Jubilees*, however, "was probably not a significant source for [Original *Testament of Levi*]." Kugler believes that *Jub.* and *Ar. Levi* are only "indirectly related, having been built from a common source, a Levi-apocryphon." Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 190-198, esp. 196, 198, and 153. In contrast, Kugel proposes the existence of two hypothetical documents: "Levi's Apocalypse" (an account of

(hereafter *T. Levi*) offers some of the most substantial evidence for the on-going transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum* during the Second Temple Period.

Following the book’s brief prologue, *T. Levi* refers to Shechem’s defilement of Dinah. At that time Levi “was a youth, about twenty years old. It was then that, together with Simeon, I performed vengeance against Hamor because of our sister, Dinah” (*T. Levi* 2:2).<sup>487</sup> In order to justify this act of retaliatory vengeance against Hamor, Levi immediately narrates the details of his first vision. Having “observed all human beings making their way in life deceitfully,” he concludes that “[s]in was erecting walls and injustice was ensconced in towers” (*T. Levi* 2:3). In addition, he grieves over the transgressions of “the race of the sons of men” and prays for deliverance from evil (*T. Levi* 2:4). As sleep overtakes him, he receives a vision from the Lord, and is invited to enter the heavens (*T. Levi* 2:5-6).

During the vision Levi is told that he will be the Lord’s priest who “shall tell forth his mysteries to men” (*T. Levi* 2:10). He will admonish men about “the day of judgment” when the Lord will “work vengeance on the spirits of error and of Beliar” (*T. Levi* 3:3; cf. 4:1). Levi, however, will be “delivered from wrongdoing,” since “[t]he Most High has given heed to [his] prayer” (*T. Levi* 4:2). As priest, Levi “shall be as the sun for all the posterity of Israel” and is “given the blessing of priesthood until [the Lord] shall come and dwell in the midst of Israel” (*T. Levi* 4:3; 5:2). After seeing this vision and having been ordained as the Lord’s priest, Levi is led back to the earth where he is given “a shield and a sword” and told to “[p]erform vengeance on Shechem for the

---

Levi’s first vision based on Mal 2:4-7) and “Levi’s Priestly Initiation” (an extra-biblical account of Levi’s second vision), which were combined in *Ar. Levi*. The author of *Jub.* knew of and used the second vision, but not the first vision. The author of *Ar. Levi* was subsequently influenced by *Jub.* and did what he could “to bring his own part of the *Aramaic Levi Document* into line with the *Jubilees* narrative.” Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 27-60. In short, for Kugler, *Ar. Levi* is a source for both *T. Levi* and *Jub.*. For Kugel, *Jub.* was a source for *Ar. Levi* that then served as a source for *T. Levi*. For Kugler’s assessment of Kugel’s position, see Kugler, *From Priest to Patriarch*, 33, 154-155.

<sup>487</sup> *T. Levi* translation is from Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:788-795. Here, and with *T. Sim.*, which is found in the appendix at the end of the chapter, I also consulted R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs with an introduction by Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D.* (New York: Macmillan, 1917); idem, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Edited from Nine MSS. Together with The Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908); and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978). Cf. Marinus de Jonge, “Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII,” in idem, ed., *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 247-260.

sake of Dinah, your sister..." (*T. Levi* 5:3). Once Levi awakens from his sleep, he embraces his commission and "put[s] an end to the sons of Hamor..." (*T. Levi* 5:5).

*Testament of Levi* then describes how Levi carries out this divine mandate. As a faithful priest for the Lord, Levi "guarded these words in his heart" (*T. Levi* 6:2). He instructed his father and Reuben to "tell the sons of Hamor that they should not be circumcised, because [he] was filled with zeal on account of the abominable thing they had done to my sister" (*T. Levi* 6:3). He "destroyed Shechem first, and Simeon destroyed Hamor. Then my brothers came and destroyed that city by the sword" (*T. Levi* 6:4-5). His father "was angry and sorrowful, because they [i.e., the Shechemites] had received circumcision and died...[t]hus we sinned in doing this contrary to his opinion" (*T. Levi* 6:6-7).

Levi, however, is confident that his actions were just, since "[he] saw that God's sentence was 'Guilty,' because they had wanted to do the same thing to Sarah and Rebecca that they did to Dinah, our sister" (*T. Levi* 6:8). Because the Canaanites had not only committed these despicable deeds, but also had "persecuted Abraham" and "[mis]treated the nomadic people, seizing their wives and murdering them," it was right for God's wrath to fall upon them (*T. Levi* 6:9-11). Consequently, "Shechem shall be called 'City of Senseless,' because as one might scoff at a fool, so we scoffed at them, because by defiling my sister they committed folly in Israel..." (*T. Levi* 7:2-3).

After describing Levi's first vision and justifying the attack on Shechem, *T. Levi* narrates a second vision and a visit to see his grandfather Isaac both of which serve to confirm his ordination as the Lord's priest (*T. Levi* 8:1-9:14). Though Levi exhorts his children to follow his decrees, in much of the remaining portions of *T. Levi*, the patriarch prophesies that they will "act lawlessly in Israel" and be "scattered as captives" and receive punishment accordingly (*T. Levi* 10:3-4; cf. 13:1-16:5). The last three chapters of *T. Levi* report Levi's sorrow about the decline of the priesthood during "the seventy weeks," the resultant penalty and the promise of "a new priest" who "shall open the gates of paradise...[and]...remove the sword that has threatened since Adam," and Levi's death and burial (*T. Levi* 17:1-19:5).

As the preceding synopsis indicates, *T. Levi* demonstrates an extraordinary connection to and broad familiarity with the “two-sword” *traditum*. First, there are the frequent and explicit references to Shechem (*T. Levi* 2:2; 5:3-5; 6:3-7:3; 12:5). Second, the motifs of the “two-sword” *traditum* have a prominent place in *T. Levi*. From the outset and throughout the testament, vengeance is justified (*T. Levi* 2:2; 3:3; 5:3; 18:1-2). Moreover, as the Lord’s priest, Levi is to execute judgment not only on Shechem and Hamor, but on all the Canaanites for their transgressions (*T. Levi* 3:2-3, 10; 4:1; 6:8-7:3). Vindication of an honored one is celebrated when Levi, Simeon, and their brothers defend their sister Dinah (*T. Levi* 2:2; 5:3; 6:4, 8; 7:3). The importance of family identity and honor are stressed when Levi is awarded the priesthood, which he and his “posterity” are to cherish and preserve by following priestly protocol and marrying suitable women (*T. Levi* 4:2-6; 8:1-9:14; 11:1-12:5). National identity and honor is safeguarded only when “everyone knows the Law of God” (*T. Levi* 13:2); but they vanish when Levi’s descendants “become darkened with impiety,” since such behavior “bring[s] down a curse on our nation” (*T. Levi* 14:4; cf. 15:1-16:5). Third, the link to the “two-sword” *traditum* is further strengthened because Levi is filled with zeal (*T. Levi* 6:3).<sup>488</sup>

Besides the obvious links with the “two-sword” *traditum* noted above, *T. Levi* also modifies and embellishes the tradition as it refracts the eponymous story. One of the first changes is the introduction of Levi’s age—he “was about twenty years old” when the confrontation occurred (*T. Levi* 2:2; cf. 12:5—Levi is “eighteen years old when [he] killed Shechem”)—a factoid not found in Gen 34. Another revision includes the addition of two narratives about Levi’s ordination and investiture as priest that justify his attack (*T. Levi* 2:5-5:7; 8:1-9:14). These prolonged anecdotes are not part of Gen 34. As Levi ostensibly speaks autobiographically, a variety of notable discrepancies appear such as: his virtuous prayer (*T. Levi* 2:4; 4:2); the two

---

<sup>488</sup> Kugel also highlights Levi’s zeal in *T. Levi*. He observes: “The *Testament of Levi* goes out of its way to tell us that Levi (and Levi alone, for Simeon is not to share any of the credit for this act of virtue) tried to persuade his father and Reuben to withdraw the offer of circumcision, since the virtuous Levi certainly would not want to use circumcision as a trick. The Shechemites, however, are circumcised despite his objections and, zealot that he is, Levi cannot let this plan go ahead...[Even though]...Jacob and his other sons were willing to allow Shechem to marry Dinah” (based on Kugel’s proposed reading), Levi was not. “It was only Levi’s zeal that thwarted this plan. His zealotry thus had the precise purpose of overthrowing a decision to intermarry and was not an act of revenge.” Kugel, “The Story of Dinah,” 11-12.



visions (*T. Levi* 2:5-5:7; 8:1-19); Isaac's blessing of him (*T. Levi* 9:1-14); his opposition to circumcision of the Shechemites (*T. Levi* 6:3); Jacob's condemnation because the Shechemites are killed after submitting to circumcision (*T. Levi* 6:6-7); receiving a shield and sword from heaven (*T. Levi* 5:3; cf. Gen 34:25—they "took their swords"); the specific identity of who killed whom (*T. Levi* 6:4); Shechem and the Shechemites being punished not only for their own sin, but also for their complicity with previous sins against the patriarchal family (*T. Levi* 6:8-7:1); and God's decree ordering Shechem's death (*T. Levi* 5:3-5; 6:8).<sup>489</sup> Many of these modifications, which are often focused on Levi's role in the Shechem affair, suggest a link with the "two-sword" *traditum* and its motifs. Both family and national identity and honor are maintained because Levi is the Lord's righteous priest who justly avenges his sister's debasement, punishes foolish Shechemites, and seeks to excise folly from Israel wherever it is found.

In sum, *T. Levi's* use of the "two-sword" *traditum* is striking. The direct references to the Shechem and Dinah incident, the occurrence of all four motifs, the homage paid to Levi's zeal for his display of righteous indignation, and the introduction of assorted revisions that further reinforce the four motifs all act to buttress the tradition as it is refracted in *T. Levi*.

### 3.3.4 Theodotus (Second to First Century B.C.E.)

Theodotus' poem *On the Jews*, which was written in the "meter of Greek epic poetry" and is preserved as eight fragments, describes Jacob's interval of time around the city of Shechem when he returned from Mesopotamia.<sup>490</sup> The first fragment describes the city and the surrounding

---

<sup>489</sup> For a thorough comparison of the Shechem incident in *T. Levi* with other Jewish writings—including a fascinating discussion about who is responsible for initiating the retaliation against Shechem and Jacob's reaction—see Baarda, "The Shechem Episode," 12-59, esp. 18-19, 49-50. For more on these modifications, see Kugel, "Levi's Elevation," 7-42; idem, "The Story of Dinah," 1-34; Parry, *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethics*, 89-90; and Mendels, *Land of Israel*, 104-105.

<sup>490</sup> The poem—along with some introductory explanatory notes—was apparently first preserved by Alexander Polyhistor, a Greek historian of the first century B.C.E. Though only a fraction of Polyhistor's version of *On the Jews* is extant, eight known fragments were later "preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea (c. A.D. 260-340) in his *Praeparatio evangelica*" (9.22.1-11). Lacking corroborating evidence, speculation about Theod. abounds. For example, some argue he was a Samaritan, others say he was a Jew (on this topic, see below). He "shows an awareness of post-biblical traditions" and employs a style consistent with Hellenistic epic poetry. Both the poem's title—*On the Jews*—and whether Shechem had already been destroyed by the time of the poem's composition are disputed. For more on these matters and other background information,

environs and also identifies its founder and leading citizens, Shechem and his father Hamor (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.1). The second announces Jacob's arrival while the third fragment traces his family history in Mesopotamia (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.2-3).

The fourth fragment is comprised mostly of Polyhistor's prosaic summation. The précis opens with a description of Hamor's welcome and Jacob's initial sojourn in the region with "his sons, eleven in number...and his daughter, Dinah..."<sup>491</sup> Some time later, Dinah—who is "still a virgin"—"came into Shechem when there was a festival, since she wished to see the city" (cf. Gen 34:1 where Dinah "went out to see the women of the region"). When "Sychem...saw her, he loved her; and after seizing her as his own, he carried her off and ravished her" (cf. Gen 34:2-3 which does not mention Shechem's love for Dinah until after he violates her). Afterwards, Shechem and Hamor ask Jacob "for her in the partnership of marriage." According to Polyhistor, Jacob refused to give her to Shechem unless "all the inhabitants of Shechem were circumcised and became Jews."<sup>492</sup> Hamor accepts this stipulation and promises to "persuade them [i.e., the Shechemites]." This fragment concludes with a brief excerpt of Theodotus' poem in which Jacob informs Hamor

---

see F. Fallon, "Theodotus: A New Translation and Introduction," in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:785-789. For additional introductory commentary and a comparison of Theod.'s *On the Jews* with other Jewish writings from the Hellenistic period, see John J. Collins, "The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans," *HTR* 73 (1980): 91-104; Reinhard Pummer, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *HTR* 75 (1982): 177-188; and Mendels, *Land of Israel*, 109-116. Regarding Theodotus' ethnic background and aims, Collins asserts that "Theodotus was a militant and exclusivist Jew...[whose epic poem]...lent itself readily to nationalistic propaganda." In other words, Theod. was a self-proclaimed anti-Samaritan proponent. See Collins, "Epic of Theodotus," 102. In contrast, Pummer challenges Collins' claim and argues that "Theodotus' epic is not anti-Samaritan...[and his]...retelling of Genesis 34 is not by this fact alone [i.e., the omission of the Shechemites' circumcision] directed against the Samaritans contemporary with the respective authors." Pummer presses this point when he concludes his essay as follows: "[N]one of the works that were included in this investigation, i.e., *Testament of Levi*, *Jubilees*, *Judith*, *Theodotus*, *Josephus*, *Philo*, and *Pseudo-Philo*, show any anti-Samaritan *Tendenz*." See Pummer, "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings," 187-188. Against both Collins and Pummer is Mendels who contends that "Theodotus was a Samaritan...who exploited the story appearing in Gen 34 and changed it [i.e., 'the people of Shechem were not Judaized (circumcised) before being killed'] to accord with his polemical purposes...to show that the present Samaritans are not to be associated with the people of Shechem appearing in Gen 34<sup>7</sup>." Mendels, *Land of Israel*, 110-111, 115. Cf. Baarda's assessment of the anti-Samaritan thrust in *T. Levi*. Baarda does not think that the issue "was not what the Greek author wanted to delineate in his retelling. His main purpose was to exonerate Levi from every blame in the Shechem episode." Baarda, "The Shechem Episode," 73.

<sup>491</sup> All translations are from F. Fallon, "Theodotus," in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:790-793.

<sup>492</sup> According to Gen 34:13-17, Jacob's sons make this demand of Hamor and Shechem with deceitful aims in mind.

that “Hebrews” are “not allowed...to bring sons-in-law or daughters-in-law into their house from elsewhere but, rather, whoever boasts that he is of the same race” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.4; cf. Gen 34:14). This explanation is followed by a brief allusion to Gen 17 when God commanded Abraham to be circumcised in fragment five (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.5).

Fragment six reports that Simeon “decided to kill Hamor and Sychem, since he was unwilling to bear in a civil manner the violent attack upon his sister.” He enlists his brother Levi to join him in this assault and persuades him “by producing an oracle which said that God had determined to give ten peoples to the descendants of Abraham” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.6). Fragment seven supplies a divine sanction for their plan, since “God sent this thought into them because those in Shechem were impious...they did not honor whoever came to them...Nor did they determine rights or laws throughout the city...deadly works were their care (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.7).<sup>493</sup>

After Polyhistor’s general summation of their attack on the city and its inhabitants, fragment eight narrates in graphic detail the execution of Hamor and Shechem. “Simeon rushed upon Hamor...and struck him upon the head; he seized his throat in his left hand and then let it go still gasping its last breath.” Meanwhile, “Levi, also irresistible in might, seized Sychem by the hair; the latter grasped his knees and raged unspeakably. Levi struck the middle of his collarbone; the sharp sword entered his inward parts through the chest...” Once the other brothers hear of Simeon and Levi’s deed, they join them, pillage the city, rescue Dinah, and return “with the prisoners to their father’s quarters” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.8).

Despite their brevity, the combination of Theodotus’ poem and Polyhistor’s prose shows evidence of the “two-sword” *traditum*. Besides the unmistakable references to the ancient tale in six of the fragments (i.e., Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.1-2, 4, 6-8), all four of the “two-sword” motifs are present. First, from Jacob’s perspective, both family and national identity and honor are

---

<sup>493</sup> The biblical story is subjected to a great deal of embellishment in fragments six, seven, and eight. For a comparison of Theodotus’ *On the Jews* with other Jewish accounts of the Shechem episode during the Hellenistic period, see Collins, “Epic of Theodotus,” 96-97. Cf. Pummer, “Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings,” 178-182.

endangered “until all the inhabitants of Shechem are circumcised and become Jews” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.4). That family and national honor is threatened is further confirmed, since the “impious” Shechemites “did not honor whoever came to them, whether evil or noble” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.7). Second, Simeon’s reaction and his willingness to initiate and plan a retaliatory attack show his total commitment to do whatever is necessary to vindicate an honored member of the family (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.6). Levi and the other brothers’ response also demonstrate that they will defend their sister at all costs (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.8). Third, the brothers’ vengeance is justified not only because of Shechem’s immoral deed, but also because God decreed their extermination (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.22.6-7).<sup>494</sup>

In sum, the way Gen 34 is embellished also bolsters the case that Theodotus and Polyhistor are transmitting the “two-sword” *traditum*. As they refract the story, especially in fragments six through eight, their embellishments create inimitable characters that are noble, courageous, and honorable; they possess traits that ought to be imitated. Simeon is “unwilling to bear in a civil manner the violent attack upon his sister,” because family identity and honor are in jeopardy. Both Simeon and Levi are “irresistible in might” as they defend an honored one. Finally, divine approval of and the graphic details concerning the execution of Hamor and Shechem justify vengeance in comparable situations.<sup>495</sup>

### **3.3.5 *Joseph and Aseneth* (First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.)**

*Joseph and Aseneth* (hereafter *Jos. Asen.*) is a romantic short story or novella based on a biblical report that Pharaoh “gave him [i.e., Joseph] Asenath daughter of Potiphera, priest of

---

<sup>494</sup> Louis H. Feldman suggests that “the action of Shechem justifies a divinely-ordained policy of revenge” in Theod. For Feldman’s entire assessment of the adaptations found in the Epic of Theodotus and Theodotus’ ideologically-driven objectives, see Feldman, “Remember Amalek!”, 167-172.

<sup>495</sup> Collins notes these and other modifications. He also points out that “Theodotus does not say that the circumcision had been performed...[which]...is a major departure from the biblical account.” Collins, “Epic of Theodotus,” 95-96. With a completely different aim in mind, Mendels also uses Theod.’s omission of circumcision in order to argue that “the Samaritans cannot historically be considered as stemming from the ancient Shechemites of Gen 34, or having any connection with them.” Mendels, *Land of Israel*, 113-116. In view of the brevity of these fragments, it is difficult to assess how much importance one should give to these changes in my estimation.

On, as his wife” (Gen 41:45; cf. vv. 50-52). The obvious challenge this record presents for Jewish interpreters is to explain why it is acceptable for Joseph to marry Aseneth. This issue is particularly germane in view of the HB’s frequent harangue against marrying foreign women (e.g., Ezra 9-10) whose roots can also be traced back to the Dinah story.<sup>496</sup> Whether the answer that *Jos. Asen.* offers to that problem is satisfactory or not is debatable, but there is no question about the book’s allusion to the “two-sword” *traditum*, though it is not initially evident.

The first nine chapters of the lengthy midrashic exposé introduce the characters and set out the plot as Aseneth first refuses her father’s request to marry Joseph, but then is smitten by him when she sees him (*Jos. Asen.* 1:1-6:8). Once Joseph is reassured that Aseneth will not molest him—“[f]or all the wives and the daughters of the noblemen and the satraps of the whole land of Egypt used to molest him (wanting) to sleep with him”—he meets her, but refuses to kiss her because she does not worship God (*Jos. Asen.* 7:1-8:7).<sup>497</sup> Upon hearing this, Aseneth is distraught. In response, Joseph—being “meek and merciful and fearing God”—blesses her and prays for her conversion (*Jos. Asen.* 8:8-11). Aseneth ponders his words and weeps over her idolatrous ways as Joseph departs, promising to return within a week (*Jos. Asen.* 9:1-10:1).

The next twelve chapters (10-21) are neatly divided into three subunits. In the first section (*Jos. Asen.* 10:2-13:15) Aseneth repents in sackcloth and ashes, casts away her idols, and confesses her sin as she prays. In the next portion (*Jos. Asen.* 14:1-17:10), Aseneth meets a man from heaven who announces to her that her prayer and confession have been heard; thus she is to marry Joseph. After a bizarre meal that ends with bees swarming around Aseneth’s mouth and forming a honeycomb, the heavenly visitor blesses Aseneth’s seven virgins and departs. In the final subunit (*Jos. Asen.* 18:1-21:21), Joseph and Aseneth wed and then Aseneth once again confesses her sin and offers praise to God in a psalm.

---

<sup>496</sup> C. Burchard poses this question as follows: “How could Joseph—the model of chastity, piety, and statesmanship—marry a foreign Hamitic girl, daughter of an idolatrous priest?” For further discussion and additional introductory remarks, see C. Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth: A New Translation and Introduction,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:177-201.

<sup>497</sup> Translations of *Jos. Asen.* are from Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:202-247.

Up to this point there is no reference to the Dinah story in *Jos. Asen*. Instead, the novella focuses on the romantic relationship of the two primary protagonists: Joseph and Aseneth. The storyline of the last eight chapters, however, cleverly integrates the Shechem episode—and thus the “two-sword” *traditum*—into a tale of intrigue as Pharaoh’s firstborn son attempts to circumvent Joseph’s power. After Joseph and Aseneth visit Jacob in Goshen, Simeon and Levi return with them, but not the sons of Zilpah and Bilhah because “they envied (them) and were hostile against them.” Aseneth—who is escorted by Levi on her right and Joseph on her left—loves Levi “because he was one who attached himself to the Lord, and he was a prudent man and a prophet of the Most High and sharp-sighted with his eyes” (*Jos. Asen. 22:1-13*).

When Pharaoh’s son sees Joseph and Aseneth together after their return he is greatly disturbed, since Aseneth was to be his wife. In an effort to get rid of Joseph, he attempts to enlist the assistance of Simeon and Levi. After summoning them, he says,

I know today that you are powerful men beyond all the men on the earth, and by these right (hands) of yours the city of the Shechemites has been overthrown, and by these two swords of yours thirty thousand fighting men were cut down. And behold, today I will take you as companions for myself, and give you plenty of gold and silver, and servants and maids and houses and big (estates as) inheritance. Only do this thing and show mercy on me, for I have been insulted very much by your brother Joseph, for he himself took Aseneth my (envisaged) wife who was betrothed to me from the beginning. And now, come assist me, and we will make war on Joseph your brother, and I will kill him with my sword, and have Aseneth for (my) wife, and you will be to me brothers and faithful friends (*Jos. Asen. 23:2-4*).

After saying these things, Pharaoh’s son flaunts his sword and threatens to kill Simeon and Levi if they refuse his invitation (*Jos. Asen. 23:5-6*).

In response, Simeon—“a bold and daring man”—intends to take his sword and kill Pharaoh’s son. Levi—who is “a prophet” and “sharp-sighted” and knows “what is written in the heart of men”—intervenes and dissuades Simeon and also advises Pharaoh’s son not to speak against Joseph again. But if Pharaoh’s son “insist[s] on this wicked purpose...,” Levi sternly cautions him, “[O]ur swords are drawn in our right hands before you” (*Jos. Asen. 23:7-13*). The warning continues when Simeon and Levi draw their swords and say,

Behold, have you seen these swords? With these two swords the Lord God punished the insult of the Shechemites (by) which they insulted the sons of

Israel, because of our sister Dinah whom Shechem the son of Hamor had defiled (*Jos. Asen. 23:14*).

After hearing their words and seeing their swords “flashing forth (something) like a flame of fire,” Pharaoh’s son is “exceedingly afraid” and falls down before them. Levi reaches out and touches him and also warns him again not to speak against Joseph (*Jos. Asen. 23:15-17*).

Despite being terrified of Simeon and Levi, Pharaoh’s son is still tormented by his desire for Aseneth. Upon learning that the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah (i.e., Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher) “are hostile to Joseph and Aseneth and envy them,” Pharaoh’s son enlists their aid (*Jos. Asen. 24:1-20*). After a botched attempt to kill Pharaoh, the younger brothers (Naphtali and Asher) attempt to convince their older brothers (Dan and Gad) to abandon Pharaoh’s son (*Jos. Asen. 25:1-8*). Dan and Gad, however, refuse and the four brothers join Pharaoh’s son in an ambush on Aseneth. As her guards are slaughtered in battle, she flees. Levi perceives the danger “as a prophet” and summons his other brothers (i.e., the sons of Leah) to defend her. Taking their swords, shields and spears, they rush off to rescue her (*Jos. Asen. 26:1-6*).

Before the sons of Leah reach Aseneth, Pharaoh’s son and his horsemen catch up with Aseneth (*Jos. Asen. 26:7-8*). Benjamin, who is riding with Aseneth, jumps out and throws a stone that strikes Pharaoh’s son on his left temple. As he lay wounded, Benjamin kills the fifty horsemen by their temples with fifty stones while the four sons of Leah (i.e., Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah) chase after and kill the men who ambushed Aseneth. In the meantime, Aseneth is delivered from the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah when “their drawn swords, full of blood,” fall to the ground and turn to ashes in response to her prayer (*Jos. Asen. 27:1-11*).

Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher are terrified at the loss of their swords and beg for mercy from Aseneth. She intervenes on their behalf and pleads with the four sons of Leah to spare their four half-brothers. She especially assuages the wrath of Simeon who was ready to “cut them down.” Levi, the perceptive one, grasps what Aseneth is seeking to do and will not disclose the hiding place of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah for fear that his brothers will attack them (*Jos. Asen. 28:1-17*). He also prevents Benjamin from killing the wounded son of Pharaoh with his own sword. Though Levi tries to save Pharaoh’s son, he dies three days later from the wound to his

temple. Pharaoh, too, dies because of his grief over his son and the kingdom of Egypt is handed on to Joseph as the novella ends (*Jos. Asen.* 29:1-9).

Like many of the other writings of the Pseudepigrapha, *Jos. Asen.* shows evidence of the “two-sword” *traditum*. Simeon and Levi—as well as Reuben and Judah—are eager to defend Joseph and Aseneth, their brother and his wife, both honored ones in Egypt. The importance of family identity and honor is evidenced not only by the words of Pharaoh’s son when he initially attempts to enlist Simeon and Levi in his coup d’état, but also by Levi’s words of warning to him that “[w]ith these two swords the Lord God punished the insult of the Shechemites (by) which they insulted the sons of Israel, because of our sister Dinah whom Shechem the son of Hamor had defiled” (*Jos. Asen.* 23:14). Levi’s words also suggest that national identity and honor are at stake, since “they insulted the sons of Israel,” an expression that likely extends beyond the eponymous ancestors. Though vengeance is occasionally circumscribed by the actions of Levi and Aseneth (c.f., *Jos. Asen.* 23:9; 28:9-17; 29:3-5), retaliation is justified against evil doers (c.f., *Jos. Asen.* 23:14-17; 26:6; 27:1-6).<sup>498</sup> In addition, Levi’s zeal—though not explicitly expressed—is seen in his conduct and the esteem accorded to Levi links *Jos. Asen.* with other pseudepigraphal writings (e.g., *Jub.*, *T. Levi*). Finally, even though few discrepancies with the Dinah story are introduced, Levi’s brief, but passionate exchange with Pharaoh’s son about the Shechem episode adds to the increasing lore of the “two-sword” *traditum*.

### 3.3.6 Summary of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum* in the Pseudepigrapha

The “two-sword” *traditum* regularly appears in the Pseudepigrapha. The Shechem episode is specifically mentioned in *Jub.*, *Ar. Levi*, *T. Levi*, Theodotus, and *Jos. Asen.* The motif

---

<sup>498</sup> Klassen overstates the position of *Jos. Asen.* when he says, “The just man does not harm his enemy and six times the statement is repeated that he never repays evil with evil (*Jos. As.* 23:9; 28:3, 5, 10, 14; 29:3). Aseneth by her own behaviour [*sic*] and her refusal to be avenged testifies to the depth of her conviction that God will fight on her behalf and that vengeance must be left in his hands. She is supported in her position by Levi against the more aggressive stance of Simon.” Klassen, “Jesus and the Messianic War,” 166. Klassen’s characterization of Aseneth is correct, but his overall assessment of *Jos. Asen.* conveniently omits any reference to Levi’s warning to Pharaoh’s son and the slaughter of those who ambushed Aseneth by the sons of Leah, which happens to include Levi (cf. *Jos. Asen.* 27:6). Although *Jos. Asen.* may place some boundaries on the exercise of vengeance, it is not entirely excluded.



of family identity and honor is present in *Jub.*, *T. Levi*, Theodotus, and *Jos. Asen.* Even the fragmentary *Ar. Levi* perhaps shows evidence of this motif. The theme of national identity and honor is found in *Jub.*, *T. Levi*, and *Jos. Asen.* Except for *Ar. Levi*, each writing scrutinized in this section promotes the vindication or defense of an honored one and justifies vengeance. Other features, such as repeated references to Levi's zeal, his elevation to the priesthood, and wide-ranging emendations—all of which are especially prominent in *Jub.* and *T. Levi*—further augment the “two-sword” legend as it is refracted in the Pseudepigrapha.

Besides corroborating the transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum*, the tradition is significantly embellished in the Pseudepigrapha. Simeon and Levi avenge the violation of Dinah because God has decreed it (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*, Theod., *Jos. Asen.*) even to the point of receiving a sword from heaven (*T. Levi*). Levi receives the priesthood because he acted virtuously and righteously despite opposition from his father (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*). Extraneous battle details—such as Levi's age, who killed whom, the number of Shechemites put to death—are also included (*T. Levi*, Theod., *Jos. Asen.*)

### **3.4 Other Jewish Writings**

In the last section of this chapter, I delineate places where the “two-sword” *traditum* is passed on through an eclectic mix of texts: Philo Judaeus, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus. As the Shechem episode is referenced, rewritten, and reshaped by these authors, the legendary exploits of Simeon and Levi are kept alive and amplified. This continued refraction, much of it dated to a time when Jesus lived and the NT was being fashioned, adds further evidence that the story was an influential component in the cultural and religious background when Luke's gospel was written.

#### **3.4.1 Philo of Alexandria (First Century C.E.)**

Philo Judaeus (a.k.a. Philo of Alexandria) was born sometime around 25 (or 20) B.C.E. and died about 50 C.E. He lived most of his life in Alexandria and appears to have visited Jerusalem only once during his life. His writings reflect both his Jewish heritage and Hellenistic

philosophy. He frequently used allegory as a primary interpretative strategy when reflecting on the HB.<sup>499</sup>

Philo refers to the Shechem episode on three occasions. The first passage is found in *Legum allegoriae, III (Allegorical Interpretation, III)* and illustrates well Philo's propensity for allegorical reading. For example, he writes,

The passions are always hidden away and placed under guard in Shechem—"shoulder" is the meaning of the name—for he that devotes toil to pleasures is prone to keep pleasures well guarded. But in the case of the wise man the passions perish and are destroyed, not for some short period but "even to this day," that is, always (Philo, *Leg. 3.25* [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

From Philo's perspective, Shechem is the archetypical brute who symbolizes the pursuit of pleasure and self-satisfaction. In contrast, the wise man overcomes and destroys passions.

This moral truth justifies Jacob's gift of Shechem "as a special portion to Joseph (Gen. x.iii. 22)" (Philo, *Leg. 3.26* [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]). According to Philo, Joseph receives the city because his father recognizes that he has the temperament of a wise man. In contrast to Shechem who is driven by his passions, Joseph conquers his appetite for pleasure. Jacob's gift, however, does not originate with God. Rather, Jacob gained Shechem by means of "sword and bow"—in other words, by reason, wisdom, and prudent speech. Philo writes:

Jacob receives Shechem not from God, but by dint of "sword and bow," words that pierce and parry. For the wise man subjects to himself the secondary as well as the primary objects, but, having subjected them, does not keep them, but bestows them on him to whose nature they are akin. (Philo, *Leg. 3.26-27* [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

In short, Jacob gives the city of Shechem to Joseph (i.e., his self-controlled son), because he (i.e., Jacob) conquered Shechem (i.e., passions) with words, not a literal sword; and being a wise father, Jacob passes on an appropriate gift to his wise son.

---

<sup>499</sup> For these introductory comments and further background information, see Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York—Oxford: Oxford University, 1979), 3-81, 127-134. See also David M. Scholer's "Foreword: An Introduction to Philo Judaeus of Alexandria," in C. D. Yonge, trans., *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993, xi-xviii. For an analysis of Philo's religious philosophy, see Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1947).

The second occurrence is in *De migratione Abrahami* (*On the Migration of Abraham*; hereafter *Migr.*), a Midrash on Gen 12:1-4, 6. Most of Philo's commentary talks about the gifts that Abraham received from God. Shechem is mentioned only at the end of the essay as Philo reflects on the meaning of Abraham's travels to Judea in response to God's promise. In this concluding portion of *Migr.* Philo exhorts his readers to press on, to search for knowledge—as exemplified by Abraham in his quest. In this way, Philo affirms that “it is a sufficient reward to obtain by unremitting inspection a clear impression of the things thou art in search of” (Philo, *Migr.* 222 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).<sup>500</sup>

As Philo continues his methodical analysis, he emphasizes the need for steadiness in the pursuit of philosophical wisdom. He employs the oak of Shechem and Dinah as metaphors that represent two persons who toil for the lofty goal of understanding. Of them, he says:

Do you not see that he says further that a tall oak had been planted in Shechem, thus shewing [*sic*] in a figure the toil of education as a hard and unbreakable substance that never yields or bends? It is a vital matter that he who would be perfect should ply this toil, to the end that the soul's court of justice, called “Dinah,” which means “judgement” [*sic*], may not be ravished by him who sinks under the opposite kind of toil, which is the insidious foe of sound sense (Philo, *Migr.* 223 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

The Shechemite oak—with its sturdy frame—never gives up, but always seeks after knowledge. Whoever labors to understand is wise and that soul is able to withstand foolishness—to conquer, if you will, “the insidious foe of sound sense.”

For confirmation of this truth, Philo then alludes to the Shechem episode.

For the man who bears the name of this place, Shechem, being son of Hamor, that is of an irrational being—for “Hamor” means “ass”—practising [*sic*] folly and nursed in shamelessness and effrontery, essayed—foul wretch that he was—to corrupt and defile the judgement [*sic*] faculties of the understanding. (Philo, *Migr.* 224 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

Shechem—the son of an “ass,” “of an irrational being”—thus symbolizes anyone who labors for desire. He is a “foul wretch” whose aim is “to corrupt and defile the judgement [*sic*] faculties of understanding.”

---

<sup>500</sup> I also consulted Yonge's translation in *The Works of Philo*.

But the hearers and pupils of sound sense, Symeon [*sic*] and Levi, were too quick for him. They made secure their own quarters and went forth against them in safety, and overthrew them when still occupied in the pleasure-loving, passion-loving, toil of the uncircumcised: for albeit there was a Divine decree that “of the daughters of Israel, the seeing one, none might ever become a harlot” (Deut. xxiii.17), these men hoped to carry off unobserved the virgin soul (Gen. xxxiv.). (Philo, *Migr.* 224 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

Even though the Shechemites “hoped to carry off unobserved the virgin soul” and tried to seduce Dinah (i.e., “judgement” [*sic*]), their efforts were to no avail, since Simeon and Levi (i.e., brothers who toil after wisdom) opposed him. Shechem (i.e., anyone consumed by “the pleasure-loving, passion-loving, toil of the uncircumcised”) failed not only because of the actions of Simeon and Levi, but also because “a Divine decree” protected “the daughters of Israel” so that “none might ever become a harlot [i.e., a person lacking discretion, wisdom, and judgment].”

Having advanced the cause of wisdom rather than desire, Philo ends *Migr.* by commending Simeon and Levi (i.e., for “Justice, the abhorrer of wickedness, the befriender of those who are wronged”)<sup>501</sup> and censuring the Shechemites (i.e., “those who shame virtue”). By the noble and courageous deed of her brothers, Dinah, who “seemed to have been shamed [by Shechem], becomes again a virgin” (Philo, *Migr.* 225 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).<sup>502</sup>

Philo alludes to the Shechem episode a third time in *De mutatione nominum* (*On the Change of Names*; hereafter *Mut.*). This essay is a midrash on Gen 17:1-5, 15-22 when God appeared to Abram and changed his name to Abraham. As with *Migr.*, Philo makes use of Shechem in *Mut.* to denounce wickedness and praise virtue. After honoring “the virtuous man” who speaks “truly virtuous words and ‘with his mind,’” Philo admits that “the wicked man sometimes gives admirable expression to noble thoughts, but his actions are most vile and their method equally so.” To illustrate this point, Philo says, “Such a one is Shechem, the son of folly, for his father is Hamor whose name is translated by ‘ass,’ while his own is interpreted as

---

<sup>501</sup> “Symeon, which means ‘diligent listening,’ is the symbol of aptness to learn; Levi of excellent activities and practices and sacred ministries” (Philo, *Somn.* 2.34 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

<sup>502</sup> Philo offers the following rationale for Dinah’s apparent violation: “Seemed, I said, because it never was defiled. It is with sufferings which we have not willed, as it is with wrongdoings which we have not intended. As there is no real doing in the second case, so there is no real suffering in the first” (Philo, *Migr.* 225 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

'shoulder,' the symbol of toil." As before, all people toil. The question, however, for what does a person toil? Is it for "unintelligence" or "intelligence?" Whereas the former "is miserable and full of affliction," the latter "is profitable" (Philo, *Mut.* 193 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).<sup>503</sup>

It is for this reason "the oracles say that Shechem spake 'according to the mind of the virgin' after first humiliating her (Gen. xxxiv. 2, 3)." In light of this troubling paradox, Philo inquires:

Are not these words "according to the mind of the virgin" added with the exact thought so as almost to shew [*sic*] that his actions were the opposite of his words? For Dinah is incorruptible judgement [*sic*], the justice which is the assessor of God, the ever virgin, for the word "Dinah" by interpretation is either judgement [*sic*] or justice. The fools attempt to seduce her by their plottings and their practices repeated day by day seek by means of specious talking to escape from conviction (Philo, *Mut.* 194-195 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

His denunciation continues when he puts forward the proposition that the "Shechems" of the world (i.e. those who pretend to speak "to the mind of the virgin") "should either make their actions conform to their words or if they persist in iniquity keep still" (Philo, *Mut.* 194 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]). Dinah, who earlier personified "judgment" in *Migr.*, now exemplifies "justice" as well.

Regrettably, according to Philo, these dissimulators address "words of friendship and fairness to the maiden Virtue, but they let no occasion slip without using it to outrage and maltreat her if they can" (Philo, *Mut.* 196 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]). Though cities are full of people who praise "Virtue," they dishonor her by their deeds. In short, they say one thing, but do another (see Philo, *Mut.* 197-198).

Yet the final outcome for the wicked is set. Whatever they do, "it is all useless." Why are all their efforts vain? It is because, Philo declares, "The vindicators will come strong and doughty, inspired with zeal for virtue" (Philo, *Mut.* 199 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

[For] the champions who stand ready to repel such profane and impure ways of thinking are two in number, Simeon and Levi, but they are one in will. That is why in the blessings, while their father ranked them under a single head (Gen. xlix. 5), because their minds are in concord and harmony and their purpose set in one and the same direction, Moses ceases even to mention the pair, but compresses the whole of Simeon into Levi (Deut. xxxiii. 8), and thus blending

---

<sup>503</sup> I also consulted Yonge's translation in *The Works of Philo*.

the two natures he makes them one, bearing the stamp of a single form, and unites hearing with action (Philo, *Mut.* 200 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]).

In other words, whoever acts like Simeon and Levi is able to reveal the true intentions of the evildoers and shame them.

Although Philo makes only three brief, tangential allusions to the Shechem episode in his commentaries, his loose adaptation of the Dinah story to inculcate virtue shows evidence of the “two-sword” *traditum*.<sup>504</sup> In both *Migr.* and *Mut.*, Simeon and Levi, “champions who stand ready to repel such profane and impure ways of thinking,” are extolled for their “sound sense.” They vindicate two honored women with quick and decisive action: their sister Dinah (i.e., “judgment” and “justice”) and the maiden “Virtue.” Not only are they rescued, their honor is restored, for it was never really taken from them in the first place. It is also easy to imagine that the noble and courageous act of Simeon and Levi preserves honor and identity—both family and national—from Philo’s perspective. Furthermore, the brothers’ vengeance is justified, since they destroy “pleasure-loving, passion-loving” Shechemites, that is, “those who shame virtue.”

Besides the preceding traits, Philo’s rhetoric resonates with the “two-sword” *traditum* in other aspects as well. For example, his omissions (e.g., the brothers’ deception, Shechem’s circumcision) and blatant emendations (e.g., Jacob conquering Shechem with wise words, the

---

<sup>504</sup> Feldman astutely summarizes the liberties Philo takes with Gen 34: “In short, Philo has very definitely downgraded Shechem, has totally omitted those details that would indict Simeon and Levi, and is clearly not at all critical of their actions. By omitting the demand by Simeon and Levi that the Hivites be circumcised and the readiness of the Hivites to do so and their being killed when they are weak from that operation, and by allegorizing the whole incident he has, in effect, bypassed the issue of deceit and guilt on the part of Simeon and Levi. Instead, Simeon and Levi are praised in terms that a philosopher would especially appreciate...” Feldman, “Remember Amalek!”, 153. To press Feldman’s point even further, I would say Philo not only omitted circumcision but ipso facto denied that the Shechemites were ever circumcised, since their goal is the “toil of the uncircumcised.” For Feldman’s entire discussion on Philo’s use of the Shechem episode, op. cit., 149-153. Parry, too, concurs. He writes: “Philo is not primarily interested in an ethical evaluation of the events recorded in the story. Nevertheless, he is concerned to use the story in ethical reflection. He tries to see how the characters’ actions signify timeless truths that can guide the soul in its journey towards God. The story, for Philo, guides one towards a unity of word and deed in the pursuit and honour [*sic*] of virtue, reason, judgement [*sic*] and wisdom...In line with other Jewish readings of the time, Shechem is made more villainous than he is in Genesis 34, and the sons of Jacob become more idealised [*sic*]. Elements in the story which place Shechem in a better light are either ignored (e.g., the narrator’s comments that he *truly* loves Dinah) or used to damn him (e.g., his affectionate words to Dinah in 34:3). Also no mention is made of his circumcision. In fact, Philo actually says that he was uncircumcised. Simeon and Levi are the heroes of the story and nothing is allowed to detract from the glory of their deeds...Dinah is held in honour as a symbol of virtue, judgement and wisdom and thus Philo honours her (or at least the ideal she represents).” Parry, *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethic*, 93-94.

rhetorical allegorization as a means to elevate reason and promote virtue) amplify the tradition. In Jacob's time, Shechem's misdeed is directed against Dinah, a young girl. In Philo's day, Shechem's misdeed is repeated when anyone practices "folly" and commits "shamelessness and effrontery." Such a one is "corrupt and defile[s] judgement faculties of the understanding." "Shechem," the son of Hamor, the "ass," symbolizes all such persons. Shechem was an "irrational being," "uncircumcised," and so are any who act like him by toiling after passion.

But the "Simeons and Levis" of Philo's time—like the eponymous ancestors—are "vindicators [who] come strong and doughty inspired with zeal for virtue."<sup>505</sup> Henceforth, the "Jacobs" of Philo's era are to act zealously to take Shechem—the village of idiots—not with a literal sword and bow, but with wise words that slay stupidity and vanquish foolishness.

In sum, the "two-sword" *traditum* is attested and accentuated in Philo. Besides the direct allusion to the events of Gen 34, his use of Shechem, Dinah, and Simeon and Levi as metaphors to praise "understanding" and condemn foolishness entails the tradition's four motifs previously identified. Philo's allegorical reworking further inflates the lore of Simeon and Levi, two brothers who take up swords—although this time symbolically—to eradicate Shechem, a fool and the son of an "ass."

### **3.4.2 Pseudo-Philo (Late First to Early Second Century C.E.?)**

Pseudo-Philo's *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* (*Biblical Antiquities*; hereafter *L.A.B.*), like Genesis Apocryphon, *Jub.* and *Jewish Antiquities*, is rewritten Bible. It retells the "history of Israel from Adam to David" and ends abruptly with a report of Saul's death. It is attested only in Medieval Latin manuscripts that some scholars believe are translations "from the Greek and that underlying the Greek there must have been a Hebrew original." The author, exact date of composition, and provenance are unknown, though many scholars speculate that a Palestinian

---

<sup>505</sup> Philo will also speak of the zeal of the tribe of Levi. See Philo, *Mos.* 2.168-172.

Jew wrote it during the first century of the Common Era. In some passages, *L.A.B.* expands the story; in other pericopes, the stories are severely truncated.<sup>506</sup>

The allusion to the Shechem and Dinah incident falls into the latter category in *L.A.B.* In fact, the chapter where the reference appears “is largely transitional.”<sup>507</sup> The first part of this chapter collapses Abraham’s time in Canaan through the birth of Isaac into just three verses (*L.A.B.* 8:1-3). The next section primarily enumerates Abraham’s descendents from Isaac through Jacob (*L.A.B.* 8:4-6). After setting out Jacob’s family tree, Pseudo-Philo compresses the entire Shechem episode into one verse.

*And Jacob dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hurrite raped Dinah his daughter and humiliated her. And the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, went in and killed the whole city of them by the sword; and they took their sister Dinah and went away from there (L.A.B. 8:7).*<sup>508</sup>

This extremely short précis of Gen 34 is then followed by a sporadic, but elsewhere attested, midrashic tradition that “Job took her [i.e., Dinah] as a wife and fathered from her fourteen sons and six daughters...” (*L.A.B.* 8:8a).<sup>509</sup> The remaining part of verse 8 identifies their children by name and states that “seven sons and three daughters [were born] before he was struck down with suffering, and afterward seven sons and three daughters when he was healed.” The rest of the chapter summarizes the Joseph novella and the family’s migration into Egypt (*L.A.B.* 8:9-14).

The concise synopsis of the Shechem episode in *L.A.B.* obviously puts constraints on whatever claim can be made about its use of the “two-sword” *traditum*, especially since most of

---

<sup>506</sup> For these comments and other introductory observations, see D. J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Commentary,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:297-303. For additional background information, see Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York—Oxford: Oxford University, 1993), 13-25; Bruce Norman Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield, 2001), 13-53; and Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* (2 vols.; Leiden—New York—Köln: Brill, 1996), 195-280.

<sup>507</sup> Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 50. Murphy aptly describes *L.A.B.* 8, which is only fourteen verses in all, as follows: “Pseudo-Philo uses enough of Genesis 12-50 to form a bridge between the story of Abraham and the tower of Babel on the one hand and the birth of Moses and the Exodus on the other.” *Op. cit.*, 50.

<sup>508</sup> *L.A.B.* translations are from Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:304-377. Italics indicate “[w]here the text agrees with a recognizable ancient biblical text (the MT, LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, etc.)...” Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 303. I also consulted Jacobson, *Commentary on Pseudo-Philo*, 102, 391-392.

<sup>509</sup> Cf. *Midr. Gen. Rab.* 19:12; *Testament of Job* 1:6.



the Gen 34 narrative is omitted.<sup>510</sup> Nevertheless, the very fact that the story is included in Pseudo-Philo's brief, one chapter summation of Gen 12-50 suggests the incident is noteworthy. And even though the motifs are not well-developed, it is possible to argue that the abstract indicates that Simeon and Levi act to defend their sister's and family's honor. It also suggests that their vengeance is justified, since "*Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hurrite raped Dinah his daughter and humiliated her*" (*L.A.B.* 8:7).

In sum, the "two-sword" *traditum* is attested in *L.A.B.* despite its diminutive size. The Shechem episode is directly referenced and the short summary indicates some awareness of at least two, possibly three, "two-sword" motifs: family honor, vindication of an honored one, and justified vengeance.

### 3.4.3 Josephus (First Century C.E.)

Josephus' brief presentation of the Shechem chronicle is found toward the close of book one in his *Jewish Antiquities* (Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία).<sup>511</sup> Here, as is characteristic for much of *Antiquities* (hereafter *Ant.*), his extensive familiarity with this portion of the HB is obvious. But as he constructs his haggadic version of the Dinah story, he takes some editorial liberties that significantly emend it. Although these changes are interesting, they ultimately have only a minor impact on the "two-sword" *traditum*.

After mentioning Jacob's arrival at Shechem, Josephus frames the opening scene with a circumstantial clause that notes the "Sikimites [*sic*] were holding a festival." While this event takes place, Dinah goes "into the city to see the finery of the women of the country." When "Sychem

---

<sup>510</sup> I opted not to catalog what is omitted by *L.A.B.*, since such a conclusion would be based on an argument from silence. In my estimation, the brevity of the account makes any inference derived from an omission highly speculative and thus neither enlightening nor reliable. For someone who is more comfortable arguing from Pseudo-Philo's silence, see Feldman, "*Remember Amalek!*", 155-156.

<sup>511</sup> For additional background regarding Josephus' *Antiquities*, see the introduction in *Josephus IV, Jewish Antiquities, Books I-IV* [Thackeray, LCL], vii-xix. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are from the same source. I also consulted William Whiston, trans., *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged* (New Updated Ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987), 51-52.

[sic]" saw her, "he carried her off and ravished her, and being enamoured [sic] of her besought his father to procure the damsel for him in marriage" (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.337 [Thackeray, LCL]).

Shechem's father complies with his son's request and goes "to Jacob to ask him to give Dinah to his son Sychem in lawful wedlock." Jacob, however, is caught in a conundrum. On the one hand, he cannot refuse Hamor's petition because of his "rank." On the other hand, he is deeply troubled, since "it [is] unlawful to marry his daughter to a foreigner." Feeling trapped between these two conflicting poles, Jacob asks for leave "to hold a council on the subject of his request" (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.338 [Thackeray, LCL]).

When the council—i.e., Jacob and his sons—assembles, Jacob informs his sons about "the seduction of their sister and of Emmor's request and ask[s] them to deliberate what ought to be done." Most of Jacob's sons hold "their peace, not knowing what ought to be done," but not Simeon and Levi. In contrast, they plan to attack the Shechemites "during a feast...when they [are] given up to indulgence and festivity." When they execute their plan, they slaughter "the sentries...in their sleep...[and kill]...all the males, the king and his son among them, sparing only the women." As Josephus' version of the tale comes to a close, Josephus states that "this deed [was perpetrated] without their father's sanction," after which "they brought their sister back." Shortly thereafter, Jacob is described as being "aghast at the enormity of these acts and indignant at his sons" (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.339-341 [Thackeray, LCL]).

Josephus' inclusion of this saga from Gen 34 suggests that he finds the "two-sword" *traditum* to be commendable at least for some reason, a point that is especially relevant since he omits other prominent stories in *Ant.* from the HB (e.g., the golden calf episode). But even more striking than its inclusion are some of his additions to and omissions from the story. For instance, after remaining relatively faithful to the HB version—except for the introduction of two rather innocuous details at the start of the narrative (i.e., the Shechemites "were holding a festival" and "Dinah went into the city to see the finery of the women" [Josephus, *Ant.* 1.337 {Thackeray, LCL}; cf. Gen 34:1])—Josephus expands on the original tale when he explicitly describes Jacob's dilemma: should he reject the request of a foreign dignitary or give his daughter to a foreigner?

(Josephus, *Ant.* 1.338). This question is not overtly raised in Gen 34; instead, the laconic text simply reports that “Jacob held his peace until they [i.e., his sons] came” (Gen 34:5). Though Jacob may have pondered the matter that Josephus projects onto him, the ancient story does not offer such insight into Jacob’s mind. In all likelihood, Josephus’ hypothetical reconstruction of this crisis probably reflects Josephus’ mindset more than Jacob’s. In view of Josephus’ own life, he would be well aware of the difficulty of refusing a request by an esteemed foreigner. He would also be sensitive to the pervasive angst among his fellow Jews regarding intermarriage.<sup>512</sup> The imaginary council between Jacob and his sons is also absent from Gen 34. There is only a vague acknowledgment that “[w]hen they heard of it, the men were indignant and very angry, because he [i.e., Shechem] had committed an outrage in Israel by lying with Jacob’s daughter” (Gen 34:7). How “the men” or Jacob’s sons learned of the offense is neither disclosed nor is there any mention of the family deliberations.

Up to this point, Josephus’ recension displays only the faintest connection to the “two-sword” *traditum*, largely because of his considerable reworking of the story. That fact notwithstanding, the most significant link with the “two-sword” *traditum* occurs quite inadvertently when Josephus contrasts Simeon and Levi with the other brothers. The latter “held their peace, not knowing what ought to be done.” But not Simeon and Levi, for they mutually devise a plan for how they will avenge their sister and punish Shechem, which they carry out with dispatch (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.339-340 [Thackeray, LCL]). In other words, when Josephus juxtaposes Simeon and Levi against the other brothers, omits any reference whatsoever to the negotiations and subsequent circumcision,<sup>513</sup> and concludes his rendition by mentioning Jacob’s horror, it seems

---

<sup>512</sup> For early interpreters’ stress on Shechem’s foreignness, see Kugel, “The Story of Dinah,” 15-17.

<sup>513</sup> According to Feldman, Josephus omits any reference to circumcision “[b]ecause he realized how unfavorably the whole circumcision incident, including the massacre of the Hivites while they were weak and the taking of spoil from them by Simeon and Levi (Gen. 34:13-29), would be viewed by his non-Jewish readers, Josephus, as we shall see, omits it completely (*Ant.* 1.338-40). Instead, just as Dinah had been ravished during a festival, so they are slaughtered, measure for measure, during a festival.” Feldman, “Remember Amalek!”, 74, n. 116; cf. op. cit., 159-167. Though Feldman detects ideological purposes in Josephus’ omission, is it realistic to think that the Romans (or other peoples for that matter) would really take offense at the slaughter of sore Shechemites? Is it not possible that Simeon and Levi’s ruse could have elicited approval (and laughter), since Jacob’s sons were able to deceive the Shechemites so easily? For Feldman’s complete appraisal of Josephus’ significant omissions and emendations to the Dinah story, see

clear that one of Josephus' main purposes is to promote Jacob's innocence and honor even further.

In actuality, however, Josephus promotes the "two-sword" *traditum*. As he recasts the story and tries to spin it so that Jews spurn intermarriage and Jacob is not defamed, the lore around Simeon and Levi is magnified. They are the family members who vindicate their sister. They are the ones who do not permit a foreigner to defame their family's identity and honor. When they zealously defend and rescue their sister, they demonstrate that they are national heroes who actualize vengeance and justify violent retaliation.

In sum, Josephus' version of the Shechem episode provides further support for the transmission of the "two-sword" *traditum*. Although Josephus is an unconscious and inadvertent witness of the "two-sword" *traditum*, his refraction of the tale entails all four motifs of the "two-sword" *traditum* as he rewrites it for people of his time.

### 3.4.4 Summary of the "Two-Sword" *Traditum* in Other Jewish Writings

Despite some apparent, over-riding moral, cultural and ethnic concerns (e.g., virtue [Philo]; intermarriage [Philo, Josephus]; and preservation of Jacob's honor [Josephus]), the "two-sword" *traditum* is corroborated in all three Jewish writings scrutinized in this section. First, all three authors (i.e., Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus) make explicit mention of the Shechem

---

op. cit., 157-167. Christopher Begg puts forward two reasons for Josephus' extensive reworking. Begg writes: "With Gentile readers in mind, Josephus, first of all, retells the story to both reassure them and to counteract their prejudices about his people. In particular, his presentation eliminates any suggestion that Jews are deceitful in their dealings with other peoples or that they are looking to impose circumcision on them (compare 34,13-17)...As for his co-religionists, Josephus rewrites Gen 34 so as to insinuate several lessons of continuing significance to contemporary Jews, i.e., the necessity of avoiding both 'unlawful' intermarriage on the one hand, and the 'Zealot-like' behavior exhibited by Levi and Simeon on the other...For an apologist like Josephus, Gen 34 is in many respects an 'embarrassing' component of the Biblical record...[Therefore,]...he opts rather to thoroughly rework the offending passage in order to make it a more suitable vehicle for the various messages he is attempting to convey to his double audience." For these comments and Begg's comparison of Gen 34 and Josephus' retelling, see Christopher Begg, "Josephus' Retelling of Genesis 34," in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. A. Wénin; Leuven: University, 2001), 599-605, esp. 604-605. Although Begg's double rationale is possible, it presumes that Josephus views Gen 34 as "an 'embarrassing' component of the Biblical record"—a highly speculative proposition. In my opinion, some (a lot?) of the reworking could be the result of confabulation, i.e., filling in memory gaps by means of fabrication rather than directed toward dual aims because two audiences were under consideration.

episode. Second, the “two-sword” motifs appear throughout these works. Simeon and Levi are held in high regard because: they defend family identity and honor (*Migr., Mut., L.A.B., Ant.*); they vindicate and rescue their sister from the clutches of a foreigner (*Migr., Mut., L.A.B., Ant.*); they act to defend national identity and honor (*Migr., Mut., Ant.*); and vengeance against Shechem is justified on account of his despicable deed (*Migr., Mut., L.A.B., Ant.*).

### 3.5 Chapter Summary and Preview

The goal of this chapter was to establish that the “two-sword” *traditum* is attested in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. The transmission of the tradition was corroborated, since most of the texts make direct allusion to the Shechem and Dinah incident and repeatedly show evidence of the four motifs along with zeal—a trait that other HB stories (e.g., Phinehas and the Levites) associate with the ancient tradition. As the ancient story was reworked and rewritten by means of omissions, additions, and adaptations, the lore associated with Simeon and Levi—the eponymous ancestors who took up their swords to avenge the desecration of their sister Dinah—was amplified, intensified, and accentuated.

There were two explicit references to the tradition in the Apocrypha (*Jdt, 4 Macc.*). In these two writings, the motif of national identity and honor was also noted. The motifs of family honor and identity as well as vindication of an honored one were detected in *4 Macc.* In addition, the depiction of zeal as an admirable trait was present in two writings (*Jdt, 4 Macc.*), a feature that makes an indirect link with the “two-sword” *traditum* because of its subsequent HB association with the Levites and Phinehas. Of the two apocryphal writings investigated, the “two-sword” *traditum* was most pronounced in *Jdt.* Besides explicit mention of the Shechem episode and incorporation of two motifs, the book notably amplified the tradition with the addition of divine assistance and sanction (i.e., God supplies the sword; God takes vengeance) and the community’s endorsement of the use of deceit to defeat an enemy.

When the analysis examined the Pseudepigrapha, explicit allusion occurred in each of the writings analyzed. The motif of family identity and honor was found in all five writings and vindication of an honored one undoubtedly appeared in three writings (*Jub. T. Levi*, Theod.). National identity and honor was clearly detected in three of the pseudepigraphal writings (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*, Theod.) and perhaps in *Jos. Asen.*, too. Although *Jos. Asen.* qualifies the motif that vengeance is justified (i.e., it belongs to God), the theme occurred in every document except *Ar. Levi*. Finally, as these works exploited and reworked the Shechem episode, intermarriage was proscribed (*Jub. T. Levi*), the priesthood of Levi was extolled (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*, *Jos. Asen.*), and religious zeal was praised as an honorable trait (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*, *Jos. Asen.*). Though all the pseudepigraphal writings abbreviated and streamlined the ancient anecdote, *Jub.*, *T. Levi*, Theodotus, and *Jos. Asen.* were particularly notable for the way they recast the story about Simeon and Levi: as their feat was amplified and accentuated, the lore associated with them increased dramatically.

In authors of other Jewish writings (Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus), the Shechem episode was explicitly referenced though in extremely truncated entries and most often for tangential aims. The magnitude of national identity and honor was attested in Philo and Josephus (*Migr.*, *Mut.*, *Ant.*). The motifs of family identity and honor, vindication of an honored one, and justified vengeance were observed in all of the texts scrutinized (*Migr.*, *Mut.*, *L.A.B.*, *Ant.*). But whereas vengeance was unequivocally justified and encouraged in Philo so that reason and virtue triumph over passion and pleasure, retaliatory vengeance was ironically justified in Josephus. Although his main objective was to discourage intermarriage and advance Jacob's honor, Josephus' portrayal of Simeon and Levi as brothers who zealously intervene on behalf of their sister ironically magnified their legendary status.

In sum, the aim of this chapter was to describe the refraction of the "two-sword" *traditum* in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods as the ancient tale was reworked and rewritten. In most instances, explicit reference or allusion to the Gen 34 narrative was used to identify the pertinent

texts. Once the texts were identified, two additional parameters were utilized to analyze and track the evolution and refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum*: the four “two-sword” motifs identified in the previous chapter and significant changes to the Gen 34 tale (e.g., omissions, additions, and adaptations). During its *traditio*, a number of noteworthy modifications to the original story were detected. These changes occurred as the various authors used the “two-sword” *traditum* for a variety of diverse purposes (e.g., to proscribe intermarriage, to elevate the Levitical priesthood, to promote virtue).<sup>514</sup> Yet despite these adaptations, as the four motifs were amplified and refracted, the basic identity and form of the tradition was consistently transmitted in such a way that it became part of the rich religious and cultural heritage of first century Judaism and thus contributed an important narrative for interpreting Luke 22:35-38.<sup>515</sup>

In closing, a brief summary of the project thus far and a preview of the next chapter are apposite. Chapter two identified the provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum* and traced its subsequent development and transmission in the HB. Chapter three tracked the tradition as it was refracted in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings. Having completed the first aim of this thesis (i.e., identifying, describing, and tracing the “two-sword” *traditum* from its source throughout its evolution in the HB, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish

---

<sup>514</sup> As Collins reviews “these Jewish versions of the story,” he identifies “some persistent features”—two of which align with my reading. He writes: “First, an act which is of dubious virtue in Genesis is now repeatedly justified...Second, in every case except Josephus the paradigmatic implications of the story are spelled out. In *T. Levi*, the story explains why the people who live in Shechem are foolish. In *Jub.*, the story grounds a prohibition against intermarriage. In *Jdt*, the action of Simeon is paradigmatic for Judith herself...Third, the story is usually related to anti-Samaritan polemic.” Collins, “Epic of Theodotus,” 97-98. For a perceptive critique regarding Collins’ third feature about “anti-Samaritan polemic,” see Pummer, “Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings,” 177-188. For a rather expansive list of motifs (e.g., “Sword from Heaven,” “Levi Opposed Circumcision,” “A Sincere Proposal,” “Killed One Each”) derived from the *T. Levi* (fourteen in all), see Kugel, “Story of Dinah,” 1-34. While it is possible to consider the possibility that *T. Levi* entails fourteen motifs, I tend to view a “motif” as a broader theme category than Kugel. In my judgment, his motif suggestions are simply too specific and narrow to be viewed as “motifs.”

<sup>515</sup> Regarding tradition adaptation and amplification, Douglas Knight keenly observes the following: “a stream of tradition can extend to new experiences, new materials, oral and written traditions of different origin, and thus it can expand itself and undergo change. It will retain its identity and its existence as a tradition stream as long as the homogenous development of its own conceptual design maintains control of the way in which new impulses are assimilated.” In my estimation, he also insightfully points out that “an Old Testament text needs to be examined in connection with the traditions, streams, and specific movements of thought which shaped it, for only then will the exegete, having analyzed it also form-critically, be able to comprehend this text as a living intellectual occurrence instead of as a detached product of the mind.” Douglas A. Knight, *Tradition and Theology*, 197, 213, cf. 310-315.

writings), the fourth chapter takes up the final task: reading Luke's sword-logion (Luke 22:35-38) in light of this ancient, well-known Israelite tradition.

## 3.6 Appendix

### 3.6.1 Sirach (Late Third to Early Second Century B.C.E.)

All in all, very little consideration is given to Jacob and his immediate family in Sirach's "Hymn in Honor of Our Ancestors" (Sir 44:1-50:29). Jacob merits only a cursory mention and—along with his father Isaac—merely serves as a bridge between Abraham and Moses (Sir 44:19-45:5, esp. 44:22-23). Furthermore, neither Simeon nor Levi—two of Jacob's twelve sons—are referred to by name except for the fact that Aaron is "of the tribe of Levi" (Sir 45:6).

These features notwithstanding, Sirach appears to include some vague references to the "two-sword" *traditum* in the hymn; and even though absolute certainty is unattainable, this portion of Sirach is nonetheless evocative of the "two-sword" *traditum* for several reasons. First, the honor that Aaron and Phinehas are given is notable, which is confirmed not only by the lofty tribute they receive but also by the length of the accolades that are heaped upon them (Sir 45:6-26). For instance, Aaron is awarded the priesthood, "an everlasting covenant," and chosen "to minister to the Lord and serve as priest" (Sir 45:7-22, esp. vv. 7, 15). Though "[o]utsiders conspired against him," the Lord destroyed them (Sir 45:18-19). In like manner, Phinehas—who "ranks third in glory"—stood firm when the people turned away from the Lord to idols and, as a result, "a covenant of friendship was established with him...that he and his descendants should have the dignity of the priesthood forever" (Sir 45:23-24).

Second, as heirs of the priesthood, both Aaron and Phinehas—along with their offspring—are obliged to preserve Israel's national identity and honor. Just as Aaron was "to teach Jacob...and to enlighten Israel" and Phinehas was "zealous in the fear of the Lord...and made atonement for Israel," their descendants are "to judge [the Lord's] people with justice, / so that their prosperity may not vanish, / and that their glory may endure through all their generations" (Sir 45:17, 23, 26).



Third, the motif of safeguarding national identity and honor is further promulgated via a cornucopia of heroes from Israel's past. These leaders are extolled for defending the nation by opposing internal threats and defeating her enemies in order to uphold Israel's national identity and honor. Using words that echo the admirable feat of Simeon and Levi, Jesus Ben Sira says of Joshua: "How glorious he was when he lifted his hands / and brandished his *sword* against the cities!" (Sir 46:2; italics added). Like Phinehas, both Joshua and Caleb "opposed the congregation, / restrained the people from sin, / and still their wicked grumbling" (Sir 46:7). The author pleads that "the names of those who have been honored [i.e., the judges] live again in their children!" (Sir 46:12). Sirach's author also mentions the celebrated victories of Samuel and David over Israel's enemies (Sir 46:13-20; 47:2-11; respectively) and then bemoans the ironic imprudence of Solomon and the folly of Rehoboam and Jeroboam (Sir 47:12-25).

As the national rehearsal continues, Ben Sira commends Elijah for "his zeal" who was "glorious...in his wondrous deeds!"...and "anointed kings to inflict retribution" (Sir 48:1-11, esp. vv. 2-3, 8). Moreover, "[n]ever in his lifetime did [Elisha] tremble before any ruler" (Sir 48:12). Hezekiah, Isaiah, and Josiah are revered for their faithfulness to the Lord (Sir 48:17-49:3). "Except for David and Hezekiah and Josiah, all of them [i.e., the kings] were great sinners...[who]...gave their power to others, / and their glory to a foreign nation" (Sir 49:4-5). Though these unfaithful rulers rejected the prophets (e.g., Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve), they are the ones "who comforted the people of Jacob and delivered them with confident hope" (Sir 49:6-10). Both Zerubbabel and Nehemiah are to be honored for what they did in rebuilding the temple and Jerusalem as well as Simon son of Onias who repaired the temple and served as high priest from 219-196 B.C.E. (Sir 49:11-13; 50:1-22). After extolling many of Israel's national heroes and lamenting some of the nation's failed leaders, Ben Sira concludes his protracted hagiographic hymn with a benediction that blesses God and seeks his blessing for the people (Sir 50:22-24).

Yet one of the most compelling reason for associating Ben Sira's hymn with the "two-sword" *traditum* is perhaps his denunciation of Shechem during the hymn's concluding curse:

“Two nations my soul detests, / and the third is not even a people: / Those who live in Seir, and the Philistines, / and the foolish people that live in Shechem” (Sir 50:25-26). Simply by invoking the name “Shechem”—and without enumerating any specific details of that ancient, initial clash between the sons of Jacob and Hamor and Shechem—Ben Sira uses an early metaphor that urges the people to maintain their national identity and honor. The city of Shechem is wretched. It is a city that endorses all sorts of repugnant practices, such as intermarriage. It promotes abhorrent idolatrous practices that began when Jeroboam rose to power and were continued by all of Israel’s kings. This notorious city and the leaders who rule there—from Jacob’s time until the present—pollute and corrupt the people of God (1 Kgs 12:1-33; cf. Sir 47:23-25).<sup>516</sup> Accordingly, Ben Sira condemns unequivocally any nation or city-state that resembles Shechem, Seir or the Philistines, because these enemies threaten Israel’s national identity and honor.<sup>517</sup>

In sum, while the reference to the “two-sword” *traditum* may seem a bit vague in Sirach, the allusion to Shechem, the continual praise of Israel’s heroes who vanquish her enemies, and the recurring concern with Israel’s national identity and honor in the book’s hymn all seem to suggest that the “two-sword” *traditum* is embedded in this early second century B.C.E. document. Finally, although the tradition is present, it does not experience any major revisions.

### **3.6.2 1 Esdras (Second Century B.C.E.?)**

Both Sirach and 1 Esdras stress the same “two-sword” motif: national identity and honor. But whereas Sirach’s connection with the “two-sword” *traditum* is backed by an assortment of supporting reasons noted in the previous section, the same cannot be said for 1 Esdras; and like the book of Ezra, which 1 Esdras mimics along with smaller portions of 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah, the associations with Gen 34 are subtle at best.<sup>518</sup>

---

<sup>516</sup> For more on Shechem, see chapter two, n. 253.

<sup>517</sup> This passage was later used by the Hasmoneans (i.e., Judeans) to condemn the Samaritans during the late second century B.C.E. and the first century B.C.E. For more on this subject, see n. 474, 490 above.

<sup>518</sup> For more on Ezra’s connection with the “two-sword” *traditum*, see chapter two, pp. 159-160.

Such that it is, the germane portion of 1 Esdras begins when Ezra the scribe (priest) and many other people return to Jerusalem based on the edict of Artaxerxes. They carry “the holy vessels of the Lord” for the temple and also deliver “the king’s orders” to leaders in Judah as they return (1 Esd 8:1-67). Shortly after arriving in Jerusalem and upon completions of these tasks, Ezra learns that “[t]he people of Israel and the rulers and the priests and the Levites have not put away from themselves the alien peoples of the land and their pollutions” (1 Esd 8:69). The specific transgression they had committed was to marry “the daughters of these people,” which polluted “the holy race” (1 Esd 8:70).

At once, Ezra is grieved by this news, tears his garments, pulls his hair and beard, and prays to the Lord (1 Esd 8:71-90). During his prayer, Ezra rehearses God’s decree that the people of Israel were not to give their daughters in marriage to foreigners nor take foreign daughters as wives (1 Esd 8:84). They also were not ever to seek peace with them (1 Esd 8:85). When the people—notably “the leaders of the priests and Levites”—see Ezra’s reaction and overhear his prayer, they too are grieved, moved to repentance, and immediately take an oath to “put away all [their] foreign wives, with their children,” a pledge that is honored as soon as the pragmatic details of the process are worked out (1 Esd 8:91-9:36).

In sum, although the link with the “two-sword” motif of national identity and honor is faint and tentative at best, there is some justification for concluding that it is present in this section of 1 Esdras. Despite no direct allusion to the incidents narrated in Gen 34, Simeon and Levi certainly opposed any sort of marriage arrangement between their sister Dinah and Shechem, a foreigner. Their conduct resonates well with the events reported in 1 Esdras and is especially noticeable as the narrative reiterates Israel’s long-standing mandate forbidding inter-marriage with foreigners and describes the response of the people.<sup>519</sup>

---

<sup>519</sup> In his dispute with Fewell and Gunn, Sternberg makes a point of stressing the prohibition against intermarriage and the connection between Gen 34 and Deut 7:1-4; 22:28-29. He says, “[T]he allusion to Genesis 34, down to echoes of language, is firm, revealing, indeed paradigmatic.” A similar link between Ezra, 1 Esdras, and Gen 34 also seems to exist, though I would probably not express it as strongly. See Sternberg, “Biblical Poetics and Sexual Politics: From Reading to Counterreading,” 482-483.

*In nuce*, the correlation with the “two-sword” *traditum*, though weak, is feasible when this chronicle is evaluated in light of the effort to maintain Israel’s national identity and honor. It is also possible—though to a lesser degree—that the motif of family identity and honor is also addressed, since the men who put away foreign wives are listed as the narration concludes (1 Esd 9:18-36). Finally, it is important to note that even if a connection to the “two-sword” *traditum* is granted, the tradition does not undergo any significant changes.

### 3.6.3 *Testament of Simeon (Second Century B.C.E.)*

Like the *T. Levi*, the *Testament of Simeon* (hereafter *T. Sim.*) is found in the *T. 12 Patr.* Yet whereas the *T. Levi* makes explicit reference to Shechem and thus to the “two-sword” *traditum*, *T. Sim.* does not. Instead, more than half of the *T. Sim.* narrates Simeon’s regret for his jealousy and envy of Joseph. During this portion of the testament, Simeon repents of his conduct and describes the self-destructive nature of envy (*T. Sim.* 1:1-5:3). Then, as the book moves into the last half, Simeon warns his sons about warring with the sons of Levi and he exhorts them to “divest [them]selves of envy and every hardness of heart” so that a variety of personal and familial blessings may follow (*T. Sim.* 5:4-9:2). For these reasons the *T. Sim.* only acts in a supportive role for the refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum*.

Even though the *T. Sim.* precedes the *T. Levi* in the *T. 12 Patr.*—Simeon and Levi are Jacob’s second and third sons, respectively—the *T. Sim.* is subservient to the greater aim of both the *T. 12 Patr.* and the *T. Levi*: the elevation of Levi (and Judah).<sup>520</sup> This objective is evident just before Simeon dies when he says:

And now, my children, be obedient to Levi and to Judah. Do not exalt yourselves above these two tribes, [because from them will arise the Savior come from God]. For the Lord will raise up from Levi someone as high priest and from Judah someone as king [God and man]. He will save all the gentiles and the tribe of Israel (*T. Sim.* 7:1-2).<sup>521</sup>

---

<sup>520</sup> Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 778-780.

<sup>521</sup> *T. Sim.* translation is from Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 785-788. Brackets [ ] indicate later Christian interpolations. These Christian emendations do not significantly affect my argument for two reasons. First, since my aim is to establish the religious and cultural background for Luke’s sword saying, it is ultimately immaterial whether that background originates in

Levi's ascendancy is also proclaimed after Simeon exhorts his children to follow Joseph's example of sexual purity (*T. Sim.* 5:1-3), he warns them of future penalty when they fight against "the sons of Levi."

For I have seen in a copy of the book of Enoch that your sons will be ruined by promiscuity, and they shall injure with a sword the sons of Levi. But they shall not be able to withstand Levi, because he shall wage the Lord's war and will triumph over all your battalions. These forces distributed among Levi and Judah will be few in number, and from you there will be no one for leadership, just as our father predicted in his blessings (*T. Sim.* 5:4-6).

From these citations, two reasons are supplied for Levi's admiration: he is the Lord's "high priest" and "he shall wage the Lord's war" (*T. Sim.* 7:2; 5:5, respectively). In both instances, deference is given to the Levi; he—along with Judah and Joseph—is to be highly esteemed.<sup>522</sup>

In contrast to Levi, adulation of Simeon is muted considerably. After identifying his parents—"I was born of Jacob, a second son for my father; and Leah, my mother, called me Simeon because the Lord had heard her prayer" (*T. Sim.* 2:2)—Simeon describes himself as one who "did not hold back from any exploit, nor did I fear anything. My heart was firm, my courage was high, and my feelings were dispassionate" (*T. Sim.* 2:3-4). Simeon then acknowledges that it is "by the Most High, manly courage is given to men in soul and body" (*T. Sim.* 2:5). But what is most surprising about this self-characterization is its glaring omission. In short, it is not followed with a description of the incident at Shechem. Nothing about that event is even mentioned—neither the participants nor the city. In spite of that fact Simeon's words nonetheless appear to

---

Jewish or Christian sources. As I see it, both played a formative role. Along a similar line of thought, Slingerland argues for a more inclusive approach that allows for "the double origin of the document. It makes room for the possibility, that is, that this source may reveal the contours of life in both Jewish and Christian communities." Slingerland, *Testaments*, 107. Second, based on my reading, the Christian insertions have little impact on the Shechem episode. In fact, if sufficient evidence could demonstrate that Christian redactors altered the Shechem episode and in such a way reinforced its link with the "two-sword" *traditum*, such revisions would be welcome and further support my thesis.

<sup>522</sup> For further discussion on Joseph and Judah's preeminence in Gen 49, the background text for *T. 12 Patr.*, see De Hoop, *Gen 49*, 114-148, 180-224, 352-355, 522-538, 569-574.

allude to that affair. Indeed, can a case be made that Simeon's courage is displayed anywhere else more prominently than in his attack on Shechem?<sup>523</sup>

In sum, there are three reasons for concluding that *T. Sim.* alludes to and refracts the “two-sword” *traditum*. First, *T. Sim.* uses language both of Simeon and Levi that is evocative of the Shechem episode despite no direct reference. Simeon's self-description resonates with his role in the slaughter of the Shechemites (*T. Sim.* 2:3-5) and Levi is held in high regard because “he shall wage the Lord's war” (*T. Sim.* 5:5). Second, this comment about Levi also seems to be an indirect allusion to Levi's role in the attack on Shechem as well as a reference to later descendants' (i.e., the Levites, Phinehas) who displayed righteous zeal at Mt. Sinai and in the wilderness (Exod 32:25-32; Num 25:1-18). In other words, past history indicates that “the sons of Levi” defend the nation's (and family's?) identity and honor even if it means that they must attack Simeon's descendants. Furthermore, their act of vengeance against Simeon's sons is justified because of their “promiscuity” (*T. Sim.* 5:4). Third, if Simeon's sons “divest [them]selves of envy and every hardness of heart,” the eponymous ancestor Simeon declares that “[his] bones will flourish as a rose in Israel...Holy ones shall be multiplied from me forever and ever” (*T. Sim.* 6:2). As a result, the identity and honor of the family and nation will increase, since “the seed of the Canaan will be destroyed, and there will be no posterity of Amalek. All the Cappadocians shall be destroyed and all the Hittites shall be wholly obliterated” (*T. Sim.* 6:3).

All in all, *T. Sim.* suggests a faint—though not conclusive—link with the “two-sword” *traditum*. Simeon is courageous and Levi wages war. Their actions and those of their

---

<sup>523</sup> Kugel raises a similar question: “Why is not a large segment of the *Testament of Simeon* devoted to the Dinah incident, just as a large part of the *Testament of Levi* was?” Whereas I see a possible allusion to the Shechem episode, Kugel does not, “for nowhere in this testament is that episode mentioned or even alluded to.” In fact, Kugel concludes that “[t]he *Testament of Levi*'s view of the Dinah story is in conflict with that found in the *Testament of Simeon*.” Kugel, “The Story of Dinah,” 28, 34. According to him, “[t]he answer is obvious. The *Testament of Simeon* seeks to deny, or at least pass over in silence, Simeon's role in the affair. The incident is not mentioned, and Jacob's blessing of Simeon and Levi...is instead interpreted in such a way as to have it refer to some unknown war between Levi and Simeon. And why is that? It seems likely that the author of the *Testament of Simeon* (like the authors of *Jdt* and *Jub.*) viewed revenge on Shechem as entirely a good thing.” *Op. cit.*, 31. While Kugel's explanation is possible, that does not make it probable or seem likely. And even though Kugel puts forward a creative reason for the interpolation of the unknown war between Levi and Simeon (i.e., to explain the catastrophic reduction in the population of the tribe of Simeon), it ultimately remains a mystery. For more on this topic, see Kugel, *op. cit.*, 28-32, esp. 29.

descendants not only reflect what happened at Shechem but also preserve both family and national identity and honor.

### 3.6.4 Appendix Summary

Due to their relatively indirect references to the “two-sword” *traditum* Sirach, 1 Esdras, and the *T. Sim.* can only serve in a secondary role for the transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum*. Sirach is the lone document that includes an explicit reference to the Shechem episode. In addition, Sirach’s recurrent adulation of Israel’s heroes and the stress on Israel’s national identity and honor in the book’s hymn all seem to suggest that the “two-sword” *traditum* is embedded in this document.

Despite no direct allusion to the incidents narrated in Gen 34, the stance of 1 Esdras appears to reflect the attitude of Simeon and Levi when they opposed any sort of marriage arrangement between Dinah and Shechem.<sup>524</sup> Confirmation of the “two-sword” *traditum* is further indicated when 1 Esdras is examined in light of Israel’s struggle to maintain national identity and honor and thus corresponds well with Israel’s long-standing mandate forbidding intermarriage with foreigners

Finally, the *T. Sim.* suggests only the slimmest association with the “two-sword” *traditum*. With no direct mention of the Shechem incident, *T. Sim.* nonetheless seems to corroborate the “two-sword” *traditum* via its admiration of Simeon and Levi’s behavior (i.e., zealous, courageous, battlefield conduct) so that both family and national identity and honor are preserved.

---

<sup>524</sup> In his dispute with Fewell and Gunn, Sternberg makes a point of stressing the prohibition against intermarriage and the connection between Gen 34 and Deut 7:1-4; 22:28-29. He says, “[T]he allusion to Genesis 34, down to echoes of language, is firm, revealing, indeed paradigmatic.” A similar link between Ezra, 1 Esdras, and Gen 34 also seems to exist, though I would probably not express it as strongly. See Sternberg, “Biblical Poetics and Sexual Politics: From Reading to Counterreading,” 482-483.

## Chapter Four: Luke's Use of the "Two-Sword" *Traditum*

"The man who is misunderstood has always this advantage over his enemies, that they do not know his weak point or his plan of campaign."<sup>525</sup>

### 4.1 Introduction

In chapter two I proposed that Gen 34 was the provenance for the "two-sword" *traditum*. My analysis of that pericope centered on the conduct of Simeon and Levi and identified four motifs (i.e., family identity and honor, vindication or defense of an honored one, national identity and honor, justified vengeance). References that alluded to the "two-sword" *traditum* and the four literary themes were subsequently followed throughout the HB in the final portion of chapter two.

Chapter three examined how the "two-sword" *traditum* was refracted through later Jewish writings as it was reworked and rewritten in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings during the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. A literary constellation consisting of the ancient story's chief protagonists (i.e., Simeon, Levi, Dinah, and/or Shechem) along with one or more of the four motifs was used to track the "two-sword *traditum*" in writings from the second century B.C.E. through the second century C.E. As the tradition was followed in these documents, a religious and cultural literary backdrop for the anomalous sword-logion in the Gospel of Luke became evident not only from its continual reappearance but also from the tale's ensuing modifications, embellishments, and adaptations.

Based on the preceding evidence, which established and corroborated the existence of a "two-sword" *traditum*, this chapter will analyze Luke 22:35-38 in view of that Israelite tradition

---

<sup>525</sup> Gilbert K. Chesterton, *Heretics / Orthodoxy* (Nelson's Royal Classics; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 25.



despite no direct evidence linking Luke's sword-logion with that ancient tradition. In some ways, this proposition corresponds well with Sandmel's claim that the relationship between Philo and Paul is "not from direct literary dependence but rather out of a common atmosphere."<sup>526</sup> In sum, I assert that one way to understand Luke's sword-logion is to explore it in light of the "two-sword" *traditum*, a tradition that was part of the "common atmosphere" in which Luke lived. Luke and his audience shared this "common atmosphere" with the broader culture. They were familiar with and also participants in this intertextual dialogue or intertextuality. It was a cultural intertextuality that reflected the non-literary and literary traditions, values, concepts, and metaphors of that era and also served as a reservoir that Luke could utilize when writing his gospel.

Before I take up that investigation, however, it is vital to examine how Luke made use of Israel's scriptures and traditions. For, if Luke 22:35-38—which is unique to the Gospel of Luke—was crafted in light of the "two-sword" *traditum*, it also seems reasonable to assume that other passages in Luke should display evidence of a similar literary style: mentioning, referring and/or alluding to Israel's scriptures and traditions. After analyzing Luke's sword-logion in light of the "two-sword" *traditum*, I will conduct a hypothetical reading of Luke's gospel and suggest how Luke's community might have heard other passages that appear to display some meaningful association with the "two-sword" *traditum* and Luke 22:35-38. Finally, I will propose a *Sitz im Leben* that may partially explain why some members of his community were adherents of the "two-sword" *traditum* and provide a rationale for the trajectory of Luke's gospel as he attempted to sever his community from that celebrated tradition.

## 4.2 Luke's Use of Israel's Scriptures and Traditions

One of the foundational assertions from the beginning of this project is that the "two-sword" *traditum* forms, at least in part, the intertextual context for interpreting Luke 22:35-38. Though not writing specifically about the present case, Richard Bauckham supports such a line of reasoning when he states:

---

<sup>526</sup> Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 150.

The general usefulness of the extracanonical Jewish literature for NT interpretation is obvious. Insofar as the context of Jesus, the early church, and the NT writings was Jewish, these writings provide us with most of what we know about that context (along with archaeological evidence and some references to Judaism and Jewish history in pagan literature).<sup>527</sup>

Bauckham also suggests that “[i]t is extremely probable that all the NT writers read some extracanonical Jewish literature and that some of them were very familiar with some of that literature.”<sup>528</sup> Moreover, since Luke declares in the prolegomena of his gospel that “after investigating everything very carefully from the very first, to write an orderly account, [παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς...γράψαι]” (Luke 1:3 NRSV), I propose that there is a high degree of probability—based on Luke’s opening declaration, extrapolating from Bauckham’s presupposition, and given the evidence that follows—that Luke was familiar with what I call the “two-sword” *traditum*.<sup>529</sup>

To press the previous point, while I neither know nor think it possible to determine whether Luke intentionally crafted his sword-logion with the “two-sword” *traditum* in mind, I do claim that that tradition was part of the “common atmosphere” during the first century of the Common Era. Consequently, before undertaking the primary objective of this chapter it is

---

<sup>527</sup> Richard Bauckham, “The Relevance of Extracanonical Jewish Texts to New Testament Study,” in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (ed. Joel B. Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 93.

<sup>528</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

<sup>529</sup> Bauckham wisely adds a number of cautions or limitations that are relevant for this project. First, he reminds us of “the famous warning issued by Samuel Sandmel against ‘parallelomania’ in NT studies.” Bauckham also notes that “[a] particular word or expression or image may have to be traced in a variety of texts before the significance of its occurrence in one can be evaluated.” Furthermore, he states that “[i]n most cases we cannot treat the Jewish literature as sources the NT writers used, but must see them as evidence of the ideas and terminology with which NT writers were familiar.” Finally, he points out that “[f]or a text to be relevant to NT interpretation, we need to be able to suppose (from various kinds of evidence, including the NT) either that Christianity was influenced by (or, in relevant cases, opposed) the particular kind of Judaism represented by the text, or that in relevant respects what the text says was not peculiar to the group that produced and read it, or that the writing in question was not restricted to a particular Jewish group but widely circulated.” All in all, I concur with Bauckham’s counsel and contend that: (1) I have sought to avoid “parallelomania;” (2) I have appropriately “traced” the “two-sword” *traditum* “in a variety of texts (see chapters two and three); (3) in no way am I suggesting that Luke used this tradition as a source—it is, as I have maintained all along—part of Luke’s religious and cultural atmosphere or, as Bauckham says, “evidence of the ideas and terminology with which NT writers were familiar;” and (4) I will demonstrate in my analysis of Luke 22:35-38 and other passages in Luke that the “two-sword” *traditum*, being “widely circulated,” is “relevant to NT interpretation.” Bauckham, “Relevance of Extracanonical Jewish Texts,” 94-96. For Sandmel’s warnings about the dangers of “parallelomania,” see Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 1-13.

important to describe how the Gospel of Luke makes use of Israel's scriptures and traditions in order to defend my premise that the "two-sword" *traditum* stands behind Luke's *Schwertwort*.

In my estimation, there are three basic ways in which Luke uses Israel's scriptures and traditions.<sup>530</sup> The most obvious way is direct citation.<sup>531</sup> Many times the source is not expressly

---

<sup>530</sup> The literature on Luke's use of the OT is extensive. Two noteworthy resources are: (1) Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington—Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995); and (2) Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997). In his thoughtful exposition, which I will engage from time to time in this chapter, Brawley argues that "Luke-Acts appropriates scripture in all its nuances with a dominant theocentric perspective." Op. cit., 1. Denova, too, finds ample links with the OT. She proposes that Luke "based the structural pattern of events in the narrative [i.e., Luke-Acts] on his reading of the text of Isaiah" ...and that "the way in which the books are arranged schematically finds a literary precedent in the Elijah/Elisha cycle in 1 Kings 17-2 Kings 13." After surveying previous Lukan research, she challenges rather decisively several widely-accepted notions, such as the proposition that the delay of the eschaton (Parousia) motivated Luke to modify his understanding of promise-fulfillment in the gospel and view "Gentile Christianity" as the fulfillment of prophecy in Acts. In her estimation, "reading Luke-Acts as a literary whole does not provide evidence that the 'theology' of the Gospel is different from the 'theology' of Acts." In addition, "the literary device of the 'fulfillment of prophecy' should not be understood as merely an apologetic device for isolated objectives, be it sympathy before the Roman state, a defense of Paul, or the justification of Gentile inclusion. It functions as the creative and binding element behind Luke's construction of the entire narrative." Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 26, 29, 79, 112. For more on this topic, see op. cit., 11-125. John Drury is confident that the Old Testament influenced Luke as much as "his Christian documents." John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1977), xi. A brief and useful resource is Craig A. Evans, "Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; eds. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 170-201. This essay is particularly applicable in the present context because Evans conducts a concise survey of five pseudepigraphal books (four of which refract the "two-sword" *traditum*) and then evaluates Luke in light of their literary styles to conclude that Luke is "radical paraphrase." Another short analysis on Luke's use of the OT is Helmer Ringgren, "Luke's Use of the Old Testament," *HTR* 79 (1986): 227-235. Other valuable works include: Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); David P. Moessner, ed., *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy* (Luke the Interpreter of Israel, vol. 1; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999); and Joseph B. Tyson, "Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Examples of the Use of the Old Testament Quotations in Luke and Acts," (Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1955).

<sup>531</sup> Richard B. Hays and Joel B. Green also identify *direct citation* as one way NT writers use the OT. See Richard B. Hays and Joel B. Green, "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers," in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (ed. Joel B. Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 226. Hays and Green's three other categories are: "summaries of OT history and teaching;" "the use of *type-scenes* in the NT;" and "*allusions* or *linguistic echoes*." They also offer a list of basic questions that should be asked when studying any NT text: (1) "What OT texts are cited or alluded to in this NT passage?" (2) "Does the text of the NT citation correspond exactly to any known textual tradition of the OT passage?" (3) "What is the original content of the passage in its OT setting? Does the writer's interpretation of the text appear to reflect a recognition of that original setting?" (4) "What can be learned about traditions of interpretation of the passage in ancient Jewish sources outside the NT?" (5) How does the OT passage function in the argument or narrative of the NT writer?" and (6) "What does the use of the text suggest about the NT writer's understanding of the relation between Israel and the church?" Op. cit., 227-228, 232. Up to this point in the project, the focus has been on answering question 4. Questions 1-3 and 5, which were initially discussed as part of the literature survey, will be addressed later in this chapter. Question 6, though important, is not a topic that I will consider. Peter Mallen proposes four categories for Luke's use of the OT: (1) "*explicit quotation* [that] may be defined as the verbal repetition of a known antecedent text, whose

identified in the introductory formula. For example, when Joseph and Mary bring Jesus “to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord” (Luke 2:22),<sup>532</sup> Luke explains this expression with the following: “(as it is written in the law of the Lord, ‘Every firstborn male shall be designated as holy to the Lord’)” (Luke 2:23). Although Luke quotes Exod 13:2 here, the citation is placed under a broad designation: “as it is written in the law of the Lord” (cf. Luke 2:24 and Lev 12:8). It is also significant to note that the NRSV translators place these words inside parentheses, since they apparently view it as an explanatory remark by Luke.<sup>533</sup>

---

presence is usually indicated by some type of introductory formula;” (2) “*verbal allusion* [that] may be defined as an informal reference to an earlier text that repeats a distinctive word or phrase but without using an introductory formula;” (3) “*conceptual allusion* [that] evokes an earlier text through a distinctive similarity in the event or character being described although expressed in different words;” and (4) “*narrative pattern* [that] may be defined as a series of events or interactions between characters whose similarity to those in an earlier text is apparent although the specific details and the language of expression may vary.” Peter Mallen, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (LNTS 367; London—New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 24. Thomas S. Moore offers four “Lucan citation techniques:” (1) “*quotation*,” which is “a significant reproduction” of a text; (2) “*explicit quotation*,” which is “a quotation with an introductory formula;” (3) “*allusion*,” which is a text with “a verbal or material parallel” to a specific text, but lacks “significant reproduction;” and (4) “*conceptual influence*,” which is “the presence of a connection to one or more...texts, but with precise verbal parallels to a specific...text lacking.” Thomas S. Moore, “Luke’s Use of Isaiah for the Gentile Mission and Jewish Rejection Theme in the Third Gospel” (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1995), 21. According to Denova, “Luke was consciously following Hellenistic literary forms, including historiography, novelistic elements, aretalogy, and narrative technique. And, simultaneously, he applied the literary devices of scriptural citation, typology, and narrative parallelism (which includes rhetorical invention).” Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 102; cf. 124. The various classification systems offered by these authors illustrates at least one inherent problem: it is a highly subjective endeavor, not only in terms of the number of categories, but also their boundaries, especially once one moves beyond direct citation. Moreover, even after naming and defining the categories there is the subjective element of deciding whether “the specific details and the language of expression”—to borrow Mallen’s jargon—are similar or sufficiently different and thus qualify as “distinctive” in each case. Since the main purpose for this section is to establish that Luke was aware and made use of Israel’s scriptures and traditions—irrespective of how the references are classified—I will forgo further discussion and direct readers to the works noted above. In my estimation, there are basically two categories: explicit citations (with and without introductory formulas) and allusions (obvious and implied)—to parse beyond these two groups is secondary to this project and an unproductive exercise. Therefore, I think it prudent not to debate the issue at present and simply point out that the examples I furnish are representative lists that were assembled primarily via my reading of the Gospel of Luke in order to demonstrate and/or illustrate how Luke used Israel’s scriptures and traditions.

<sup>532</sup> Unless otherwise identified, all quotations in this section are from the NRSV.

<sup>533</sup> Some other examples of explanatory notes include: the prevalent belief about Joseph being Jesus’ father (Luke 3:23); the reason for contradictory views of John the Baptist (Luke 7:29-30); tradition of washing hands (Mark 7:3-4); meaning of “Corban” (Mark 7:11); declaring all foods clean (Mark 7:19); (Matthew does not include any of these explanations from Mark presumably because they wrote to different audiences; cf. Matt 15:1-20); different name for “courtyard of the palace” (Mark 15:16); meaning of “Golgotha” (Mark 15:22); meaning of “Messiah” (John 1:41); Jesus did not baptize disciples (John 4:2); “Messiah” is also called “Christ” (John 4:25); “Sea of Galilee” also known as the “Sea of Tiberias” (John 6:1); Jesus’ brothers did not believe (John 7:5); meaning of Siloam (John 9:7); reason for Judas wanting to sell Mary’s perfume (John 12:6); when the disciples understand Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem (John 12:16); why people rejected Jesus (John 12:37-43); “The Place of the Skull” is called “Golgotha” in Hebrew (John 19:17); why they divided his clothes and why Jesus said “I am thirsty” (John 19:24, 28); why Jesus’ body was not left on the

This form of direct citation—that is, citing a passage of scripture without naming the exact source for the quote—is also found when the devil tempts Jesus (cf. Luke 4:4, 8, 10-12 and Deut 8:3; 6:13; and Ps 91:11-12 along with Deut 6:16; respectively).<sup>534</sup> I would include Mary's Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55) and Zechariah's Benedictus (Luke 1:67-79) in this category as well, since these compilations stitch together an expansive array of texts from the HB.<sup>535</sup> Luke 22:37 (cf. Isa 53:12), which I will address later in the chapter, follows this literary form, too.

At other times the source is definitively named in the introductory formula.<sup>536</sup> For example, at the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist, before inserting a citation from the OT, Luke declares, "[A]s it is written in the book of the words of the *prophet Isaiah*" (Luke 3:4a, emphasis added).<sup>537</sup> This literary style is also repeated at the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee. When he stands in the synagogue to read from the scriptures, Luke points out that "the

---

cross (John 19:31); why the witness's testimony is to be believed (John 19:35; 21:24-25); purpose for John's gospel (John 20:30-31); prediction about Peter's manner of death (John 21:19); and reason for rumor about the disciple whom Jesus' loved (John 21:23).

<sup>534</sup> Additional examples of this type, which may or may not include an introductory formula, are: Luke 7:27 (cf. Mal 3:1); Luke 8:10 (cf. Isa 6:9-10); Luke 10:26-27 (cf. Deut 6:4-9; Lev 19:18); Luke 13:35 (cf. Ps 118:26); Luke 18:13, 38-39 (cf. Pss 57:7; 51:1); Luke 19:38 (cf. Ps 118:26); Luke 19:40 (cf. Hab 2:11); Luke 19:46 (cf. Isa 56:7; Jer 7:11; Zech 14:21); Luke 20:17 (cf. Ps 118:22). For an outstanding analysis of the "figurative voices of scripture in the temptation of Jesus" (Luke 4:1-13), see Brawley, *Text to Text*, 15-26.

<sup>535</sup> While Simeon's blessing in Luke 2:28-32 may fall into this category, I consider it to be a form of oblique allusion, which is discussed toward the end of this section. Brawley concurs that the Magnificat appropriates "swells from Hannah's prayer" and "supercharges it with textual patterns from Genesis, Deuteronomy, 2 Kingdoms [i.e., 2 Sam], the Psalms, Isaiah, and Habakkuk." Brawley, *Text to Text*, 3-4.

<sup>536</sup> For more discussion on Luke's use of introductory formulas and a list of OT quotations in Luke, see Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition*, 52-54, 204-205, 213-214.

<sup>537</sup> Although I did not cite Luke's excerpt from Isaiah, Hays and Green use this passage to illustrate some of the complicating factors interpreters face when analyzing how a NT writer uses an OT text. They state, "A number of factors, then, complicate any straightforward discussion of the use of the OT by NT writers. These include problems with the status of the OT canon in the first century and a range of issues related to the texts available to and used by the NT writers. They quote texts in various ways, which show an eclectic freedom to select from among various available text forms readings most suitable for the purpose at hand...One must [also] allow for the possibility that NT authors worked from memory in citing some texts. Moreover, as well [sic] shall see, NT writers shaped their quotations of OT texts—even amending the language of the OT—so as to work at the interpretive task already in the way the text is cited." See Hays and Green, "Use of the Old Testament," 225. For their specific comments on Luke 3:3-6 and Luke's use of Isaiah, in particular, op. cit., 227, 234-235. Also see James A. Sanders, "Isaiah in Luke," in Evans and Sanders, *Luke and Scripture*, 14-25.

scroll of the *prophet Isaiah* was given to him. He unrolled the scroll and found the place where it was written:..." (Luke 4:17, emphasis added).<sup>538</sup>

A second way in which Luke uses Israel's scriptures and traditions is to name a well-known person or place,<sup>539</sup> refer to a familiar story, practice or tradition, or utilize a well-established metaphor or expression. For example, when the angel Gabriel appears to Zechariah in order to announce the birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1:8-23), Gabriel declares:

He [i.e., John] will turn many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God. With the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before him, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord (Luke 1:16-17).

This passage is noteworthy in that it specifically names two renowned figures (i.e., Elijah and Gabriel; see 1 Kgs 17-19, 21-2 Kgs 2 and Dan 8:16; 9:21, respectively) and also alludes to a celebrated tradition (i.e., the return of the prophet Elijah in Mal 3:1; 4:5-6).<sup>540</sup>

The second way of using Israel's scriptures and traditions also includes direct references to familiar stories along with some details from the ancestral stories.<sup>541</sup> For instance, Luke reports that Jesus defends his disciples when they gather and eat grain on the Sabbath by invoking

---

<sup>538</sup> Another example of this type is: "For David himself says in the book of Psalms, 'The Lord said to my Lord, / "Sit at my right hand, / until I make your enemies your footstool'" (Luke 20:42-43; cf. Ps 110:1). Denova views Luke 4:16-30 as the key for understanding "the structural pattern of Luke-Acts." Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 126-154.

<sup>539</sup> Of course, whether a person or place is "well-known" is a somewhat subjective determination and will vary considerably. On the one hand, some figures or places are so renowned that the very mention of their names instantly evokes an expansive repertoire of stories and metaphors (e.g., Aaron [Luke 1:5]; David [Luke 1:27, 32, 69; 2:4, 11; 18:38-39; 20:41-44]; Jacob [Luke 1:33; 3:34; 13:28; 20:37]; Abraham [Luke 1:55, 73; 3:8, 34; 13:12, 28; 16:19-31; 19:9; 20:37]; Elisha [Luke 4:27]; Moses [Luke 5:14; 9:30, 33; 16:30-31; 20:28, 37; 24:27, 44]; Sodom [Luke 10:12]); Satan [Luke 10:18; 11:18; 13:12; 22:3, 31]; Jericho [Luke 10:30; 18:35; 19:1]; Jonah/Nineveh [Luke 11:29-32]; Abel [Luke 11:51]; Isaac [13:28]; and Mount of Olives [Luke 19:29, 37; 21:37; 22:39]. On the other hand, others are generally less recognized though their names or places are known by careful, thorough readers of the scriptures (e.g., Abijah [Luke 1:5]; Asher [Luke 2:36]; and many of the names listed in Jesus' genealogy [Luke 3:23-38]).

<sup>540</sup> Even though the passage directly cites a small portion of Mal 4:5-6 (i.e., "He will turn the hearts of parents to their children"), Luke's free adaptation is lax enough to warrant its inclusion in the second category rather than the first. In addition, Elijah plays a prominent role in the first nine chapters of the Gospel of Luke, since he not only prefigures both John the Baptist and Jesus but also appears with Jesus at his transfiguration (cf. Luke 4:25-26; 7:11-17; 9:8, 19, 30, 33).

<sup>541</sup> Henry J. Cadbury uses the expression "reminiscence from the Old Testament" in his classic philological study to describe references or allusions to the OT. See Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), 10, n. 4.

David's example when he was fleeing from Saul (cf. Luke 6:1-5 and 1 Sam 21:1-6). Jesus will even ask the Pharisees bluntly, "Have you not read what David did when he and his companions were hungry?" (Luke 6:3).<sup>542</sup>

Besides naming well-known persons or referring to recognizable stories, Luke mentions—often in passing and without any explanation—a number of prominent Jewish traditions or expressions, including, but not limited to: "Son of God" (cf. Luke 1:35; 3:22; 4:3, 9, 41; 8:28; 9:35; 10:22; 22:70 and Ps 2); circumcision (cf. Luke 1:59; 2:21 and Gen 17:11-14; Josh 5:1-9); "Passover" and "the feast of Unleavened Bread" (cf. Luke 2:41; 22:1, 7-20 and Exod 12:1-28; Num 9:1-14); "Sabbath" (cf. Luke 4:16, 31; 6:1, 6; 13:10, 14-15; 14:3, 5; 23:54 and Gen 2:1-3; Exod 20:8-11; Deut 5:12-15); "Son of Man" (cf. Luke 5:24; 9:22, 44, 58; 12:8, 10, 40; 17:22-30; 18:8, 31; 19:10; 21:27, 36; 22:22, 48, 69; 24:7 and Ezek 2:1, 3; 3:1, 4, 17; Dan 7:13-14; 8:17; 10:16, 18); "Holy One" (cf. Luke 4:34 and Ps 71:22; 78:41; 89:18; Isa 1:4; 5:19, 24; 10:17, 20); "Messiah" (cf. Luke 2:11, 26; 3:15; 4:41; 9:20; 20:41; 22:67; 23:2, 35, 39; 24:26, 46 and 1 Sam 9:16; 10:1; 16:1-13; Ps 2:2); the Shema (cf. Luke 6:31; 10:27 and Deut 6:4-9 along with Lev 19:18); and the Lord as good (cf. Luke 18:19 and Ps 34:8; 100:5; 106:1; 107:1; 118:1, 29; Jer 33:11; Nah 1:7).

Luke also appears to assume his audience is aware of many other Jewish traditions that necessarily serve as vital background information if a story is to be properly understood. In short, he does not explain these traditions or expressions; rather, the author seems to presume that these "stock images"<sup>543</sup> are understood. For example, some of these traditions include: restoration of sight to the blind (cf. Luke 4:18; 18:41-42 and Isa 29:18; 35:5; 42:7, 16); prophetic "Woel" (cf. Luke 6:24-26; 10:13; 11:42-52; 17:1; 21:23; 22:22 and Isa 5:8-23 ["Ah!"]); Amos 5:18; 6:1, 4; Hab 2:6-20 ["Alas!"]); purity laws regarding a corpse (cf. Luke 7:14; 9:42; 10:31-32; 11:44

---

<sup>542</sup> Other examples include: Elijah's care for the widow (cf. Luke 4:25-26 and 1 Kgs 17:8-24); Elisha healing Naaman (cf. Luke 4:27 and 2 Kgs 5:1-19); the visit of the queen of the South (Sheba) with Solomon (cf. Luke 11:31 and 1 Kgs 10:1-10); stoning of Zechariah (cf. Luke 11:51 and 2 Chr 24:20-22); Noah and the flood (cf. Luke 17:26-27 and Gen 6:5-8:22); Lot, Lot's wife, and the destruction of Sodom (cf. Luke 17:28-29, 32 and Gen 19:1-29); and Moses and the burning bush (cf. Luke 20:37-38 and Exod 3:1-6).

<sup>543</sup> An expression borrowed from Brawley, *Text to Text*, 29.

and Num 19:10b-20); swine as unclean (cf. Luke 8:32; 15:15-16 and Lev 11:7; Deut 14:8); Hades or Sheol as a place of punishment (cf. Luke 10:15; 16:23 and Pss 9:17; 16:10; 31:17; 49:14; 55:15; Isa 5:14; 14:9-15); the ten commandments (cf. Luke 10:26-27; 18:20 and Exod. 20:1-17; Deut 5:1-21); prophets sent and rejected (cf. Luke 11:49; 13:34 and 2 Chr 36:14-16; Neh 9:26; Jer 26:20-23); Isa 14:1; 49:13-15; Hos 11:8; Mic 7:9); arrival of messianic king (cf. Luke 13:35; 19:29-40 and Ps 118:26; Zech 9:9; 14:4-9);<sup>544</sup> justice for widows (cf. Luke 18:1-8; 20:47 and Deut 10:17-18; 24:17-22; 27:19; Isa 1:17; Jer 7:5-7; Sir 35:17-19); and the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (cf. Luke 21:5-6, 20-24 and Isa 24:17-23; 64:10; Jer 4:5-18; 7:1-16; 22:5; 25:18; 26:1-6; 44:2, 6).<sup>545</sup>

---

<sup>544</sup> For more on Luke's use of Ps 118, see Sanders, "A Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118 in Luke's Entrance Narrative," in Evans and Sanders, *Luke and Scripture*, 140-153.

<sup>545</sup> Other Jewish traditions and expressions that furnish important background information, but play more modest roles in the Gospel of Luke, include: avoidance of strong drink or wine (cf. Luke 1:15 and Num 6:1-21 [Nazarites]; Judg 13:4 [Samson]; 1 Sam 1:11 [Samuel]; Jer 35:1-19 [Rechabites]); the disgrace of childlessness (cf. Luke 1:25 and Gen 16:1-4; 30:22-24; 1 Sam 1:3-28); the word of God coming to a prophet (cf. Luke 3:2 and Gen 15:1, 4; 1 Sam 15:10; 2 Sam 7:4; 24:11; Isa 38:4; Jer 1:2-4, 11; Ezek 1:3; Hos 1:1; Joel 1:1; Jonah 1:1; 3:1); the "winnowing fork" (cf. Luke 3:17 and Isa 41:15-16; Jer 15:7); forty days (cf. Luke 4:2 and Gen 7:4, 12, 17; 8:6; Exod 24:18; 34:28; Num 13:25; 14:34; 1 Kgs 19:18; Ezek 4:6); "wisdom's children" (cf. Luke 7:35 and Sir 4:11); test of a true prophet (cf. Luke 7:39 and Deut 18:21-22); purity laws about the issue of blood (cf. Luke 8:42 and Lev 15:19-30); divine presence as a cloud (cf. Luke 9:34 and Exod 13:21-22; 14:19-20; 16:10; 19:9; 24:16-18; 33:9-10; 40:34-40; Num 9:15-23); "faithless and perverse generation" (cf. Luke 9:41 and Deut 32:5, 20); respect for proper burial of parents (cf. Luke 9:59 and Gen 50:5; Tob 4:1-4); a disciple saying farewell to family (cf. Luke 9:61 and 1 Kgs 19:19-21); the importance of seventy leaders (cf. Luke 10:1, 17 and Exod 1:5; 24:1, 9; Num 11:16, 24-25; Deut 10:22); Israel as harvest (cf. Luke 10:2 and Jer 2:3); false leaders as wolves and Jesus as shepherd of his lambs (cf. Luke 10:3; 12:32 and Ezek 22:27; 34:1-31; 2 Esd 5:18; Isa 40:11); prohibition against greeting someone on the road (cf. Luke 10:4 and 2 Kgs 4:29); snakes and scorpions as evil entities (cf. Luke 10:19 and Deut 8:15; Ps 140:3; Jer 8:17; Ezek 2:6; Amos 5:9; Sir 21:2); daily bread (cf. Luke 11:3 and Exod 16:4); "Baal-zebul, the god of Ekron" (cf. Luke 11:14-19 and 2 Kgs 1:2-16); "finger of God" (cf. Luke 11:20 and Exod 8:19; 31:18; Deut 9:10); duty to give alms (cf. Luke 11:41; 12:33 and Tob 4:5-11, 16; 12:8-9; 14:2, 8, 10-11; Sir 3:30; 12:3; 17:22; 29:12; 35:4; 40:17,24); tithing (cf. Luke 11:42; 18:12 and Lev 27:30-32; Deut 14:22; Tob 1:6); expectation for justice (cf. Luke 11:42 and Exod 23:2, 6; Lev 19:15; Deut 16:19-20; 24:17; 27:19; Ps 10:18; Isa 1:17; 5:7, 16; 10:1-2; Jer 21:12; 22:3; 23:5; 33:15; Amos 5:15, 24; Mic 6:8); suffering is a consequence of sin (cf. Luke 13:2 and Deut 28:1-68; 30:15-20; Ezek 18:1-32); rejection of evildoers (cf. Luke 13:27 and Pss 5:5; 34:16; 92:9; 125:5; Mal 4:1); people gathered from all directions (cf. Luke 13:29 and Ps 107:3); kingdom feast (cf. Luke 13:29; 14:15; 22:30 and Isa 25:6; 65:13-16); rescuing ox or donkey (cf. Luke 14:5 and Exod 23:5; Deut 22:4); humility at a banquet (cf. Luke 14:7-11 and Prov 25:6-7; 27:2; 29:23; Sir 31:12); exemptions from service (cf. Luke 14:18-20 and Deut 20:5-8; 24:5); concern for the lost (cf. Luke 15:1-32 and Ezek 34:11-16); on giving away one's property prior to death (cf. Luke 15:11-12 and Sir 33:20-24); God's compassion (cf. Luke 15:20-24 and Deut 30:3; 32:36; 2 Chr 30:9; Ps 103:13); incompatibility of serving two gods (cf. Luke 16:13 and Exod 20:2-5; Deut 5:7-10); self-justification (cf. Luke 16:15 and Judg 17:6; 21:25; Ps 36:2; Prov 3:7; 16:2; 21:2-3; 24:10-12; Isa 5:21); dogs as despised creatures (cf. Luke 16:21 and 1 Sam 17:43; 2 Sam 9:8; 16:9; 1 Kgs 14:11; Ps 22:16, 20; Isa 56:11; Jer 15:3; Sir 26:25); Abraham's bosom (cf. Luke 16:22 and *Jub.* 22:26; 23:2); purity laws about leprosy (cf. Luke 17:11-19 and Lev 13:1-14:57); vultures as sign of punishment (cf. Luke 17:35 and Prov 30:17; Hos 8:1); chosen ones (cf. Luke 18:7 and Pss 105:6, 43; 106:4-5; Tob 8:15); God acts swiftly, he does not delay (cf. Luke 18:7b-8a and Deut 7:4; 11:17; 28:20; Josh 23:16; Isa 60:22; Sir 11:22; 27:3; 35:22b; 48:20); laws of restitution (cf. Luke 19:8 and



The third way Luke makes use of Israel's scriptures and traditions is that of oblique allusion.<sup>546</sup> In some cases the referent—though perhaps obvious once pointed out—is nonetheless discreet and indirect. The subtlety is so extreme in other cases that the relationship is frequently not recognized at all and depends to a large extent on one's familiarity with writings that fall outside the ordinary purview of many readers. In other words, the connection with an earlier referent to extracanonical writings is easily overlooked and often goes undetected, since an interpreter's focus may tend to concentrate on discovering links with the OT.

Of course, the preceding characterization of oblique allusions is highly subjective and being a theoretical construct, it is not subject to absolute confirmation. To what extent Luke and his readers would have recognized the oblique allusions examined below is also entirely hypothetical. Yet, since there is neither a direct citation nor an explicit reference to the "two-sword" *traditum* in Luke 22:35-38, it is crucial to devote more space to the following examples in order to bolster my assertion that Luke's use of oblique allusions reflects one of his literary styles. I am not, however, claiming that Luke literally used any of the writings where the "two-sword"

---

Exod 22:1-15; Num 5:6-8); today as the day of salvation (cf. Luke 19:9 and Deut 26:16-19; Isa 49:8); Israel as God's vineyard (cf. Luke 20:9-19 and Ps 80:8-18; Isa 5:1-7; 27:2-6; for a fascinating examination of the parable of the wicked tenants as a *mise en abyme* [i.e., an explanatory and pattern text embedded in a larger narrative], see Brawley, *Text to Text*, 27-41 ); levirate or next-of-kin marriage (cf. Luke 20:28 and Deut 25:5-6; Ruth 3:12-13; 4:1-12; Tob 3:7-9); nation against nation with signs (cf. Luke 21:10-11 and Ezek 38:17-23); apocalyptic signs (cf. Luke 21:25-27; 23:44 and Isa 13:10; Ezek 32:7; Joel 2:10, 30-32; 3:15; Zeph 1:15); relationship of blood and covenant (cf. Luke 22:20 and Exod 24:8; Zech 9:11); twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Luke 22:30 and Gen 49:28; Exod 24:4; 28:21; 39:14; Josh 3:12; 4:8); cup of suffering (cf. Luke 22:42 and Pss 11:6; 75:8; Isa 51:17; Jer 25:15-16; Hab 2:15-16); daughter(s) of Jerusalem (cf. Luke 23:28 and Isa 37:22; Lam 2:13, 15; Zeph 3:14; Zech 9:9); God redeems Israel (cf. Luke 24:21 and 2 Sam 7:23; Ps 130:7-8); and power from on high (cf. Luke 24:49 and Isa 32:15; 44:3; Joel 2:28:29). For a comparative list of OT allusions in Luke, see Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition*, 206-212.

<sup>546</sup> Brawley observes that "oblique allusions are particular ways texts entice readers to participate in writing the text. The indeterminacy of the text and its allusions pulls readers into a journey toward determinacy." Brawley, *Text to Text*, 2. Knight perceptively comments, "Connections of content between the Old Testament and primitive Christianity or early Judaism are by no means limited merely to citations from codified scripture. Well into the early centuries of this era, the Old Testament writings remained in close association with the diverse theological life of late Israel, a life which unfolds and endures independently in the respective traditions of Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. This diverse theological life of late Israel establishes the connection with primitive Christianity, in both ties and tensions. When we endeavor to develop a biblical theology with a descriptive and historical base, such knowledge of theological streams connecting late Israel and primitive Christianity is of great significance." By identifying, describing, and tracking the refraction of the "two-sword" *traditum* (or "theological stream"), I have attempted to connect one component of late Second Temple Israel with primitive Christianity. For further discussion, see Knight, *Tradition and Theology*, 213, cf. 310, 322, 325.

*traditum* is found (see chapter three) as sources unless “sources” is broadly understood as the cultural and religious milieu that was concomitant with Luke.

One way in which Luke utilizes oblique allusion is through type-scenes.<sup>547</sup> John’s birth narrative (Luke 1:5-25; 57-80), for instance, follows many of the conventions associated with this biblical type-scene (i.e., barren woman, appearance of angel, human disbelief; cf. Gen 18:1-15 [Isaac]; Judg 13:1-25 [Samson]; 1 Sam 1:1-28 [Samuel]). A second type-scene comes to mind when Jesus’ first call of his disciples appears to incorporate some of the features commonly found with the divine call of many ancient prophets (i.e., the holiness of God, the sinfulness of the one called and his response). This is especially apparent when Peter—like the prophets of old—falls down before Jesus (cf. Luke 5:1-11 and Exod 3:1-6 [Moses hides his face]; Isa 6:1-5 [Isaiah’s expression of dread when he sees the Lord]; see also Judg 6 [Gideon’s call] and Jer 1 [Jeremiah’s call]). Luke may also employ a third type-scene when the story about the feeding of the five thousand is compared with Elisha’s feeding of one hundred men (cf. Luke 9:12-17 and 2 Kgs 4:42-44). Both Jesus and Elisha welcome one who is carrying loaves of bread; both stories report objections of their followers: Jesus’ disciples and Elisha’s servant, respectively; and finally, after the people have eaten, leftover food remains. Besides these fascinating parallels, the miraculous feeding is also suggestive of God’s provision for the people of Israel when they were in the wilderness (Exod 16:1-36).

In addition, two narratives in Luke 7, which do not display such overt type-scene motifs like those described above, almost certainly entail oblique allusions to two HB stories, since a number of parallels are present. The first narrative—the healing of the centurion’s servant—evokes Elisha’s healing of Naaman, which Luke employs as a way to supplement Jesus’ earlier prophecy that he will be rejected by his own people and further stress the divergent reactions to him (see Luke 4:24-30). It is also fascinating to note that a reversal occurs when the two stories are compared. For instance, when Elisha heals Naaman, an army commander, it is Naaman’s servants who convince him to obey the prophet’s words. In Luke, however, it is the centurion who

---

<sup>547</sup> For further discussion on features of type-scenes, Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 47-62.

believes the prophet's (i.e., Jesus') words so that his servant might be healed (cf. Luke 7:1-10 and 2 Kgs 5:1-19).<sup>548</sup> The second narrative—the raising of widow's son at Nain (Luke 7:11-17)—also appears to echo Elijah's raising of a widow's son, which is both a recognizable story from the HB and one already mentioned in Luke (cf. Luke 4:25-25 and 1 Kgs 17:8-24). Luke's notation—"and Jesus gave him to his mother" (Luke 7:15b; cf. Luke 9:42)—is particularly suggestive of Elijah's actions when he "took the child...and gave him to his mother" (1 Kgs 17:23).<sup>549</sup>

The second type of oblique allusion occurs when there appears to be a subtle allusion to a specific passage in the HB. In these instances Luke intuitively picks up or incorporates familiar jargon from the HB. But in contrast to the type-scene forms discussed above, these oblique allusions are often less conspicuous. For instance, one possible example is when Luke narrates the angel's words to the shepherds: "This will be a sign for you: you will find a child wrapped in bands of cloth and lying in a manger" (Luke 2:12). While the phrase (i.e., "This will be a sign for you") and the angelic announcement that a young woman will bear child plausibly echo Isaiah's words to King Ahaz: "Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel" (Isa 7:14), they do so only faintly.<sup>550</sup> Another instance is found as Jesus "set his face to go to Jerusalem" (Luke 9:51). This

---

<sup>548</sup> For more discussion on reversals in Luke, see Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 86-91.

<sup>549</sup> Another "type-scene-esque" oblique allusion may be the brief account about John and some of Jesus' other disciples trying to stop a non-conventional follower from casting out demons. This story shows some points of correspondence to the occasion when Joshua exhorted Moses to stop Eldad and Medad from prophesying (cf. Luke 9:49-50 and Num 11:26-30). Drawing on Martin Rese's study, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, Talbert says that Luke 7:11-17 is "what Rese calls a 'typological use of the Old Testament.'" See Charles H. Talbert, "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984), 93; and Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969), 134, 209. On Luke's use of Elijah and Elisha narratives, see Craig A. Evans, "The Function of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives in Luke's Ethic of Election," in Evans and Sanders, *Luke and Scripture*, 70-83.

<sup>550</sup> Jack T. Sanders maintains—based on these passages—that "Luke was of the firm conviction that Jesus' Messiahship and his death and resurrection were foretold in the 'Scriptures,' probably in 'all the Scriptures' as a unit, *whether any particular text is cited or not*" (emphasis added). See Jack T. Sanders, "The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke-Acts," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (eds. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 192. Similar instances of oblique allusion to the HB may include: combining the image of the "Suffering Servant" with the "Son of Man" or "Messiah" (cf. Luke 9:22; 17:25; 24:26 and Isa 52:13-53:12); Moses as prefigure of Jesus (cf. Luke 9:35 and Deut 18:15); and affixing the "Son of Man" expression with the one seated at God's right hand (cf. Luke 22:69 and Ps 110:1). For more on the relationship between the Isaianic servant songs

phrase is eerily reminiscent of the instructions given to the prophet Ezekiel, “Mortal, set your face toward Jerusalem and preach against the sanctuaries” (Ezek 21:2; cf. Isa 50:7).<sup>551</sup>

Although examples of this kind of oblique allusion to the HB are intermittent in Luke, the Passion account appears to have an unusually high concentration of them. In this portion of the gospel, instead of clearly attributing a lot of the specific details to the fulfillment of the scriptures, a point which Luke stresses in Jesus’ post-resurrection appearances (cf. Luke 24:25-27, 32, 44-47),<sup>552</sup> the data are simply reported with no conspicuous reference to the scriptures at all. First of all, during the Supper Jesus declares that “the one who betrays me is with me and his hand is on the table” (Luke 22:21). If Luke is alluding to Ps 41:9 (“Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, / who ate of my bread, has lifted his heel against me;” cf. Ps 55:12-14; Sir 6:10; 37:1-6) with the

---

and the gospel Passion narratives, see Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, 79-172. Cf. Moore, “Luke’s Use of Isaiah,” especially 124-215 where Moore discusses two passages from “the Jerusalem narrative” (i.e., Luke 20:9-19 and 24:46-49). Two limitations of Moore’s analysis regarding Luke’s use of Isaiah is that it is too selective (e.g., he does not examine Luke 22:37) and truncated (i.e., he does not extend his study into Acts). For a recent study, see Mallen, *Isaiah in Luke-Acts*, especially 201-207 where Mallen offers six reasons why Luke used Isaiah and seven ways in which Luke read Isaiah. Regrettably for this project, when Mallen refers to or discusses Luke 22:37, the verse is chiefly viewed as prophecy-fulfillment and used to confirm the link between Jesus’ passion and Isaiah with virtually no consideration of its immediate context (i.e., Luke 22:35-38). Contra Moo, Moore, and Mallen, Donald L. Jones asserts that “the alleged references to Isaiah 53 both in the New Testament generally and in Luke-Acts in particular are, for the most part, ambiguous and inconclusive.” In addition, he maintains that “the Suffering Servant” metaphor is “‘developed’ Christology of Luke and the Christian church at the close of the first century A.D.” Donald L. Jones, “The Title ‘Servant’ in Luke-Acts,” in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984), 158-159.

<sup>551</sup> Evans, too, thinks that Luke 9:51 alludes to Ezekiel. He admits, however, that there is some uncertainty about this conclusion. See Evans, “‘He Set His Face’: On the Meaning of Luke 9:51,” in Evans and Sanders, *Luke and Scripture*, 93-105.

<sup>552</sup> Matthew, more than any other gospel, stresses the explicit connection between his gospel and Israel’s scriptures (e.g., Matt 1:22; 2:5, 15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 11:10; 12:17; 13:14, 35; 21:4; 26:21, 24, 54, 56; 27:9). Both Mark and John make an overt association with Israel’s scriptures, but—like Luke—do so less frequently (e.g., Mark 1:2; 7:6; 9:12-13; 14:21, 27, 49; John 12:38; 15:25; 19:24, 28, 36). Talbert ably warns against making a facile leap to “proof-from-prophecy” or “promise-fulfillment” pattern based on Luke’s use of the OT. Talbert, “Promise and Fulfillment,” 91-103. Cf. William S. Kurz, “Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts,” in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim Upon Israel’s Legacy* (ed. David P. Moessner; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999), 147-170. Based in part on Mikhail Bakhtin’s carnivalization method of literary analysis, Brawley proposes that this portion of Luke’s gospel is best understood as “resistance to a carnivalesque construct of world in Luke’s passion by voices of scripture.” According to Brawley, Jesus is “the carnival king,” that is, he is whatever his disciples (partially), the religious leaders, Pilate, Herod, the people, and the soldiers say he is. But Jesus resists their carnivalesque characterizations by appealing to scripture, specifically, Isaiah, Hosea, and the Psalms. E.g., when Jesus is paraded and mocked as a “carnival king”—one who is worthy of death in their construct world—he alludes to Hos 10:8, because they, in reality, face destruction. For that reason, they should weep for themselves rather than for him. Brawley, *Text to Text*, 42-60. For an additional example of carnivalization, see n. 555. I will return to Brawley’s remarks about Luke 22:35-38, esp. v. 37, later in this chapter.

statement, “his hand is on the table,” he leaves it to his readers to make the connection with the HB tradition.<sup>553</sup> Second, when Jesus is before the council, the elders, chief priests and scribes ask him, “If you are the Messiah, tell us.” In reply, Jesus says, “If I tell you, you will not believe; and if I question you, you will not answer” (Luke 22:67-68). Once again, if Luke is making an oblique allusion—on this occasion to Jeremiah’s answer to King Zedekiah (i.e., “If I tell you, you will put me to death, will you not? And if I give you advice, you will not listen to me” [Jer 38:19])—the connection to the HB is appealing despite its vagueness.<sup>554</sup> Third, as Jesus is being led to the cross he exhorts the people not to weep for him, but for themselves and their children because of their future ruin (Luke 23:27-29); and when their doom finally arrives, he says that they will plead for the mountains to fall on them and the hills to cover them (Luke 23:30). Although his words can be traced back to Hos 10:8, Luke does not explicitly point out the connection to this prophetic text.<sup>555</sup> Fourth, at least three oblique allusions occur during Jesus’ crucifixion: the division of his clothes when the soldiers cast lots; the leaders’ mocking Jesus to save himself; and the offer of sour wine to him (Luke 23:34-36). Whereas the Gospel of John expressly declares that the casting of lots and the offer of sour wine fulfill the scriptures (cf. John 19:24, 28; Pss 22:18;

---

<sup>553</sup> In contrast, the Gospel of John plainly makes the connection between Judas’ betrayal and Ps 41:9 (cf. John 13:18).

<sup>554</sup> Although Matthew does not include Jesus’ reply to their question in his gospel (Matt 26:26:63-64; Mark 14:61-62), he does associate Jesus with the prophet Jeremiah (cf. Matt 2:17; 16:14; 27:9).

<sup>555</sup> Borrowing from Richard Hays’ seven tests for “hearing echoes,” Brawley offers three ways to detect allusions: “volume—the degree of verbatim repetition,” which Brawley insightfully expands to include setting and plot; “availability”—the degree to which a text is available for author and audience; and “repetition.” Brawley also emphasizes that “biblical allusions are among the principal features that resist the carnivalesque.” Specifically, about this passage, he says, “The death wish of Hos 10:8 is the destiny of people who live out of the idolatrous construct of world. In Luke 23:30 Jesus anticipates a similar destiny for those who live out of a carnivalesque construct of world—an anticipation that becomes tangible in the death of Judas Iscariot (Acts 1:16-26).” Brawley, *Text to Text*, 53. Hays’ seven tests for “hearing echoes” are: (1) “*Availability*. Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers?” (2) “*Volume*. The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns...” (3) “*Recurrence*. How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?” (4) “*Thematic coherence*. How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing?” (5) “*Historical Plausibility*. Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect?” (6) “*History of Interpretation*. Have other readers, both critical and precritical, heard the same echoes?” and (7) “*Satisfaction*. With or without confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation?” For further discussion on Hays’ method of allusion recognition, see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29-32.

69:21),<sup>556</sup> Luke continues to employ a strategy of oblique allusion with these two events.<sup>557</sup> In addition, the leaders' taunt—"He saved others; let him save himself if he is the Messiah of God, his chosen one!"—echoes Ps 22:6-8 where the alleged malefactor is called a worm, scorned, and derided by passersby who mock him, saying, "Commit your cause to the Lord; / let him deliver— / let him rescue the one in whom he delights."<sup>558</sup> Fifth, another oblique allusion happens as Jesus cries out, "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46). Luke does not indicate in any way that these words are from a psalm; to a casual reader, it appears that he is simply recounting Jesus' final words. But the allusion is compelling given the psalmist's words: "Into your hand I commit my spirit" (Ps 31:5a).<sup>559</sup> Sixth, Joseph of Arimathea's desire to bury Jesus before sundown (Luke 23:50-54) may also be Luke's way of making an oblique allusion to Deut 21:22-23, which stipulates that an executed criminal's body is not to remain unburied.<sup>560</sup>

Obviously, if the examples identified in the preceding paragraph are analyzed separately, the case for this second type of oblique allusion seems unimpressive and perhaps inconclusive. But Luke clearly knows his scriptures and has so internalized them that he persistently structures

---

<sup>556</sup> Brawley thinks that the allusion between Luke 23:36 and Ps 69:21 is a "weak case" because *oxos* [*sic*] is the only word the two texts have in common. Again, rather than a complaint on the lips of Jesus, as in John 19:28-29, the reference to sour wine in Luke 23 is in the narrator's voice, who gives the readers the clue to its function as mockery. What is more, the offer of sour wine is a part of the carnivalesque. The soldiers are mocking Jesus as a king—carnival king, and they offer him sour wine instead of the superior beverage appropriate for a king." Brawley, *Text to Text*, 54.

<sup>557</sup> One other oblique allusion in Luke's Passion narrative might occur when Judas agrees to betray Jesus for money. Matthew explicitly states that Judas' reward of thirty pieces of silver, which is used to purchase a field for his burial, fulfills what the prophet Jeremiah had predicted—although, in reality, the words are from Zech 11:13 and conflated with Jeremiah's visit to a potter's house along with his purchase of land (cf. Luke 22:3-6 and Matt 26:14-16; 27:3-10; Jer 18:1; 19:1; 32:1-15). For whatever reason, if Luke is making an oblique allusion, it is not particularly evident, since he does not include as many details as Matthew.

<sup>558</sup> Brawley characterizes "the mockery of the leaders" as a "strong allusion" even though "Luke...does not record the opening lines so prominent in Mark and Matthew: 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?'" Brawley further contends that "by the standard of verbatim repetition, Luke gives readers little reason to recollect the divine deliverance. But when the setting and plot come into play, the Lucan passion strongly reiterates wider aspects of the psalm." Brawley, *Text to Text*, 55-57.

<sup>559</sup> For an earlier version of Brawley's analysis of Luke's passion narrative, which I found easier to follow at times, see Robert L. Brawley, "Resistance to the Carnivalization of Jesus: Scripture in the Lucan Passion Narrative," *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 33-60.

<sup>560</sup> The Gospel of John seems to allude to this passage and adds that this is the reason why the Jews asked for the bones of the criminals to be broken (John 19:31-42).

and alludes to them in his gospel without comment. Perhaps this indicates as well that Luke's community knew their scriptures and could have understood these references without explicit notation. Thus, when this cluster of six examples from the Passion narrative is considered together, it is reasonable to think that Luke's use of this kind of oblique allusion is one of his clever literary devices. This conclusion is reinforced further if the following is admitted as evidence: (1) based on the book's introduction, Luke was methodical in his research (Luke 1:1-4); (2) the frequent use of or reference to a wide repertoire of well-known individuals, places and traditions from the HB, which were enumerated earlier in this chapter, indicates Luke's wide-ranging awareness of these traditions; and (3) the stress on the role of the scriptures during the narration of Jesus' post-resurrection appearances suggests that Luke thought they formed an integral component of the gospel as he understood it (Luke 24:25-27; 44-47).

A third variety of oblique allusion, however, is the most germane form, since Luke 22:35-38 does not overtly refer to the "two-sword" *traditum*. This type of allusion makes links with extracanonical writings and, more importantly, with documents that explicitly mention the "two-sword" *traditum*. Like Luke 22:35-38, these texts, which are examined below, draw upon a number of canonical and extracanonical Jewish traditions that are found in the contemporary religious and cultural atmosphere. From our vantage point, these passages either exhibit only the slightest intimation of a relationship to an existing Jewish tradition or appear to make no explicit allusion to any tradition whatsoever. This is not because no cultural intertextuality exists, but is more likely caused by our unfamiliarity with the cultural and religious milieu of the first century C.E., especially in view of Luke's literary penchant for subtle allusion.

One example of this kind of oblique allusion occurs when Simeon sees the baby Jesus (Luke 2:25-35). Simeon—who was "looking for the consolation of Israel" and had been told that "he would not see death before he had seen the Lord's Messiah" (Luke 2:25-26)—praises God at the sight of the child:

Master, now you are dismissing your servant in peace, / according to your word;  
/ for my eyes have seen your salvation, / which you have prepared in the  
presence of all peoples, / a light for revelation to the Gentiles / and glory to your  
people Israel (Luke 2:29-32).

An initial analysis of Simeon's declaration (a.k.a. Simeon's Nunc Dimittis) indicates a connection with the book of Isaiah, which proclaims that all people will see the Lord's glory and that Israel will be a light to all nations (cf. Isa 40:5; 42:6; 49:6).<sup>561</sup>

Further consideration, though, suggests that Luke's description of the event displays an acquaintance with an extracanonical tradition found in the *Psalms of Solomon*.<sup>562</sup> Two passages, in particular, support such a supposition. The first is: "Blessed are those born in those days / to see the good fortune of Israel / which God will bring to pass in the assembly of the tribes" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:44).<sup>563</sup> The second is: "Blessed are those born in those days, / to see the good things of the Lord / which he will do for the coming generation" (*Pss. Sol.* 18:6).<sup>564</sup> The implied association is also reinforced by R. B. Wright who states:

The eighteen Psalms of Solomon incorporate the response of a group of devout Jews to the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans in the first century B.C....[and that they] preserve one of the most detailed messianic expectations in the immediate pre-Christian centuries.<sup>565</sup>

If Wright is correct, it is feasible that both Luke and the author(s) of the *Psalms of Solomon* knew and made use of the same extracanonical messianic tradition. Luke's recounting of Anna's encounter with Jesus also points to this tradition, since she and many others "were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke 2:38).<sup>566</sup> Although the relationship is both hypothetical and oblique, it is plausible to infer that Luke drew upon this post-Roman capture of Jerusalem messianic tradition when composing the story about Simeon and Anna's hopeful expectations. In

---

<sup>561</sup> Moore argues for a prominent relationship between Luke 2:25-38 and Isa 40-66. See Moore, "Luke's Use of Isaiah," 45-68.

<sup>562</sup> For an introduction to the *Psalms of Solomon*, see R. B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:639-650.

<sup>563</sup> *Ibid.*, 669.

<sup>564</sup> *Ibid.*, 669.

<sup>565</sup> *Ibid.*, 639, 643.

<sup>566</sup> Wright notes that one MS reads "to see the good fortune of *Jerusalem*" (*Pss. Sol.* 17:44; italics added). *Ibid.*, 669, n. e2. Moore detects a link between Luke 2:38 and Isa 52:9 ("Break forth together into singing, / you ruins of Jerusalem; / for the Lord has comforted his people, / he has redeemed Jerusalem."). Moore, "Luke's Use of Isaiah," 67.



other words, when Luke crafted Jesus' birth narrative and wanted to depict the emotions associated with that occasion (i.e., the birth of a savior) in a way that would connect with his readers, he tapped into the Jewish pathos surrounding Jerusalem's prior capture and its more recent destruction by the Romans and their resilient hope for a messiah who would restore and rebuild the city despite the present ruins.<sup>567</sup> And as the Magnificat indicates, Luke is a master of rewriting texts, which the pronouncements of Simeon and Anna further demonstrate.<sup>568</sup>

A second example of this kind of oblique allusion is found in Luke 3:21-22 when the Holy Spirit descends on Jesus in the form of a dove. Unlike the preceding examples, however, there are no observable connections between this passage and any texts in the HB.<sup>569</sup> Yet there is an alluring reference to an extracanonical dove tradition in the *Odes of Solomon* (hereafter *Odes Sol.*) when the poet writes, "The dove fluttered over the head of our Lord Messiah, / because he was her Head" (*Odes Sol.* 24:1).<sup>570</sup> Lacking any parallel dove tradition in canonical writings, evidence that Luke and this *Ode of Solomon* share some sort of broader dove tradition is admittedly less certain with this example than with the first example above.<sup>571</sup> But the tradition's presence in the Pseudepigrapha does suggest a possible intertextual link between the Gospel of Luke and a "dove tradition" as long as intertextual is understood as I described it in chapter one.<sup>572</sup>

---

<sup>567</sup> Brawley makes a similar point when discussing the relationship between Acts 8:26-38 and Isa 56:3-5. He says, "This is not to say that Isa 56:3-5 provided the source for the story any more than Isa 40:3-5 provided the source for the account of John the Baptist, but the story nevertheless reverberates with the Isaianic text." Brawley, *Text to Text*, 51.

<sup>568</sup> For further discussion on the Magnificat, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (ABRL; New Updated Version; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 355-366, esp. 358-360 where Brown identifies canonical and extracanonical texts that serve as the Magnificat's background.

<sup>569</sup> In the HB, the dove appears in the flood narrative, is used as a simile for flight or a metaphor for one's lover, and is seen as a silly and senseless creature (cf. Gen 8:8-12; Pss 55:6; 68:13; 74:19; Song 2:14; 5:2; 6:9; Isa 38:14; Jer 48:28; Hos 7:11).

<sup>570</sup> For an introduction to the *Odes Sol.* and this excerpt, see J. H. Charlesworth, "Odes of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:725-734, 757.

<sup>571</sup> The date for *Odes Sol.* is estimated to be from the late first to early second C.E.

<sup>572</sup> See chapter one, 66-69. A rather faint and weak oblique allusion may occur between Luke 18:9-14 and *Jos. Asen.* 21:10-21. Both the tax collector and Aseneth are described as sinners who confess their sins and

A third example is possibly embedded in Luke 11:45-52. As Jesus rebukes one of the lawyers because they add burdens on the people rather than ease them, Jesus says:

Woe to you! For you build the tombs of the prophets whom your ancestors killed. So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of your ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs (Luke 11:47-48).

On the one hand, this saying of Jesus reflects an established HB tradition: Israel frequently rejected God's prophets (cf. 2 Chr 36:14-16; Jer 26:20-23). On the other hand, the saying may also point to another prevalent extracanonical tradition: the curiosity of first century C.E. Israel, especially the religious leaders, about the final outcome of the ancient prophets. This cultural phenomenon is corroborated to some extent in the opening prologue of the *Lives of the Prophets* that reads: "The names of the prophets, and where they are from, and where they died and how, and where they lie."<sup>573</sup> While the practice of constructing memorials to honor martyred prophets mentioned in Luke 11:47 (cf. Matt 23:29) "has no direct point of contact with *The Lives of the Prophets*," D. R. A. Hare suggests that "it supports our text by providing evidence of the contemporary interest in the graves of the prophets."<sup>574</sup> In sum, this passage seems to indicate—

---

receive forgiveness. Admittedly, I may be guilty of the sin of "parallelomania" in this instance. Another example like the dove tradition is found in *T. Naph.* 6:1-10, which narrates an unusual story about Jacob and his sons sailing across a sea. When they encounter a storm, the boat fills with water and breaks apart. Joseph escapes via a small boat and his brothers are scattered on the sea as they cling to planks. Levi prays for them, the storm ceases, and they arrive at the shore where they are inexplicably greeted by their father Jacob. While this story has some points of correspondence with Luke 8:22-25, they do not appear to justify making any case for an oblique allusion. Conversely, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:16-21, which report Jesus' walking on water, seem to present a better scenario for such an argument if one is so inclined. For an introduction to *T. Naph.*, see Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 813.

<sup>573</sup> D. R. A. Hare, "The Lives of the Prophets: A New Translation and Introduction," in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:385. Hare dates *Liv. Pro.* toward the end of the first century C.E.

<sup>574</sup> Hare, "The Lives of the Prophets," 2:383. Prior to this remark, Hare rightly cautions, "There is no indication that the book [i.e., *Liv. Pro.*] was known to any of the New Testament writers, but the author of the Letter to the Hebrews seems to have been aware of some of the traditions here recorded" (e.g., cf. Heb 11:37 and *Liv. Pro.* 1:1; 2:1; 3:2, passages that describe the way in which some prophets were killed). *Op. cit.*, 2:383. For an introduction and translation of *Liv. Pro.*, *op.cit.*, 379-399. See also J. Edward Wright, "Hebrews 11:37 and the Death of the Prophet Ezekiel," in *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions—Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman* (BJS 313; eds. William G. Dever and J. Edward Wright; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 147-158.

albeit provisionally—Luke’s awareness of an extracanonical tradition that stands behind this pericope in a way that is analogous to the “two-sword” *traditum*’s role in Luke 22:35-38.<sup>575</sup>

Two final examples of this third form of oblique allusion suggest a correlation between Luke and the “two-sword” *traditum*. Both exemplars are exceptionally enticing, since they entail a veiled relationship to the “two-sword” *traditum*. The first example is found in Luke 14:25-35. At this point in Luke’s gospel, Jesus turns to the crowd and says, “Whoever comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself, cannot be my disciple” (Luke 14:26). At first glance, these words appear to be just another saying of Jesus. Further reflection on this saying from Q, however, suggests that it is an allusion to Exod 32:25-29 that describes Moses’ angry reaction to the degenerate conduct of the people after Aaron made the golden calf. At the sight of their immoral behavior, Moses declares, “Who is on the Lord’s side? Come to me!” In response, the sons of Levi gather around Moses, take up their swords, and slaughter three thousand of their neighbors. The Levites are rewarded for their deed, since they honored God even above their own kin.

In the context of Luke, it is especially important to recall that this zealous disposition becomes a trademark of the tribe of Levi in the HB; and as part of the HB literary complex that makes up the “two-sword” *traditum*,<sup>576</sup> Luke’s allusion to Exod 32:25-29 is all the more striking because Moses’ call, “Come to me!” and the response of the sons of Levi prefigure Jesus’ call that whoever comes to him is on the Lord’s side. For, whoever would follow Jesus must be willing to “hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself”—in

---

<sup>575</sup> Luke 22:23 also seems to reflect Luke’s inclusion of another prevalent tradition. Here, Luke reports that someone asks Jesus as he travels from one village to another, “Lord, will only a few be saved?” This traditional concern is corroborated in both canonical and extracanonical writings (e.g., Deut 4:27; 28:62; Isa 10:19; 16:14; 24:6; Ezek 12:16; 2 Esd 7:45-61; 8:1-3; 9:15; 10:57). This subject (i.e., the number of saved people) is especially prominent in 2 Esd 7-10, which is part of the book that is generally dated toward the end of the first century C.E. after the destruction of Jerusalem. This date, if accurate, places the book and its preoccupation with this matter in a timeframe that is relatively close to the composition of Luke’s gospel.

<sup>576</sup> E.g., Phinehas kills a fellow Israelite, specifically a Simeonite, for marrying a Midianite woman (Num 25:1-18); the Levites are commended for their godly passion (Deut 33:8-11); they protect Joash from his grandmother Athaliah (2 Chr 23:1-7); and Ezra’s call for putting away foreign wives (Ezra 9-10). For further discussion, see chapter two, esp. 140-164.

other words, to take up the sword as did Levi and his descendents—in order to be one of Jesus' disciples.<sup>577</sup>

The second example is found in Luke 16:19-31, which describes the after-life conditions of Lazarus and the rich man. Whereas the rich man suffers fiery “agony” and begs “Father Abraham” to “send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue,” Lazarus—who had suffered all his life—is “carried away by the angels to be with Abraham [i.e., Gk.: ‘to Abraham’s bosom’]” (Luke 16:22, 24). Although this datum may at first seem insignificant, Luke’s use of the expression “Abraham’s bosom” is revelatory, since it is found in *Jub.*, a pseudepigraphal writing that makes an explicit reference to the “two-sword” *traditum* and all four of its motifs and thus points to Luke’s possible familiarity with that tradition.

In summary, it seems certain, first of all, that Luke knew many of Israel’s traditions, both from canonical and extracanonical sources, since: (a) he cites specific texts (e.g., Luke 2:23; 3:4-6; 4:4, 8, 10-12; 7:27; 8:10; 10:26-27; 13:35; 18:13, 38-39; 19:38, 40, 46; 20:17; 22:37); (b) there are many instances where renowned people, places, stories, and expressions are mentioned (see discussion above); and (c) he makes use of HB type-scenes (e.g., John the Baptist’s birth narrative [Luke 1:5-25; 57-80]; the initial call of Jesus’ disciples [Luke 5:1-11]; and the feeding of the five thousand [Luke 9:21-17]; and the healing of the centurion’s servant and the raising of the widow’s son also displayed some type-scene correspondences [Luke 7:1-17]).

Second, Luke made use of oblique allusions, especially in the Passion narrative. In these cases there is no explicit reference to a Jewish story, expression, or tradition. Instead, the connection is implicit and remains veiled until it is pointed out (e.g., Luke 22:21, 67-68; 23:27-29, 34-36, 46, 50-54). Although some of these associations are conjectures of this interpreter as well as others,<sup>578</sup> they are not exclusively so, since the Gospel of John explicitly cites the connection with Israel’s scriptures (e.g., Luke 22:21 and John 13:18; Luke 23:34, 36 and John 19:24, 28).

---

<sup>577</sup> The connection between Luke 14:26 and Exod 32:25-29 is also suggested by David L. Tiede in his notes on the Gospel of Luke, *HarperCollins Study Bible*, 1989.

<sup>578</sup> See e.g., Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 235-239, 278-285; and especially Brawley, *Text to Text*, 42-60.

Third, there are several allusions that indicate rather convincingly that Luke was acquainted with traditions from extracanonical writings. For example, Luke's description of Simeon's and Anna's messianic anticipation (Luke 2:25-38) is not only an Isaianic tradition (Isa 40:5; 42:6; 49:6), but also similar to one found in the *Psalms of Solomon* (*Pss. Sol.* 17:44; 18:6). In addition, Luke's dove tradition appears to reflect a comparable one in an *Ode of Solomon* (cf. Luke 3:21-22; *Odes. Sol.* 24:1). The contemporary fascination with the final outcome and burial of the prophets is attested in both Luke and the *Lives of the Prophets* (cf. Luke 11:45-52 and *Liv. Pro.* prologue).

Fourth, two other allusions are particularly important to highlight in closing because they not only demonstrate that Luke and his culture share a common religious heritage based on Israel's scriptures and traditions, but also indicate that he was familiar with at least two Jewish writings that transmitted the "two-sword" *traditum*. First, Jesus' call that whoever comes to him must hate their family resonates with one story that forms part of the "two-sword" *traditum*: Moses' summon for allies (combatants?) when the people were rebelling after Aaron made the golden calf (cf. Luke 14:26 and Exod 32:25-29). Second, the plain reference to "Abraham's bosom" in Luke 16:22 implies Luke's familiarity with an extracanonical tradition that is found only in *Jub.* as far as I know (*Jub.* 22:26; 23:2).<sup>579</sup> This fact, in and of itself, of course, does not prove that Luke used *Jub.* as one of his sources. But it seems reasonable to assume that if Luke is aware of this *Jub.*'s tradition he might also know about the "two-sword" *traditum*, which is an important tradition found in that writing.<sup>580</sup>

Based on the preceding survey, it is apparent that Luke was a sophisticated writer whose invocations of the HB indicate that he knew Israel's scriptures and traditions and had internalized them sufficiently to make recurring allusions. This feature also suggests that he is confident his readers were sufficiently knowledgeable to grasp the references. Luke is a very literate gospel

---

<sup>579</sup> Evans claims that "[m]ethodologically his [i.e., Luke's] predecessor is *Jubilees*." Evans, "Luke and the Rewritten Bible," 175.

<sup>580</sup> See chapter three, 183-187.

and so are his gospel's recipients—the style of the gospel argues for such a conclusion. And although the links are admittedly vague and highly speculative at times, Luke drew on oblique allusions to make connections between his gospel and Jewish traditions of that time period. To press this point further, there is, arguably, sufficient evidence to conclude that he was aware of and exploited oblique allusions, such as the “two-sword” *traditum*, when writing his gospel. In view of this finding, it is now fitting to analyze Luke 22:35-38 on the assumption that Luke crafted this pericope in light of the “two-sword” *traditum*.

### **4.3 Reading Luke 22:35-38 in Light of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum***

Gilbert K. Chesterton's remark at the beginning of this chapter—“The man who is misunderstood has always this advantage over his enemies, that they do not know his weak point or his plan of campaign”—captures the inscrutability of Luke's sword-logion: For, if it was either Luke's or Jesus' purpose to obfuscate, it has been a resounding success. It is clear from all previous attempts to unlock the mystery of this pericope that both Jesus and/or Luke have been and likely will continue to be misunderstood here; and because of that actuality, they undoubtedly still have the advantage. Yet despite the reality that I “do not know [their] weak point or [their] plan of campaign,” I am confident that engaging Luke 22:35-38 via the “two-sword” *traditum* offers an opportunity to peel back at least some of the impenetrable layers of that text in Luke.

While Jesus' instruction to buy a sword is bizarre, there are a number of other noticeable anomalies scattered throughout the entire Last Supper narrative as well. The variations are particularly conspicuous when this portion of Luke is compared with the other gospels. For instance, Jesus is eager to eat this meal, there are two cups instead of one, Judas appears to stay throughout the Passover meal and Jesus' farewell address, and the dispute among the disciples about who is greatest is relocated to this setting.<sup>581</sup> These variances suggest that Luke

---

<sup>581</sup> Calvin K. Katter identifies eleven new elements in Luke 22:14-38 when compared to the other Synoptists. Calvin K. Katter, “Luke 22:14-38: A Farewell Address” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1993). 3, n. 2.

exercised a great deal of latitude when composing this section. In short, Luke is a dynamic writer who freely redacts his sources.

Given Luke's tendency to modify and rearrange Matthew's and Mark's narratives and to embed oblique allusions to Israel's scriptures and traditions, it seems logical to view the sword-logion as a riddle or puzzle that reflects Luke's literary acumen that flows out of his literary psyche. In other words, Luke inserted this passage into his narrative so as to provoke thought. And though the sword-logion may appear to obfuscate at first glance, there is a compelling message that stands behind its opaque fortifications, a message that promotes peace and is accessed by reading Luke's gospel against the "two-sword" *traditum*.

#### **4.3.1 The "Two-Sword" *Traditum* as Luke's Narrative Background**

Before I undertake the formal analysis of Luke's sword-logion, it is important to review the premises that will guide the remainder of this investigation. First, as I have argued above, Luke is a sophisticated author whose writing style is neither clumsy nor haphazard. His continual invocation of Israel's scriptures and traditions—whether through citations or indirect references—is notable and reflects his thorough grasp of that corpus. Second, Luke appears to be writing to an urbane audience whose literary competency is on par with his own. He assumes that his community is capable of understanding his prose, including the ability to recognize oblique allusions to Israel's scriptures and traditions. Third, as I explore Luke 22:35-38 and other texts in the Gospel of Luke, I assume—based on the research presented in chapters two and three—that the "two-sword" *traditum* was part of their cultural narrative background; it was, in a word, part of the broad intertextual heritage shared by Luke and his community. As such, the "two-sword" *traditum* offers a clever and imaginative way to scrutinize what seems to be an inscrutable text. Fourth, as will become evident, I propose that Luke exploited—albeit with a high degree of subtlety—his culture's narrative universe, which included the "two-sword" *traditum*, in order to overturn or invert their taken-for-granted world and replace it with an entirely different conceptual framework. In other words, the Gospel of Luke is thoroughly theological because Luke exhorts his

community to adopt a belief system that is at odds with one of their long-standing traditions: that vengeance is justified when preserving identity and honor and defending an honored one.<sup>582</sup>

In sum, Luke relies on a familiar tradition whose roots can be traced back to an ancestral story about Simeon and Levi and its legendary accretions that are found in all its subsequent rewritten forms in order to challenge his readers' presuppositions. To borrow the words of Hays and Green, Luke is "not simply agree[ing] with and build[ing] on an earlier writing. Rather, his engagement with the OT [and other traditions] might be parodic, repeating an old pattern or echoing ancient metaphors to signal *difference* at the very heart of similarity."<sup>583</sup> In more specific terms of this project, Luke is exploiting the sword-logion incident—which he found in one of his sources—and the "two-sword" *traditum* in order to dismantle a long-standing biblical tradition that sanctioned the use of force in order to preserve identity and honor and justify vengeance. Whether the pericope entails Jesus' authentic words is beside the point. What is important for Luke is that he remains faithful to his understanding of Jesus and his message.

Having stipulated my suppositions, I will first situate the pericope's literary context within the Gospel of Luke and then move immediately into an exegetical analysis of Luke's sword-logion in view of the "two-sword" *traditum*. Although the investigation will address some of the problems raised by previous studies as it proceeds, the focus is to offer clues about and stress the relationship between Luke 22:35-38 and the "two-sword" *traditum*.

---

<sup>582</sup> Ibitolu Oluseyi Jerome Megbelavin claims that "Luke 22:7-38 (Western Text) clearly functions as a rhetorical discourse meant to alter the social expectations of Luke's community and produce corresponding changes in its conduct." Although I was unable to examine the specific details of Megbelavin's argument (it was not available via the Interlibrary Loan program) his assertion appears to support my thesis that Luke's sword-logion—as part of the last supper narrative—was written to repudiate a long-standing tradition and its ethical code. Ibitolu Oluseyi Jerome Megbelavin, "A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Lukan Narrative of the Last Supper," (Ph.D. diss., University of Ottawa, 2002), abstract, accessed on-line.

<sup>583</sup> Hays and Green, "Use of the Old Testament," 229 (emphasis added). If Luke is drawing on and reacting to the "two-sword" *traditum*, this may be another example of reversal in Luke-Acts. I also think that Brawley's application of carnivalization reinforces my proposition in that this pericope and related ones entail a parody of expectations that stem from a shared narrative world.



### 4.3.2 The Setting of Luke 22:35-38 in the Gospel of Luke

From a global perspective, the Gospel of Luke breaks down into four large components: the birth narrative (Luke 1:1-2:52); Jesus' Galilean ministry (Luke 3:1-9:50); Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:27); and the Jerusalem narrative (Luke 19:28-24:53). Against the broader landscape, then, Luke 22:35-38 is one small component of Luke's Jerusalem narrative.

Moving in more closely, the sword-logion is unique to the Gospel of Luke<sup>584</sup> and contains the last exchange between Jesus and his disciples during their Passover meal before they depart and go to the Mount of Olives.<sup>585</sup> It is also part of the concluding vignette of Jesus' farewell address (*Abschiedsrede*) to the disciples (Luke 22:14-38),<sup>586</sup> which is framed at the outset by

---

<sup>584</sup> This pericope is unique to Luke. It is not found in Matthew, Mark, or John. It is from one of Luke's unnamed sources and obviously could be part of Luke's special source "L." Helmut Koester classifies this passage as one of the special "sayings" in the Gospel of Luke. Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1990), 336-339. Joel B. Green concludes "that 22:35-38 is based on pre-Lukan material...[and]...has significant points of contact with preceding sections and may well have been associated with them in Luke's *Sondergut*." Joel B. Green, *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative* (2 Reihe; WUNT 33; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988), 50-52. The Jesus Seminar "designated the words of Jesus in this passage black" because "they reverse earlier instructions...[and]...the quotation of Isa 53:12 in v. 37 suggests that early Christian scribes are at work: They are preparing for the incident of the sword during the arrest of Jesus (22:49-51)." The Jesus Seminar concludes that "Luke has invented the narrative context to go with the words. Out of materials gathered from elsewhere in his gospel (22:24-38), he has created a symposium, which has no counterpart in his source, Mark. Black is the proper color for Luke's invention." Robert M. Funk and the Jesus Seminar, *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 1988), 351. Cf. Philip Sellew, "The Last Supper Discourse in Luke 22:14-38," *Forum* 3 (1987): 70-95, who recommended the Jesus Seminar vote black. For a thorough discussion on the special material in Luke 22, see Marion L. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

<sup>585</sup> In contrast to Matthew and Mark, Luke does not use "Gethsemane" (cf. Matt 26:36; Mark 14:32). The "Mount of Olives" is also mentioned in Matt 21:1; 24:3; 26:30; Mark 11:1; 13:3; 14:26; Luke 19:29, 37; 21:37; and John 8:1 (part of an interpolation that might have originally been in Luke).

<sup>586</sup> For a detailed analysis of Luke 22:14-38 as a farewell address and his subsequent redaction critical investigation on Luke's characteristic style and use of his sources, see Katter, "Farewell Address," 123-248. After Katter completes a survey of previous studies, he examines standard forms of the farewell address in the HB (e.g., Gen 47:29-50:14; Deut 31-34; Josh 23; 1 Sam 12), Greco-Roman literature (including epics, tragedies, histories, lives), and extracanonical literature (e.g., *T. 12 Patr.*, *T. Mos.*, *T. Job*, *L.A.B.*). Katter then compares Luke 22:14-38 to these models and concludes that Luke constructed his farewell address, at least in part, after them. One highlight of Katter's analysis is the comparison of Luke's supper narrative with those found in Matthew and Mark, which do not make use of the farewell address genre (see esp. "Excursus B," op. cit., 136-144). For a short introduction to Luke 22:14-38 as a farewell address, see Michael Dwaine Greene, "The Death of Christ in the Farewell Speech of Luke 22:14-38," (M.A. thesis; Wake Forest University, 1982). In his study, Greene investigates textual and redactional issues before he identifies and describes the connections between the death of Christ and Isaiah's suffering servant motif in this pericope. According to William S. Kurz "the ancient 'farewell address' provides a structure into which to fit such apparently unrelated pericopes [e.g., dispute about greatness, giving apostles the kingdom, Luke's sword-logion]. The genre helps to explain why Luke moved the prediction of Judas's betrayal and the dispute over

several disturbing notices (Luke 22:1-6). In this ominous prologue Luke reveals: it was near the time of “the festival of Unleavened Bread, which is also called the Passover” (Luke 22:1);<sup>587</sup> “the chief priests and the scribes were looking for a way to put Jesus to death [ἐζήτουν...τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν<sup>588</sup> αὐτόν], for they were afraid of the people” (Luke 22:2); “Satan entered [Ἐἰσῆλθεν] into Judas” (Luke 22:3);<sup>589</sup> Judas confers with the religious authorities “about how he might betray him [i.e. Jesus] to them [τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῶ αὐτόν] (Luke 22:4); and Judas “began to look for an opportunity to betray him [ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτόν] to them when no crowd was present [ἄτερ ὄχλου]” (Luke 22:6).

Leading up to the sword-logion, Luke first narrates some rather bizarre instructions that Jesus gives to Peter and John so they can prepare the Passover meal (Luke 22:7-13): they are to follow a jar-carrying man into a house and say to the owner, “The teacher asks you, ‘Where is the guest room, where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?’” (Luke 22:11). After Peter and John complete the preparations for the meal, Jesus and the apostles [οἱ ἀπόστολοι] gather around a table in order to eat the Passover meal (Luke 22:14). Although Jesus says, “I have eagerly desired [ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα] to eat this Passover,” the narration is disconcerting, since he announces that this meal is taking place before he suffers [πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν] and that he will not “eat it until it is fulfilled [ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ] in the kingdom of God” (Luke 22:15-16).

Following Jesus’ opening statement Luke presents his own distinct version of the Passover meal as he narrates the drinking of two cups—one before the bread and one after

---

greatness to where he did. The way the genre serves to explain new situations after a founder’s death helps to account for the apparent reversal of instructions from Luke 9 and 10 in Luke 22:35-38.” In an interesting move, Kurz eventually concludes that “[t]he problematic Luke 22:35-38 seems to lay an apologetic foundation for Paul’s pastoral instructions in Acts 20 [another farewell address]...By undercutting the absolutism of the Gospel instructions, they implicitly defend the different approach of Paul and leaders of churches he founded from criticism.” William S. Kurz, “Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses,” *JBL* 104/2 (1985): 251, 266. Cf. P. Winter, „Eine quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22, 7-38,” *NTS* 4 (1958): 223-227.

<sup>587</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, translations in this section are from the NRSV.

<sup>588</sup> ἀνέλωσιν aor. subjunc  
. act. of ἀναιρέω (“to take up,” “kill,” “destroy;” LSJ, 106).

<sup>589</sup> For Conzelmann, this verse marks the end of Jesus’ docile earthly ministry and the beginning of a time of severe testing. Satan—who has not been a protagonist in the Gospel of Luke since leaving Jesus after the temptation (cf. Luke 4:13)—returns to the stage.

(Luke 22:17-20). While they are partaking of the meal Jesus also announces that “the one who betrays me is with me, and his hand is on the table [ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης]” (Luke 22:21). Whereas “the Son of Man [ὁ υἱὸς...τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] is going as it has been determined [κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον πορεύεται],” there is only “woe [ὠαὶ] to that one by whom he is betrayed [δι’ οὗ παραδίδοται]” (Luke 22:22). Upon hearing Jesus’ unexpected words, the apostles begin to ask each other which one of them could do such a deed (Luke 22:23).

Despite being shocked by Jesus’ revelation that one of them would betray him, they quickly reveal their self-absorption as a “dispute [φιλονεικία]” erupts over “which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest [τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων]” (Luke 22:24).<sup>590</sup> In response, Jesus challenges them not to behave like “the kings of the Gentiles,” but to serve as he has done (Luke 22:25-27). Furthermore, as Luke tells it, Jesus appears to suggest that they do not need to argue about their position in the kingdom, since they will “eat and drink” at Jesus’ table in his kingdom and “sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Luke 22:28-30).<sup>591</sup> Although the apostles may have been reassured by his words, at this moment, they probably fail to understand that eating and drinking at Jesus’ table entails suffering, betrayal, and a future that is not self-determined (cf. Luke 22:15, 21-22).

Their future destiny at Jesus’ table becomes clear, however, when he alerts Peter and the other apostles about the testing they are about to face: “Simon, Simon, listen! Satan has demanded [ἐξήτησατο]<sup>592</sup> to sift all of you [ὑμᾶς] like wheat” (Luke 22:31). But Jesus does not simply issue a warning and then abandon them. On the contrary, he says to Simon, “I have

---

<sup>590</sup> Neither Matthew nor Mark locates this dispute within the Passover meal. In Matthew, the mother of James and John asks Jesus to seat her sons next to him; when the other disciples hear of her request, they become angry. In Mark, James and John—not their mother—make the request. In both gospels, the incident happens prior to Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem (cf. Matt 20:20-28; Mark 10:35-45).

<sup>591</sup> Larry Edwin Murphy suggests that this passage “indicates a sensitivity to the eschatological concerns of the Jewish people. For Luke, these interests are addressed through the Twelve who are representatives of the twelve tribes of Israel.” Murphy’s analysis of Luke 22:28-30 is a key component in his thesis because he contends that “Luke’s stress on the Twelve, a group whose number signifies a concern with Israel...demonstrates that God’s promises to this people have not failed.” See Larry Edwin Murphy, “The Concept of the Twelve in Luke-Acts as a Key to the Lukan Perspective on the Restoration of Israel,” (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988), 104-131, 166-167.

<sup>592</sup> Or, “asked for himself, begged,” (LSJ, 582).

prayed for you [σοῦ] that your faith may not fail [ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου].” Jesus also informs Simon about his responsibility to “strengthen [στήρισον]” [his] brothers once he turns back (Luke 22:32). Simon immediately disavows Jesus’ prediction: “Lord, I am ready [ἔτοιμός εἰμι] to go with you to prison and to death!” (Luke 22:33). In response, Jesus tells Peter that he will deny knowing him three times before the rooster crows (Luke 22:34).

After the arcane exchange about the swords (Luke 22:35-38), Luke describes two key events while Jesus and his disciples are on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-53). The first one is a brief account of Jesus’ prayer in the garden. After exhorting his disciples to pray, he withdraws to pray; while he is away, they sleep (Luke 22:40-46).<sup>593</sup> In the second part of the garden episode, Jesus is betrayed by Judas (Luke 22:47-48). When some “around him saw what was coming, they asked, ‘Lord, should we strike with the sword? [κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ;]’” (Luke 22:49). Without waiting for a reply, someone takes a sword and cuts off the right ear of the high priest’s slave (Luke 22:50).<sup>594</sup> At once, Jesus says, “No more of this! [ἔατε ἕως τούτου]” and heals the servant’s ear (Luke 22:51). Then, Jesus says to mob, “Have you come out with swords and clubs as if I were a bandit? [ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ξύλων;]” (Luke 22:52). He also reminds the crowd that though he had been teaching in the temple daily, they did not find it necessary to arrest him there (Luke 22:53).

As chapter 22 comes to a close, Luke describes Peter’s denial of Jesus and includes a curious addendum that Jesus “turned and looked at Peter,” at which point Peter remembers what Jesus had said to him at the Passover meal (Luke 22:54-62). The chapter’s concluding narrative also describes how the soldiers mocked and beat Jesus, blindfolded him and demanded that he identify who struck him, and repeatedly insulted him (Luke 22:63-65). The final vignette narrates Jesus’ examination before the religious authorities when they inquire whether he is the Messiah (Luke 22:66-67a). Jesus’ cryptic rejoinder corresponds in some ways to Jeremiah’s reply to King

---

<sup>593</sup> Luke’s version is highly condensed when compared to Matthew and Mark. Jesus returns only once to find his disciples sleeping, rather than three times in the other Synoptics (cf. Matt 26:36-46; Mark 14:32-42).

<sup>594</sup> The Gospel of John names Peter as the culprit (John 18:10-11).

Zedekiah (Jer 38:14-16) and also invokes the epithet “Son of Man,” which Luke not only interjects throughout the Passover meal and arrest scenes (Luke 22:22, 48, 69), but is also found immediately before these events occur as he describes the coming of “the Son of Man” (Luke 21:25-36, esp. vv. 27, 36).

### 4.3.3 Exegesis of Luke 22:35-38 in View of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum*

This brief exchange between Jesus and the apostles<sup>595</sup> opens with Jesus saying to them, “When I sent you without purse and bag and sandals, you didn’t lack anything, did you? [ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλλαντίου<sup>596</sup> καὶ πήρας<sup>597</sup> καὶ ὑποδημάτων, μή τινος ὑστερήσατε;]” (Luke 22:35a).<sup>598</sup> Although it is not acutely critical for the exegesis, it is worth mentioning that Luke’s use of μή rather than οὐ indicates that the expected answer to Jesus’ question is “No.” This anticipated response is reflected not only by the translation above but also confirmed by their succinct response, “No, nothing [οὐθενός]” (Luke 22:35b).

At this point, there is little to debate. There is only one minor text critical issue.<sup>599</sup> In fact, the chief controversy concerns Jesus’ referent. Is it Luke 9:1-6 or 10:1-12? On the one hand, the wording of his question is more consistent with Luke 10 where he says, “Do not carry a purse, a

---

<sup>595</sup> I use “the apostles” because the group is identified as “the apostles” in Luke 22:14. While they are called “disciples” immediately before and after the farewell address (Luke 22:11, 39), they are not designated as such within the farewell address’s strictly defined boundaries. In the gospel, “disciple(s)” is the far more common term (occurring 40 times); “apostles” is used in 6:13; 9:10; 11:49; 17:5; 22:14; 24:10 (and frequently in Acts 1-16); “the twelve” (or “the eleven”) is found in 6:13; 8:1; 9:1, 12; 18:31; 22:3, 47; 24:9, 33 (and in Acts 1:26; 2:14; 6:2). In Luke 6:13 Jesus chooses “twelve” from his “disciples” and also calls them “apostles.” Murphy discusses Luke’s use of “disciples,” “apostles,” and “the twelve” (or “the eleven”). He does not think a distinction between “apostles” and “disciples” should be made in this portion of Luke (i.e., the “disciples” are the “apostles” or “the twelve”). Although I do not strongly disagree with his conclusion, I will generally refer to the disciples as “apostles” here, since Luke does not use that term again until verse 39. For further discussion, see Murphy, “The Concept of the Twelve,” 94-103.

<sup>596</sup> “Bag” or “pouch” (LSJ, 304). Cf. “purse for money,” “a special purse,” or “part of the equipment of the well-to-do townsman.” Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, “βαλλάντιον,” *TDNT* 1:525-526. All four occurrences of this word in the NT are found in Luke (10:4; 12:33; 22:35-36).

<sup>597</sup> “Leathern pouch” for food or “wallet” (LSJ, 1401). Cf. “knapsack,” or “a (big) wallet with (considerable) provisions.” Wilhelm Michaelis, “πήρα,” *TDNT* 6:119-121.

<sup>598</sup> In this section, author’s translations unless otherwise noted.

<sup>599</sup> A few manuscripts omit καὶ ὑποδημάτων. See n. 35, NA<sup>27</sup>.

bag, or sandals [μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ ὑποδήματα]; and greet no one on the road” (Luke 10:4). In contrast, Jesus’ instructions in Luke 9 include extra details about prohibited provisions. He tells them, “Take nothing for the journey [μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν], no staff [μὴτε ῥάβδον], no bag [μὴτε πήραν], no bread [μὴτε ἄρτον], no silver [μὴτε ἀργύριον]—nor an extra tunic [μὴτε (ἀνὰ) δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν]” (Luke 9:4). In short, this discrepancy seems to point to Luke 10 as the referent. On the other hand, Jesus’ instructions in Luke 9 are given to “the apostles” (Luke 9:1), as they are in Luke 22:35. In Luke 10 they are given to “the seventy[-two]” (Luke 10:1). In this instance, the use of “apostles” suggests that Luke 9 is the referent.<sup>600</sup>

Ultimately, it is perhaps irrelevant which text is the referent. After all, both passages display some points of correspondence with Jesus’ query in that they include directions about their conduct while they are guests in someone else’s house—though these instructions are briefer in Luke 9 than in Luke 10 (cf. Luke 9:4; 10:5-9). More significantly, however, both passages state what Jesus’ followers are to do if a town does not welcome them. They are to shake the dust off their feet. In other words, Jesus’ apostles and disciples are not to retaliate against those who reject their message. They are not to avenge. Instead, final judgment against such a town belongs to God, not to them.

Irrespective of which earlier episode was in mind in the verse 35, Jesus’ next remark is challenging not only because of his instruction to buy a sword, but also because of the opening adversative (i.e., ἀλλὰ νῦν) and two substantival participles (i.e., ὁ ἔχων and ὁ μὴ ἔχων).<sup>601</sup> After

---

<sup>600</sup> Nearly a century ago, John Martin Creed offered the following explanation: “[W]e may easily explain the slight discrepancy by supposing a slip of memory on the part of the evangelist.” He also suggests, if one is “inclined to conjecture,” that this discrepancy is traceable to “an earlier source.” In final analysis, Creed says, “On either view we shall regard the assignation of the charge in x. 1 f. to the seventy as a later insertion of the ultimate editor, who has failed to notice the slight discrepancy which his editing has created.” John Martin Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: MacMillan, 1930), 270-271.

<sup>601</sup> The substantival participle of ἔχω with the article is found in Luke 3:11; 5:31; 6:8; 8:8; 9:11; 14:35; 18:24; 19:24, 26; 21:23. In all but two cases (Luke 5:31; 21:23), a transitive sense seems more appropriate because an object is named or implied.

the apostles acknowledge and confirm Jesus' expected answer, he says,<sup>602</sup> "But now [ἀλλὰ νῦν], the one who has a purse must take it [ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον ἀράτω<sup>603</sup>], and likewise a bag [ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν] and the one who does not have [καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων] must sell his cloak and buy a sword [πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν]" (Luke 22:36).

As previously discussed in chapter one, the adversative conjunction ἀλλὰ νῦν has been the source of much debate. Since the expression occurs only here in Luke and is rarely used elsewhere in the NT (i.e., 2 Cor 5:16; Phil 2:12),<sup>604</sup> interpreting the phrase with neither overstatement nor understatement is challenging. According to Conzelmann, this temporal clause points to a dramatic shift from one theological epoch to another: it marks the end of the period of Jesus, which was characterized by peaceful conditions due in large part to Satan's temporary absence (cf. Luke 4:13; 22:3), and the beginning of the period of the church, an era filled with trials, persecutions, and conflict that starts with Jesus' death. However, Conzelmann's hypothesis is problematic when pressed because Luke neither describes Jesus' ministry nor the apostolic church in that way. On the contrary, when Luke-Acts is read, there is peace and hostility as well as acceptance and rejection throughout Jesus' earthly life and the church's early years (e.g., Luke 4:15, 28-29; 5:15; 6:11; 8:26-39; 10:1-12, 25, 38; 11:14-23, 53-54; 13:17, 31; 15:1-2; 18:15-17, 35-43; 19:47-48; Acts 2:42-47; 4:1-4; 5:12-42; 7:54-8:8; *inter alia*).<sup>605</sup>

Also weighing against Conzelmann is the fact that Luke's more common temporal expression in the gospel is ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (Luke 1:48; 5:10; 12:52; 22:18, 69).<sup>606</sup> Since this phrase

---

<sup>602</sup> There are three insignificant variations attested in the MSS for "he said" (i.e., εἶπεν δέ; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν; and εἶπεν οὖν). For specific MSS attestations, see note 36 in NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>603</sup> ἀρεῖ (fut. act. indic. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg.—"he will take") *D* (*et multi apud Basilium*), NA<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>604</sup> Katter identifies three additional, possibly four, examples (2 Cor 5:16; Phil; 2:12; 1 Pet 2:25; and perhaps John 11:22). Although he mentions the text critical problem associated with John 11:22 (ἀλλὰ is omitted in some important manuscripts "and a καὶ separates the two words"), he does not point out that ἐπεστράθητε separates the two words in 1 Pet 2:25. Katter, "Farewell Address," 236, n. 71; cf. 237, n. 78 where he describes Luke's use of νῦν. Cf. G. Stählin, "νῦν (ἄρτι)," *TDNT* 9:1106-1123.

<sup>605</sup> See chapter one, 6-14, for a more thorough presentation and subsequent criticisms of Conzelmann's position. N.B. Tyson, *Death of Jesus*, 48-83.

<sup>606</sup> Luke also uses νῦν δέ (Luke 16:25; 19:42) and combines ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν with δέ in Luke 22:69.

appears to indicate not only a pivotal transition point but also entails the initiation of a period that will extend into the future for some unspecified length of time, it is odd that Luke would have opted to utilize such a strong adversative ἀλλὰ νῦν that is more temporally restrictive if he had had Conzelmann's "Age of the Church" in mind. At this point, of course, it is impossible to ask Luke why he used ἀλλὰ νῦν rather than ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν. One simple, but unsubstantiated rationale is that he was dependent on his source(s) here. Yet whatever the explanation might be, the expression appears to be an important sign that points to a dramatic change whether that change is about the immediate future or for an extended period of time.

Another complicating factor is determining the object of the substantival participles (i.e., ὁ ἔχων and ὁ μὴ ἔχων). For Gormley, who examined three possibilities, this is a crucial matter in order to understand the passage. The first option is to view βαλλάντιον as the object of ὁ ἔχων and μάχαιραν as the object of ὁ μὴ ἔχων. The obvious advantage here is that the natural connection between ὁ ἔχων and βαλλάντιον is maintained (i.e., ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον).<sup>607</sup> The chief disadvantage is that the object of the second participle (i.e., μάχαιραν) does not immediately follow the participle this time, but instead is found at the end of the sentence. For Gormley, the placement of μάχαιραν so far from ὁ μὴ ἔχων is highly problematic because of "the extraordinary word order which it assumes, and the nature of antithetic parallelism of the saying." Therefore, she rejects this option even though it is widely accepted among translators.<sup>608</sup>

The second option is to absolutize both substantival participles: to view them as abstract noun constructs rather than real travelers who actually carry these objects. Taken in this absolute sense, ὁ ἔχων is "anyone who has"—that is, anyone who is self-sufficient and able to provide for himself or herself. In a word, he or she is not impoverished. In like manner, ὁ μὴ ἔχων is "anyone who does not have"—that is, he or she is dependent, in need, without the necessary means.<sup>609</sup>

---

<sup>607</sup> This is Luke's ordinary style (cf. Luke 3:11; 6:8; 8:8; 9:11; 14:35; 18:24; 19:24, 26).

<sup>608</sup> Gormley, "Final Passion Prediction," 49-51.

<sup>609</sup> Another example of this abstract form is found in Luke 19:26.



Since neither participle has a tangible object if this alternative is adopted, the distinct advantage is the enchanting, antithetical parallelism of two figurative classes: “the one who has” and “the one who does not have.” Arguing against this suggestion, however, is the unnatural dissonance it creates between v. 35 and v. 36, which Gormley also points out. In v. 35, Jesus reminds the apostles of the occasion when they did not take purse, bag, and sandals. In light of their previous experience when they literally left their possessions behind, it is illogical to transform “the one who has a purse [ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον]” into an abstraction—i.e., “the one who has [ὁ ἔχων]”—that is placed against another abstraction—i.e., “the one who does not have [ὁ μὴ ἔχων]”—in order to derive or preserve some sort of poetic equilibrium (i.e., antithetical parallelism) in v. 36. In Gormley’s words, “the sequential development of the passage” resists such an interpretation.<sup>610</sup> I concur.

The third option, according to Gormley, is to regard βαλλάντιον as the object for both participles. The advantage of this reading is that it avoids the awkward introduction of the sword as an object in the first option and the abstraction of the participles addressed in the second option. Based on this reading, then, two actual groups of people are under consideration: those who have resources for a journey and those who do not. Members of first group (i.e. ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον) are to take their “money and other necessities” with them on their journey. Members of the second group (i.e., ὁ μὴ ἔχων [βαλλάντιον]—the ones who do not have “money and other necessities”)—should sell their cloak and buy sword before they begin their journey. For Gormley, what is critical is that both groups are called to action or make “provisions”—“ordinary ones if that is possible; extraordinary ones if that is not possible.” The specific action taken, however, depends on one’s particular economic circumstance.<sup>611</sup>

---

<sup>610</sup> Gormley, “Final Passion Prediction,” 52-55.

<sup>611</sup> Ibid., 55-58. For additional details on Gormley’s exegesis of Luke 22:36, see Gormley, “Final Passion Prediction,” 45-69. Also see my comments in chapter one, 23-28. In partial agreement with Gormley’s interpretation is Morgan B. Angliss. He thinks: (1) the sword exchange between Jesus and the apostles—as well as Jesus’ prediction about Peter’s denial (cf. Matt 26:30-35; Mark 14:26-31; the locale is not as clear in John 13:30-38)—took place as the group walked from the upper room to Gethsemane; (2) that it is not about the immediate future (if that had been the intent, εὐθύς would have been used, not ἀλλὰ νῦν); and (3) that

Despite Gormley's confidence that the third option is the best reading, her proposition introduces a troublesome inconsistency: why would "the one who does not have a purse" sell his cloak—which is a valuable possession and even more so, one would think, if traveling—and then buy a sword? Or, to put it differently, why would "the one who does not have a purse," after selling his or her outer garment, not go and procure a purse and bag and thus be equipped and prepared for the journey like "the one who has a purse"? Gormley's third option is also undermined not only by the preceding exchange (v. 35) but also by the apostles' declaration to Jesus that they have two swords (v. 38). Their response leaves little doubt that they thought Jesus is telling them to buy a sword and that at least two of them are already so equipped. In sum, this option introduces an indefensible dichotomy between two groups of disciples (i.e., those who make "ordinary provisions" and those who make "extraordinary provisions")<sup>612</sup> that is not sustainable when the entire passage is considered.

In my estimation, the first option is preferred for a number of reasons. First, it maintains the pericope's internal integrity as discussed above. Second, even though Luke does not typically separate a substantival participle from its object (e.g., Luke 3:11; 6:8; 8:8; 9:11; 14:35; 18:24; 19:24, 26), its placement at the end of this sentence serves to heighten the tension of the conversation as the apostles and Luke's community must wait before they learn what to buy. Furthermore, if Jesus simply instructs the apostles to buy a purse, a bag, and sandals, there is

---

Jesus is instructing the apostles to buy a sword for self-defense, since his departure means that he will no longer directly care for them. Morgan B. Angliss, "Buy A Sword, Luke 22:36," (B.D. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1964), 30-43. Angliss' paraphrase of Luke 22:36 illustrates well where he and Gormley would agree: "But now (following my ignominious death, resulting in the removal from the earth of the King and the principles which will prevail during the kingdom period), the one (of you, my beloved disciples) who has a money bag take it, and likewise a knapsack (in order to care for your needs as you perform your ministries), and the one who does not have (the financial resources as those above) sell (your) outer garment and purchase a (short Roman combat) sword (that you might defend yourself against wild beasts and those persons who would attack you without a valid cause)." Op. cit., 45. Both Angliss and Gormley think that all believers are to take action; but Gormley stops short of endorsing self-defense. For her, procuring a sword remains a metaphor for those who need to make "extraordinary provisions" for their journey. Cf. Fitzmyer who identifies four different interpretations: (1) "*ho echōn* and *ho mē echōn* have the same objs., *ballantion*, 'purse,' and *pēran*, 'knapsack;'" (2) "*ho echōn* has the objs. *ballantion* and *pēran*, but *ho mē echōn* has as obj. *machairan*, 'a sword,' understood from the end of the sentence;" (3) "*ho echōn* has the objs. *ballantion* and *pēran*, but *ho mē echōn* is used absolutely;" and (4) "*ho echōn* and *ho mē echōn* are both used absolutely." Fitzmyer, *Luke 10-24*, 1431-1432.

<sup>612</sup> Gormley, "Final Passion Prediction," 69.

nothing shocking or distinctly revelatory about such a directive. In this case, his words are banal, mundane. But when he tells them to buy a sword, both the apostles and Luke's audience are drawn into the pathos of an extraordinary discourse in a profound and meaningful way that existentially taps into the "two-sword" *traditum*. In other words, Jesus' decree to buy a sword (μάχαιραν)<sup>613</sup> is not some veiled metaphor for courage in the face of soon to be experienced persecution;<sup>614</sup> it is his order to buy a sword, a literal one, just as his instructions to take a purse, bag, and sandals were about real, physical objects. And when he gives this command, his apostles—along with Luke's readers—immediately identify with it because they have been nurtured on the "two-sword" *traditum* that authorizes justified vengeance and the vindication of an honored person when necessary.

In contrast to this literal reading of Jesus' instruction, consider, for example, Katter's explanation of Luke's sword-logion. In Katter's opinion:

The tradition about the sword most probably came to Luke rather than having been created by him. It is an anomaly in his theology...[because] Luke goes out of his way to avoid offenses to the Roman political establishment, e.g., in his attempts to mitigate the charges against Jesus...He [i.e., Luke] qualifies the usage of the sword and repairs its damage in 22:51. Why did he not simply omit it? One obvious supposition is that he was writing in a context where the tradition of swords in the garden was known, and that he was attempting to give it a proper interpretation...[because...r]umors of violent and even revolutionary activity may have circulated around the scene of Jesus' arrest in the garden.<sup>615</sup>

Contra Katter who views this saying as "an anomaly in [Luke's] theology," which Luke "qualifies," "repair[ing] its damage in 22:51," on account of Luke's perceived trepidation of "the Roman political establishment," I argue that Luke's chief concern is with his community and not the Roman authorities. If Luke's overarching worry is about the Romans, why not simply omit the

---

<sup>613</sup> μάχαιρα is used 29 times in the NT and refers to a literal weapon (i.e., "small sword" or "sword;" e.g., Matt 26:47, 51-52, 55; John 18:10-11; Acts 12:2; 16:27; Rev 13:10) or is a figure of speech or metaphor (e.g., Eph 6:17; Heb 4:12). For a brief discussion about the use of μάχαιρα in the NT, see W. Michaelis, "μάχαιρα," *TDNT* 4:524-527.

<sup>614</sup> E.g., Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 134-135; Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 192; Schweizer, *Luke*, 342.

<sup>615</sup> Katter, "Farewell Address," 241 including n. 88, 89, 90.

pericope on the Mount of Olives altogether? After all, Luke freely redacts other passages (e.g., Jesus only returns to the disciples once in Luke while it is three times in Matt and Mark; Luke also relocated the disciples' dispute about greatness to the Supper narrative). For that reason, the sword-logion is not "an anomaly." Rather, it is one of Luke's literary strategies in order to exploit one of Israel's traditions with the ultimate objective of toppling a taken-for-granted attitude that was seen first in Jesus' apostles and also found in some members of Luke's community.

Although I think Katter is correct to assume that the sword tradition was in Luke's source(s), the source discussion is a secondary concern. From my perspective, Luke set "the tradition of swords in the garden [and supper narrative]" against an oblique allusion to the "two-sword" *traditum* for a theological objective: to dissuade his community from using weapons just as Jesus did with his apostles. In the words of Green and Hays, Luke is "repeating an old pattern or echoing ancient metaphors to signal difference at the very heart of similarity." Luke permits, at least for the moment, the apostles and those in his community to continue operating under the parameters of the "two-sword" *traditum*. But Luke's strategy is a sophisticated, indirect and round-about way that requires further inquiry before becoming more evident.<sup>616</sup>

Nielson reinforces this interpretative perspective (i.e., that Luke is concerned with community) when he offers a compelling suggestion about the impact of ἀλλὰ νῦν. He asks, "[D]oes it [i.e., the adversative conjunction] have a present aspect that breaks through into the

---

<sup>616</sup> Elton Trueblood proposes that some of Christ's words—e.g., Jesus' explanation for why he teaches in parables; cf. Matt 13:13-15; Mark 4:10-12; Luke 8:9-10—are "meant to be taken in the exact opposite of their literal expression. In that case some would get it and some would not. Humor is an instrument of natural selection." Specifically about Luke's sword-logion, Trueblood asserts, "We get a strong hint of a similar situation in the account of the two swords (Luke 22:35-38)...We do not know what He meant, but it is practically certain that the Apostles missed some subtle point which was intended to be obvious. Their mistake must have been that of a humorless literalism. In this regard the confusion about the two swords is similar to the confusion about the purpose of speaking in parables." Elton Trueblood, *The Humor of Christ: A Significant but Often Unrecognized Aspect of Christ Teaching* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 92-93. Cf. James M. Dawsey, *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1986), 143-156, esp. 153. While I agree with Trueblood that there is humor in the gospels, I do not think that explains Jesus' words in this case. And while Dawsey's use of the term "irony" is a better way to approach this pericope, in my opinion, Jesus actually instructs the apostles to buy swords. The irony is not so much found in Luke's source that included this exchange between Jesus and his apostles, but is rather embedded in the way that Luke has written his gospel. In other words, Luke makes use of this incident and the "two-sword" *traditum* in order to disrupt a long-standing biblical tradition that sanctioned the use of force in the defense of identity and honor and justified vengeance. In this way, Luke remains faithful to his understanding of Jesus and the message that he proclaimed.

narrative world, and thus the readers' world, or is it a present aspect that relates only to the narrated world of the text?"<sup>617</sup> To ask it differently, are these words limited solely to the purview of the written narrative or do they extend beyond the page and apply to Luke's community as well?

As the narrative soon reveals, Jesus' pronouncement seizes the attention of the apostles, for when he says, "But now," they are alerted to an imminent, momentous occasion. His command to buy a sword instantaneously reverberates with the "two-sword" *traditum*—a tradition that inevitably circumscribes their understanding and propels them along a particular arc. In a flash, their expectations crystallize. When Jesus tells his apostles to buy a sword he reinforces the world of Simeon and Levi—a world where identity and honor are to be preserved, honored persons are defended, and vengeance is justified.

But Jesus' words also engage Luke's community because Luke is exploiting the vast storehouse of traditions that he and his community share with Jesus and his apostles. Since they breathe the air of a "common atmosphere," when Luke narrates Jesus' words, Luke's community involuntarily, reflexively makes associations with those mutually-shared traditions. For that reason, Nielson perceptively asserts that "the adversative conjunction indicates a decisive turning-point in the dialogue,"<sup>618</sup> which is true not only for the "narrated world of the text" (i.e., the apostles' world), but also for the "narrative world" of Luke's community. For, if Jesus' apostles are to buy a sword and emulate their ancestral heroes of the "two-sword" *traditum*, this anecdote about buying swords has implications for Luke's community, especially if that community identifies itself with the apostles and their intertextual (literary) heritage that sanctions the ideals of the "two-sword" *traditum*.

Operating under the assumption that this tradition foregrounds Jesus and his apostles along with Luke and his community, Luke's appeal to one of Israel's scriptures for this radical

---

<sup>617</sup> Nielson, *Until it is Fulfilled*, 111.

<sup>618</sup> *Ibid.*, 112. If I am reading Nielson correctly, he appears to de-emphasize his initial proposal that the adversative conjunction extends the temporal perspective of the text beyond its narrative world (i.e., "the time of Jesus/the disciples") into "the time of Luke/his readers." For, when Nielson exegetes Luke 22:35-38, he focuses more on "the immediate situation in Jesus' own inner circle." *Op. cit.*, 118-122.

course of action (i.e., buying a sword and acting out the “two-sword” *traditum*) in v. 37 is not wholly unexpected. After all, the protagonists of the narrated world and the readers of Luke’s narrative world are familiar with Israel’s scriptures and traditions, a position argued in the first part of this chapter. Thus when Jesus declares, “For I say to all of you [λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν] that this scripture must be realized in me: [ὅτι<sup>619</sup> τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ<sup>620</sup> τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό·] ‘And he was counted among the lawless’; [καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων<sup>621</sup> ἐλογίσθη·<sup>622</sup>] for indeed it concerns

<sup>619</sup> A few MSS insert ετι before ὅτι. See n. 37, NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>620</sup> δεῖ is found eighteen times in Luke. Of these, seven are specifically associated with Jesus’ anticipation of his future suffering or some aspect about what he must do during his ministry (Luke 2:49; 4:43; 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 19:5; 24:7); three expressly link Jesus’ death with the scriptures (Luke 22:37; 24:26, 44); the other eight address what laws “ought” to be followed, behaviors are expected, or the inevitability of war (Luke 11:42; 12:12; 13:14, 16; 15:32; 18:1; 21:9; 22:7). Mineshige states that “δεῖ ist ein lukanisches Vorzugswort [is a preferred Lucan word].” Mineshige, *Besitzverzicht und Almosen bei Lukas*, 109, n. 301. Katter says, “Δεῖ also characterizes Luke.” Katter, *Farewell Address*, 244. In an essay on social-scientific criticism, Philip Richter challenges commentators who so misrepresent Luke’s use of δεῖ that they ultimately equate “divine necessity” with “divine determinism,” an equivalence that Richter rejects in Luke-Acts. See Philip Richter, “Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: An Appraisal and Extended Example,” in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (eds. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; JSNTSup 120; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995), 291-294. For an example of reading δεῖ as “divine determinism,” see the section entitled, “Jesus’ Death as Divinely Determined,” in Greene, “Farewell Speech,” 64-68. Charles H. Cosgrove identifies four “shades of meaning” for δεῖ. First, it “points back to God’s ancient plan (the βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ) and so grounds the kerygmatic history in divine sanction.” Second, it is “a summons to obedience.” Third, it is “God’s guarantee of his plan.” Fourth, “the logic of the divine δεῖ in Luke-Acts involves a dramatic-comedic understanding of salvation-history as a stage set time and again for divine intervention, so that the spotlight of history continuously turns on God’s saving miracle.” Charles H. Cosgrove, “The Divine ΔΕΙ in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God’s Providence,” *NovT* 26/2 (1984): 189-190. John Taylor Squires’ thorough investigation of “the plan of God in Luke-Acts” concluded that “[t]he understanding of providence which informs Luke’s use of the theme of the plan of God might be called a basically Stoic understanding, moderated for popular consumption in the manner of the historians, and mediated to early Christians through hellenistic Judaism such as we see in Josephus...Luke-Acts is to be regarded as a kind of cultural ‘translation’, an attempt to tell a story to people who are in a context somewhat different from the context in which the story originally took place...It is the theme of providence which, as we have seen, draws all of these interests and aims together. Providence was a central theme in hellenistic historiography, a theme which was also central to the Hebrew scriptures, albeit in different terminology. Providence was a central aspect of philosophical discussion and theory, and it had an apologetic function in the less technical writings of hellenism. Providence in the histories had a religious application; it emphasized certain rituals at the expense of others. All of these elements are found in Luke-Acts in association with the theme of ‘the plan of God’, which provides us with a key to unlock some of the complexities of Luke-Acts. John Taylor Squires, “The Plan of God in Luke-Acts,” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988). Hyung Dae Park puts forward an interesting thesis that “Jesus’ death on the cross is not a case of *vaticinium ex eventu* but the fulfilment [*sic*] of a broader picture of הרמ. When Jesus is considered as הרמ, certain הרמ passages in the OT can be considered as the Scripture to which Jesus refers in Lk. 24.44 (cf. 22.37), in which δεῖ is used to point out that all the things concerning Jesus are based on Scripture.” Hyung Dae Park, *Finding Herem? A Study of Luke-Acts in the Light of Herem* (LNTS 357; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 115-169, quote 162-163.

<sup>621</sup> ἀνομος, “lawless” or “impious” (LSJ, 147). Cf. “having no law,” “not paying heed to the law (which exists),” “acting as if there were no law or laws.” W. Gutbrod, “ἀνομος,” *TDNT* 4:1086-1087.

<sup>622</sup> Whereas λογίζεσθαι (λογίζομαι) is a common word in Paul’s letters (esp. Romans), this is its only occurrence in Luke due to its presence in the LXX: ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη. H. W. Heidland opines, “That

what comes to pass in me [καὶ γὰρ<sup>623</sup> τὸ<sup>624</sup> περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει]” (Luke 22:37), all parties are naturally attentive because Jesus links himself with their shared literary heritage—an authoritative realm that defines their identity in significant ways. Appropriately, Jesus’ invocation of a prophetic saying increases the exigency of the situation. Yet in contrast to Matthew and Mark, Luke draws on Isaiah rather than Zechariah,<sup>625</sup> a citation that elicits the following question: Is this Isaianic

---

λογίζεσθαι grounded in reason will fall when confronted by this reality [i.e., ‘the reality of God as this is manifested at the cross’] is stated in Lk. 22:37 in a quotation from Is. 53:12: καὶ μετὰ τοῖς ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη. The purely conceptual transcending of the Gk. sense of λογίζεσθαι as an apprehension of truth is here a picture of the collapse of heaven-storming reason before the revelation of this heaven.” H. W. Heidland, “λογίζομαι,” *TDNT* 4:287. For discussion on whether Luke’s source was closer to the MT [וְאֵת-פְּשָׁעֵי־נַגְנָה] or the LXX in Luke 22:37, see e.g., Katter, *Farewell Address*, 245; Green, *Death of Jesus*, 50; and Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 154.

<sup>623</sup> Omitted by **D** 1424 it sy<sup>s.c.</sup>, NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>624</sup> τὰ Α Θ ψ ῥ<sup>3</sup> lat sy, NA<sup>27</sup>. If this variant is followed, my translation is: “for indeed it concerns the things that come to pass in me.” The τὰ might be a substitution based on τὰ περὶ in Luke 24:19, 27. As far as I could determine, τὸ περὶ with the singular substantival participle or singular noun is found only in Matt 26:28 and Luke 22:37. Joachim Jeremias also noted the uniqueness of this construction: „Der substantivierte präpositionale Ausdruck τὸ περὶ τινος begegnet singularisch im NT nur an unserer Stelle [The substantival prepositional expression τὸ περὶ τινος is encountered singularly in the NT only in our passage].” Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 292. Katter notes that Matt 20:10 also may be an example of a “substantized prepositional phrase following τὸ.” Katter, “Farewell Address,” 246.

<sup>625</sup> Gormley contends that Luke 22:35-38 is “a deliberate substitute for Mk. 14:27-28” (cf. Matt 26:31-35). Two reasons are offered for this conclusion. First, a replacement for the Zechariah citation is necessary, because Luke nowhere reports “the apostles’ scattering during the passion” (cf. Mark 14:50; Matt 26:56). Second, Luke omits the Markan passage, since “the geographical center of activity after the resurrection is not Galilee but Jerusalem (Lk. 24:13, 33, 52; Acts 1:4, 12).” Gormley, “Final Passion Prediction,” 44, 167. Gormley’s explanation is reasonable, but the first reason seems less compelling. The Markan passage reads: “And Jesus said to them, ‘You will all become deserters; for it is written, “I will strike the shepherd, / and the sheep will be scattered.” But after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee” (Mark 14:27-28 NRSV). From my perspective, the most requisite deletion is Jesus’ prediction about going into Galilee ahead of his disciples (v. 28), since the post-resurrection appearances center on Jerusalem and not Galilee in Luke’s gospel. If Luke had simply omitted verse 28 he could have easily retained verse 27 in its present form and position (i.e., before Jesus predicts Peter’s denial). As it is, Luke’s transition from Jesus’ declaration that the apostles will sit on twelve thrones to Peter’s denial seems abrupt and somewhat disjointed. In my estimation, this transition would have been less complicated had Luke retained Mark 14:27. Another curious aspect is the actual citation from Zech 13:7. Only the last half of that verse is quoted in Matthew and Mark. The first half of Zech 13:7 reads: “Awake, O sword [LXX: ῥομφαία], against my shepherd, / against the man who is my associate,’ says the Lord of hosts” (Zech 13:7a NRSV). If Luke 22:35-38 was a substitution for Mark 14:27-28, was it not possible for Luke to incorporate this portion of Zech 13:7 into his narrative and thereby tap into the ideals of the “two-sword” *triditum*, which promotes the preservation of identity and honor and the defense of honored ones? In other words, this saying that speaks of a shepherd who will be struck down with a sword would necessarily intensify the apostles’ desire to defend Jesus, something they were quite prepared to do as Peter’s declaration and the use of the sword on the Mount of Olives demonstrate (Luke 22:31-34, 49-51). Therefore, why not include it? Perhaps, it is because Luke 22:35-38 is not a substitution for or reworking of Mark 14:27-28. Or, is it because the word in the LXX is ῥομφαία rather than μάχαιρα? Of course, it is important to remember that the Passover meal and journey to the Mount of Olives are significantly rewritten in Luke. For that reason, any attempt to explain this revision, including my own, is

saying a prediction about Jesus' future or indicator of something else? Or, stated differently, what sort of relationship exists between Jesus and Israel's scriptures and traditions?

For some commentators, it is routine to point to this brief quote as an example of NT fulfillment of OT scripture or prophecy,<sup>626</sup> since τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί can legitimately be rendered, "this scripture must be fulfilled in me." To support this position, many scholars contend that the excerpt from Isa 53:12 is a prediction of the death of God's suffering servant.<sup>627</sup> However, that inference is not necessary despite the widespread backing that position certainly receives, for the suffering attribute is neither expressly alluded to nor implied in Luke's brief citation here.<sup>628</sup> Strictly speaking, Jesus' suffering on the cross does not even appear to be under consideration at all in Luke 22:37.<sup>629</sup>

Some exegetes undoubtedly will object to the preceding conclusion, since there are intimations of Jesus' inevitable demise present in his farewell address. For example, Jesus speaks of his eagerness to eat this Passover with them before suffering (Luke 22:15); he

---

fraught with speculation and therefore impossible to prove. For additional discussion on the use of Zech 13:7 by Matthew and Mark, see Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 182-186.

<sup>626</sup> E.g., Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 193-194; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 4; Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 132-138; Mallen, *Isaiah in Luke-Acts*, 118-125, 134-158; Gormley, "Final Passion Prediction," 126-141, 170-172; and Brigid Curtin Frein, "The Literary Significance of the Jesus-as-Prophet Motif in the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles," (Ph.D. diss., Saint Louis University, 1989), 241. Taylor sees this saying "as providing a link between the present passage and other non-Markan portions of Lk. (e.g. Lk. Xxiv. 26f., 44ff.)" Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 43.

<sup>627</sup> Cf., e.g., Bock, *Proclamation From Prophecy*, 137-139; Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 132-138, esp. 137; Koet, "Dreams and Scripture," 62-65; and Strauss, *Luke-Acts*, 325-327; who see connections between Isaiah's Suffering Servant and Luke. For an opposing view, see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 206-208, 293-296, who questions this proposition.

<sup>628</sup> Strangely enough, when Jesus' passion is explicitly mentioned in Luke's gospel, there is no direct reference to the Isaiah servant passage. Instead, the titles "the Son of Man" or "Messiah" and not "servant [παῖς, LXX]" are used (cf. Luke 9:21-22, 43b-45; 17:24-25; 18:31-34; 24:6, 26-27, 44-49). Besides Luke 22:37, there are, in fact, only two other NT citations taken from Isa 52:13-53:12 (i.e., "He took our infirmities and bore our diseases" [Matt 8:17 NRSV; cf. Isa 53:4]; and "Like a sheep he was led to the slaughter, / and like a lamb silent before its shearer, / so he does not open his mouth. / In his humiliation justice was denied him. / Who can describe his generation? / For his life is taken away from the earth" [Acts 8:32-33 NRSV; cf. Isa 53:7-8]). Matt 8:17 emphasizes Jesus' compassion; Acts 8:32-33 depicts Jesus' suffering, however, it is not for salvific reasons, but because he was treated unjustly by others. In contrast, Leon Morris sees Jesus' death as substitutionary. See Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary* (repr. 1984; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 310.

<sup>629</sup> In contrast to my position, Kwong argues that there is a compelling connection between Jesus' previous predictions about his suffering and death and Luke 22:37. Kwong, *Word Order of Luke*, 184-189.



announces that he will be betrayed (Luke 22:21-23); and lastly, he declares that Satan will sift all of them (Luke 22:31). In addition, Luke repeatedly integrates Jesus' prior declarations about his destiny—i.e., that he will suffer, be rejected, and be killed (Luke 9:22, 44; 12:50; 13:32-35; 17:24-26; 18:31-33) into his gospel. But Luke's assessment of the disciples' understanding is absolute: "But they did not understand this saying; its meaning was concealed from them, so that they could not perceive it" (Luke 9:45 NRSV; cf. Luke 18:34; 24:16, 25-27, 41, 45). Therefore, when Jesus tells them at the beginning of the meal that he is going to suffer and later announces that he will be "counted among the lawless," it is improbable they understand either him or the Isaianic saying. Simply put, it is doubtful they are capable of conceiving how such a tragic end could ever materialize. Even after Jesus tells them that one of them will betray him, when they attempt to ascertain who it is, they fail (Luke 22:23). My point: the apostles hear something different—what could it be?

Since this inference is not that far-fetched, especially in light of the farewell address dialogue, Jesus' extraction of a fragment from Isaiah must initially be incoherent for the apostles. From their point of view, Jesus is a good and righteous man, a prophet, and a respected teacher by allies and foes alike (Luke 2:52; 3:12; 4:24; 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 18:48; 19:39; 20:21, 39; 21:7; 23:47; 24:19). While the apostles are aware that Jesus is opposed by some authorities (Luke 11:53-54; 13:31; 19:47; 22:2), the extraordinary reception he receives from the people, especially in Jerusalem, would perhaps lead them to believe that they along with his supporters will prevail over the voices of his antagonists (Luke 19:37-38, 48). Ultimately, then, to presume that the apostles understand Isaiah's words as a prophetic prediction of Jesus' actual future demise is incompatible not only with Luke's assessment of Jesus' disciples but also with Luke's depiction of Jesus' reception in Jerusalem.

That the Isaianic saying does not automatically entail a specific prognostication of Jesus' suffering on the cross in the sense of a proof-from-prophecy paradigm is also apparent when one

notes that the words δεῖ τελεσθῆναι<sup>630</sup> should not be limited strictly to prophetic fulfillment. As Kenneth Duncan Litwak points out, “[T]he verb τελέω...can mean to ‘complete’, ‘end’, ‘make happen’, ‘obey’, or ‘pay taxes’, while the rendering ‘fulfill’ is [sometimes] much less plausible as a proper understanding of the verb.”<sup>631</sup> This sense of τελεσθῆναι (i.e., “to complete,” “to end,” “to make happen”) also finds confirmation in the last part of v. 37 where Jesus rephrases the Isaianic saying. That a relationship exists between the prophet’s adage and Jesus’ words is also underscored by the obvious affiliation between τέλος and τελεσθῆναι. Thus, when Jesus says, “For indeed it [i.e., Isaiah’s saying] it is about my end [καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ<sup>632</sup> ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει],” his reformulation of the Isaianic saying suggests that it is a synonymous statement. The NRSV translators also recognize this parallelism with their rendering, “and indeed what is written about

---

<sup>630</sup> Mineshige points out that the combination of δεῖ and τελέω is found only in Luke 18:31; 22:37; and Acts 13:29 (cf. Luke 21:22; 24:44). See Mineshige, *Besitzverzicht und Almosen bei Lukas*, 109, n. 301.

<sup>631</sup> Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London—New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 120. Although Litwak’s comment is specifically about Luke 18:31, I contend it is applicable to Luke 22:37 as well. For confirmation of this understanding of τελέω see LSJ, 1771-1772 and Gerhard Delling, “τελέω,” *TDNT* 8:59-60. Litwak is also tremendously insightful with his analysis of Luke 24. He begins by pointing out that when Jesus talked with the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, “[i]t is *the Scriptures* that need explaining, not the events of the last few days.” To support this claim, Litwak notes that “[t]hey have already told Jesus that they had hoped that Jesus was the Messiah, implicitly showing that they surely did believe the Scriptures of Israel as *they understood them*.” According to Litwak, then, what they need is “a [new] hermeneutical aid” if their blindness is to be removed. He asserts, “The disciples have been blind; they cannot integrate a suffering, dying and rising Messiah into their exegesis of the prophets. Jesus explains the Scriptures to them so that they are able to do this. Jesus accomplishes this by reading the Scriptures through, or in light of his own experience...Jesus uses his own life, death and resurrection to point *backwards* into the Scriptures of Israel to interpret them, making sense of Israel’s sacred traditions through his own experience, not vice-versa...From Luke’s perspective, the events of Jesus’ life are *the* guides for interpreting the Scriptures of Israel.” Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture*, 118-120. For further discussion on Luke 24, esp. vv. 44-49, op. cit., 116-155. Bart J. Koet offers a number of criticisms of Litwak’s work. For instance, Koet thinks “the concept of ‘framing in discourse’ is not altogether clear” (I concur); “that Litwak’s own statements are sometimes more passionate than accurate; some sentences are even hard to understand;” “he gives so much attention to the failures of other writers that he seems to forget to present a coherent view of the way Luke uses continuity;” “its tone is enthusiastic, but the content is not always ripe” (perhaps, but overall I think Litwak makes a good case); and finally, “listening to echoes can be a deceiving enterprise; the less clear the echo, the greater the chance that we are deceived; the less specific the intertextual relation, the less specific the lesson to learn” (that may be true, but “listening to echoes” can also open up doors into new realms of meaning). For Koet’s full critique, see Bart J. Koet’s review of Litwak’s book in *Review of Biblical Literature* 01/2006. Accessed online at: [http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4751\\_4916.pdf](http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4751_4916.pdf) .

<sup>632</sup> When περὶ is used with the genitive, it can mean “about,” “concerning,” “for,” “on account of,” or “on behalf of.” Cf. LSJ, 1366; Ernst Harald Riesenfeld, “περὶ,” *TDNT* 6:53-56. Gormley cites three possible translations for τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος: “the things written about me;” “the things that refer to me;” and “my earthly life.” Gormley, “Final Passion Prediction,” 10-12.

me is being fulfilled,” but unnecessarily inundate the phrase with “fulfillment” overtones based on their restrictive interpretation of τελεσθῆναι.

Even if one accepts in principle that the Isaiah quote and Jesus’ restatement are equivalent expressions, the irregular sentence structure makes it challenging to arrive at a satisfactory translation. One particular obstacle is determining whether ἔχει should be understood in the transitive or intransitive sense. On the one hand, given that Luke’s customary practice is to employ the verb in a transitive sense, which either specifies or implies an object (e.g., Luke 5:24; 7:33; 9:58; 14:28; 19:25-26, 31, 34; 20:24; 24:39), one might expect this to be true in Luke 22:37 as well. Therefore, if a transitive meaning is applied to ἔχει, one possible rendering is: “For indeed it has (entails?) the end about me,” but such a rendering is clumsy and unwieldy. On the other hand, perhaps a better option is to view ἔχει in an intransitive sense so that the implied equivalence with the Isaianic saying can be maintained more easily.<sup>633</sup> Following this path, the sentence can be translated as I did in the preceding paragraph or even more loosely as: “For indeed it is (about) what I complete,” “For indeed it is (about) what is being realized in me,” or “For indeed it is what happens to me.” In my estimation, these intransitive renderings are preferred because they preserve the implicit parallelism and avoid the common introduction of questionable “fulfillment” verbiage like that of the NRSV.<sup>634</sup>

---

<sup>633</sup> Arguably, there is at least one other instance in Luke when ἔχει could be understood in the intransitive sense. In the parable about the worthless slaves, Jesus asks, “He [i.e., the master] does not thank a slave for doing the things commanded, does he? [μὴ ἔχει χάριν τῷ δούλῳ ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὰ διατάχθεντα;]” (Luke 17:9). But even here, a transitive sense is possible: “He has no thanks for the slave who does what is commanded, does he?”

<sup>634</sup> Gormley’s translation of v. 37 also retains fulfillment notions: “I tell you, this Scripture must be fulfilled in me: ‘He was classed with criminals;’ Indeed it is having its fulfillment.” Gormley, “Final Passion Prediction,” 75. Minear’s translation is: “What is written about me here and now is finding its fulfillment.” Minear, “Note,” 131. Alfred Plummer offers the following opinion: “καὶ γάρ. An extension of the argument: ‘and what is more.’ This fulfillment is not only necessary,—it is reaching its conclusion, ‘is having an end’ (Mk. iii.26).” Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1896), 506. Fitzmyer says, “The expression *echein telos*, lit. ‘have an end,’ can be understood in several ways: (1) ‘is at an end,’ which with *to peri emou* referring to Jesus’ earthly life would mean: ‘my life’s work is at an end,’ i.e. comes to cessation in a temporal sense...(2) ‘has its fulfillment,’ i.e. all that has been foreseen in God’s plan comes to realization, fulfillment. Since the vb. *telein* has been used in the preceding sentence in the sense of ‘fulfill,’ *telos*, the cognate n., is given the same sense here...[and] (3) ‘(now) reaches its goal,’ understanding *telos* as that toward which all Jesus’ life and ministry have been aimed.” Fitzmyer, *Luke 10-24*, 1433.

Despite the awkward structure of the final phrase in v. 37, it is reasonable to conclude that the Isaianic saying and Jesus' paraphrase of it are synonymous expressions that do not necessarily entail promise-fulfillment concepts. But if it is problematic to think that the Isaianic saying predicts Jesus' future, what is the relationship between Jesus, the Isaianic saying, and the "two-sword" *traditum*? Or, to state this question in a form that corresponds to the way it was first asked above, if the Isaianic saying is not predicting Jesus' future, what does it indicate?

The key for unlocking this mystery resides elsewhere and begins, in actual fact, by returning to a point mentioned above that Luke's focus is not on suffering, but on another attribute. Jesus' assertion in v. 37 that he is going to be called a "lawbreaker," "a criminal," or one who has no regard for Israel's scriptures and traditions,<sup>635</sup> entails something more than a proof-from-prophecy, point-to-point template, that equates ἀνόμων either with the apostles,<sup>636</sup> the criminals (κακοῦργοι) who are crucified with Jesus (Luke 23:32),<sup>637</sup> or the Romans (cf. Luke 24:7; Acts 2:23).<sup>638</sup> Rather, this verse concerns a prevalent theme in Luke: God's servant will be "counted among the lawless"—that is, he will be labeled a lawbreaker or criminal.<sup>639</sup> That this feature is one of Luke's foci is substantiated not only by the subsequent condemnation of Jesus

---

<sup>635</sup> W. Gutbrod lends support to this characterization when he states that ἀνομος signifies "on the subjective attitude, 'not paying heed to the law (which exists),' 'acting as if there were no law or laws.' Since this attitude is usually wrong in the eyes of others a judgment is thus declared." W. Gutbrod, "ἀνομος," *TDNT* 4:1086-1087.

<sup>636</sup> E.g., Minear, "Note," 133; and David L. Tiede who asserts, "So here Jesus tells them to be equipped for an alien task, one which will be out of character and leave them vulnerable to false charges...he is orchestrating the symbolic action which the Scriptures are the script." David L. Tiede, *Luke* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 389.

<sup>637</sup> E.g., Strauss, *Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 326-327; Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy*, 137-139; Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship*, 73, n. 107; and Tyson, *Images*, 89.

<sup>638</sup> E.g., Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, 352-353.

<sup>639</sup> Bock's remark about this citation is a classic example of understatement and worth mentioning: "Luke presents this citation of Isa. 53.12 in a unique pericope of some difficulty." Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy*, 137. Evans, too, offers a memorable comment: "It [i.e., v. 37] affords an example of the 'atomic' use of scripture, where only the words quoted, irrespective of any context, are meant to apply." Evans, *Saint Luke*, 806. My favorite, however, is from Samuel Tobias Lachs: "There are no rabbinic parallels to this section," which indicates that the rabbis ultimately may have the right strategy for Luke's sword-logion, that is, it is sometimes better to say nothing, a position that I find somewhat ironic for rabbis. Samuel Tobias Lachs, *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Hoboken, N. J.: Ktav, 1987), 411.

by his adversaries (cf. Luke 22:66-71; 23:2, 5, 10-11, 18-21, 23-25, 35-39), but also by Jesus' habitual association with sinners during his earthly ministry (e.g., Luke 5:30-32; 7:34, 39; 15:1-2; 19:7).<sup>640</sup> From Luke's perspective as narrator, Jesus is time after time "counted among the lawless." Viewed in this way the passage does not function in some prescient anticipatory fashion that narrowly links Jesus and/or his apostles with condemned robbers or the Romans. On the contrary, the citation moves beyond promise-fulfillment theology, into a realm of prophetic realization and completion. In other words, Jesus' entire life—not just his death—reifies or actualizes the prophet's words according to Luke.

Litwak's analysis of Luke 24:44-49 is helpful at this point and provides a way to get at the meaning of Luke 22:37. During this portion of his monograph, Litwak argues that even Luke 22:44-49 "does not provide evidence for a promise-fulfillment interpretation of Luke's use of the Scriptures."<sup>641</sup> Litwak justifies this conclusion, in part, on the fact that no specific texts are referenced in either the passion predictions or Luke 24. In addition, he makes the case that:

Luke's use of the Scriptures of Israel at the front of Luke's Gospel was for framing in discourse, and nothing would lead his audience to interpret Lk. 24.44-49 in a different (promise-fulfillment) manner... [Since t]he primary use of the Scriptures of Israel in Luke 1(-2) is for framing in discourse to show continuity between God and his people in the past and God and his people now...it is unlikely that Luke would make a programmatic statement in 24.44-49 that presented a hermeneutic out of step with what the narrative has already exemplified from the outset.<sup>642</sup>

Litwak further contends that when Luke 22:44 uses πληρωθῆναι rather than τελεσθῆναι, it "does not mean to 'fulfill (a prophecy)', but to 'carry out', the word's more common meaning."<sup>643</sup>

Accordingly, in Litwak's opinion,

When Jesus says 'it is written', he is not sending the disciples off on a 'treasure hunt' for texts to which specific events can be mapped. Rather, the totality of

---

<sup>640</sup> Along similar lines, Green states, "A well-known motif with the Third Gospel is Jesus' friendship with sinners, and this is typically bundled together with the hostility he attracts on account of those associations (e.g., 7:34, 39; 15:1-2; 19:7-10). It is more probably in this sense that Jesus is 'numbered with the lawless.'" Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 775-776.

<sup>641</sup> Litwak, *Echoes of Scriptures*, 123.

<sup>642</sup> *Ibid.*, 126.

<sup>643</sup> *Ibid.*, 129.

Scripture reveals a divine plan and Jesus and his disciples' own experience somehow *actualize the patterns* found in the Scriptures or carries out the divine plan which encompasses the Scriptures.<sup>644</sup>

In a similar way, then, when Luke's Jesus cites the prophetic text from Isaiah and then paraphrases it in v. 37, he is not invoking a promise-fulfillment or proof-from-prophecy paradigm, but attempting to highlight a fundamental pattern that is embedded in Israel's scriptures and traditions. Rather than simply seeing these words as an ancient prophet's forecast of Jesus' death, the citation signifies the end, the completion, or the full realization of Jesus' life.<sup>645</sup> The Isaianic saying confirms what is always true: God's servant—whoever that may be—will be “counted among the lawless.” And in this particular case, Jesus is the one who is going to be falsely accused just like God's servant in Isaiah had been.

At first, the apostles are unable to fathom the implications of Jesus' statement. It would have been unbelievable on one level. When Jesus places himself in the midst of “lawbreakers” and “criminals” they neither understand nor accept it. Such a proposition simply does not make sense—they know him neither as a lawbreaker nor criminal. To be sure, they are in shock. But in short order, they regroup and reorient themselves to Jesus' declaration; they quickly recover their composure and reconfigure Jesus' assertion in such a way that it is compatible with the “two-sword” *traditum*. In other words, they reject Jesus' meaning and impose their own on it based on their narrative world. Accordingly, they will not allow Jesus to be called a lawbreaker or criminal. On the contrary, they will defend him.

---

<sup>644</sup> Ibid., 131 (emphasis added). For more on Litwak's analysis, see his *Echoes of Scripture*, 123-146, esp. 141, 143-146.

<sup>645</sup> Brawley's “carnavalesque” analysis also displays some correspondence with Litwak's understanding as well as my own. Brawley writes, “When by Jesus' inference the opponents drive toward a carnivalesque construct of world, the world sanctioned by the narrative resists it primarily by a citation from scripture. This citation may be classified as hermeneutical, that is, it provides understanding of the baffling event of the arrest of messiah. This understanding comes as part of the world that stands in contrast to the carnivalesque. In the construct of world advanced by the norms of the narrative, the answer is fulfillment of scripture: ‘He was reckoned with the transgressors’ (Luke 22:37)...Jesus' direct appeal to Isa 53:12 (Luke 22:37) makes a claim to be a fulfillment, a *completion*...Jesus' citation does not overthrow Isa 53:12. Rather, it depends on it...[because]...there is an implicit claim that Isaiah is unfinished...” Brawley, *Text to Text*, 48, 59 (emphasis added).

Litwak correctly points out, in my opinion, that “the disciples’ inability to grasp Jesus’ statements was not based on divine veiling but on the inability of their imaginations to integrate what Jesus was saying to them with their understanding of Jesus.”<sup>646</sup> Extending Litwak’s thought, I contend that the “inability of [the disciples’] imaginations to integrate what Jesus was saying to them” here is due, at least in part, to the constriction of their imaginations because of the nearly complete assimilation of their minds by their own communal narrative traditions, and specifically in this case, the “two-sword” *traditum*. For that reason, the explanation for their blindness, their inability to understand, and their unwillingness to accept Jesus’ declaration can be traced to the world of the “two-sword” *traditum*. They live in a world where honored ones are defended and vengeance is justified. Consequently, their response to Jesus will flow out of their inculcated predispositions.

From their perspective Jesus has confirmed their taken-for-granted world during the meal when he acknowledged their loyalty—“You are those who have stood by me in my trials” (Luke 22:28 NRSV). Even their vain effort to determine who might betray Jesus indicates their allegiance to him—they want to identify the villain and dispose of him (Luke 22:23). Peter’s rejoinder to Jesus (“I am ready to go with you to prison and to death” [Luke 22:33 NRSV]) is not a flippant retort, but a genuine sign of his courageous resolve to defend Jesus at all costs. To be sure, they are in the world of “two-sword” *traditum*, where identity and honor matter, family members and comrades are defended, and vengeance is justified against others, even members of one’s own nation, including religious leaders, if necessary. In sum, Isaiah’s words and Jesus’ reiteration ironically reinforce the apostles’ determination to stand alongside Jesus and defend him at all costs.

Although initially they may have been disturbed by his announcement that he will be “counted among the lawless,” they soon reorient themselves and, as the exchange in v. 38 demonstrates, they are ready to prepare themselves—two, in fact, are already prepared—to respond to any threat as Simeon and Levi would have. They quickly accept that Jesus—like

---

<sup>646</sup> Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture*, 138.

God's servant in Isaiah—will be considered a lawbreaker even though he is a righteous person worthy of honor. But rather than being unduly perturbed by Jesus' assertion, the apostles instinctively identify with the long-standing traditions of their ancestors and believe that they, too, can carry out heroic feats like them. At this point, they and their nexus with the "two-sword" *traditum* are inseparable. Hence, Jesus' order to buy a sword and his invocation of Isaiah's words embolden them to defend him.<sup>647</sup>

After Jesus tells his apostles to buy a sword (v. 36) and they hear his invocation and paraphrase of an Isaianic saying that paradoxically makes sense of the moment (v. 37), they immediately say, "Lord, look, here are two swords [κύριε, ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο]" (Luke 22:38).<sup>648</sup> That they live in the world of the "two-sword" *traditum* is now unmistakable. They are ready to defend Jesus, to preserve his identity and honor, and execute vengeance on his enemies. Just as Simeon and Levi retaliated against Shechem for violating, dishonoring, and shaming their sister Dinah and their family as well, so, too, will the apostles on behalf of Jesus. On this occasion, however, the apostles will not wait until after an injustice is perpetrated against him. On the contrary, they will act as soon as Jesus is threatened; there will be no delay in their retaliatory attack (Luke 22:49-51).

---

<sup>647</sup> In contrast to Gormley who claims, "That Lk. 22:35-38 is not an independent literary unit and that it lacks internal cohesion suggest that the passage did not originally circulate as a unit," my reading possibly suggests that there is more "internal cohesion" than one might think at first. In addition, if there is "internal cohesion" in Luke 22:35-38, the pericope may have circulated as "an independent literary" before Luke included it in his gospel. Whatever the case, I concur with Gormley and others who affirm that Luke significantly redacted his sources. Gormley, "Final Passion Prediction," 81. Kwong's assessment of Luke 22:35-38 is fascinating because of the impact his word order analysis of Luke might have on future redaction critical investigations. For example, Kwong argues that "[t]he [entire] discourse has a high degree of continuity...[but that]...the content of the speech recorded in 22.37 represents topic discontinuity." While I do not know specifically how an internal "topic discontinuity" (i.e., v. 37) within a pericope that shows evidence of "continuity" might alter redactional studies, it is probably an issue worth consideration for those with Kwong's rhetorical expertise.

<sup>648</sup> For an alternative interpretation of v. 38, see Lampe who argues that v. 38 "is a clumsy attempt to establish a connection between the dialogue (verses 35 to 37) and the episode of the attack on the high priest's servant." Lampe, "The Two Swords," 335-351, esp. 335, 342-348. Like Gormley, Lampe believes that Luke is redacting Mark 14:27-28, which cites Zech 13:7. Julius Wellhausen also sees a connection between Luke 22:38 and Luke 22:49 when he asks and answers his own question: „Was ist der Ausgangspunkt? Vermutlich Vers 38, der auf 22, 49 ausschaut [What is the point of departure? Presumably, verse 38 points to 22:49.]" Julius Wellhausen, *Evangelienkommentare* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987). Even if I concede that Luke redacts Mark 14:27-28 and substitutes his own composition for it, I do not think it is appropriate to call the substitution "clumsy." In my opinion, Luke is a very adroit and sophisticated writer who is worthy of a better explanation. For more of my comments on Lampe, see chapter one, 18-23.



Yet it is not only one provincial, ancestral story that compels them. The apostles also are ideological captives of a venerable tradition that is part of HB scriptures (e.g., the faithful response of the Levites to Moses' call [Exod 32:25-29]; and Phinehas' zealous, righteous act because of the sexual immorality of his own people [Num 25:1-18]) as well as the lore of the rewritten story that is found in a vast array of Second Temple writings (e.g., Judith's divinely sanctioned beheading of the Assyrian general Holofernes [Jdt. 8:1-16:25]; the celebratory accolades for Levi's conduct in *T. Levi* [e.g., *T. Levi* 2:2; 5:3; 6:4, 8; 7:3]; and the courageous conduct of Simeon and Levi as they defend Aseneth when Pharaoh's son and four of Jacob's sons ambush her [*Jos. Asen.* 23:1-28:8]). Because the apostles are part of a narrative tapestry that includes the "two-sword" *traditum*, especially the renowned amplifications of Simeon and Levi's noble feat, the apostles are poised to act. Hence, when the constellation of their cultural and religious heritage, their misguided messianic expectations that were heightened upon entering Jerusalem (i.e., the people shout, "Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord" Luke 19:38),<sup>649</sup> and the intimations of Jesus' farewell address (Luke 22:14-38) intersect, the apostles show Jesus two swords. No one is actually shocked—neither Jesus and his apostles, nor Luke and his community.

To press this point and further attest to the apostles' frame of mind, Luke's narrative itself includes a number of signposts that imply the disciples were aware of an approaching conflict. In the opening of this chapter, Luke summarizes the hostile feelings that the chief priest and scribes have for Jesus: "they were seeking how they might put him to death [ἐζήτουν...τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν

---

<sup>649</sup> In contrast to Matthew and Mark, Luke substitutes "king" for "one" as Jesus enters Jerusalem (cf. Matt 21:1-11, esp. v. 9; Mark 11:1-11, esp. v. 9; Luke 19:29-40, esp. v. 38). It is also notable that Matthew and Mark place the request of James and John to sit on Jesus' right and left "in his kingdom" (Matt 20:21) or "in his glory" (Mark 10:37), which discloses their messianic expectations, immediately prior to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Luke either omits this incident altogether or incorporates a highly redacted version of it in Jesus' farewell address (Luke 22:24-30; cf. Matt 20:20-28; Mark 10:35-45). Perhaps, Luke's substitution of "king" for "one" was his way of retaining or signaling the misguided messianic expectations of the disciples, since he does not include the request of James and John. Ps 118:26 reads: "Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord [יְהוָה בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה הַבָּא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה];" LXX: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

αὐτόν],” (Luke 22:2), a reality that the apostles were surely aware of given other confrontations (e.g., Luke 11:53-54; 19:47-48; 20:19-20). The ominous character of the story increases dramatically when Luke declares, “Then Satan entered into Judas [Ἐἰσήλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν]” (Luke 22:3). The private machinations of Judas and the religious leaders corroborate the fact that a real threat is emerging (Luke 22:4-6). Then during Jesus’ farewell address, the apostles’ angst (apprehension) becomes even more acute as he tells them that he is about to suffer (Luke 22:15) and that one of them will betray him (Luke 22:21-22). And even though Jesus predicts that Peter will deny him, Peter’s instantaneous and vehement protest mitigates Jesus’ words and reassures all of them that they are prepared to die for him. And if they are willing to die for him, they are ready to fight like Simeon and Levi—to pick up a sword and defend Jesus at all costs. Therefore, the swords make sense.

*Pace* Tannehill and Minear who, in my estimation, project fear onto Luke’s narrative, the apostles do not carry swords out of fear.<sup>650</sup> In this moment, they are acting courageously, in harmony with a tradition whose provenance begins in the HB and is zealously refracted in later Jewish writings. Moreover, fear is an unlikely explanation for the apostles’ behavior, since Luke rarely depicts them as being afraid. There are, in actuality, relatively few occasions when Jesus’ disciples are afraid in Luke and in these cases it is not fear of human authorities or powers, but usually fear of divine power or terror prompted by an epiphany.<sup>651</sup> Had it been Luke’s purpose to portray the disciples as a fearful lot, he could have easily done so after Jesus’ arrest in the

---

<sup>650</sup> Tannehill asserts, based in part on Minear, that “Jesus’ command does not cause something to happen but reveals what the disciples have already done out of fear...The fact that they [i.e., the apostles] already have two swords shows that [their present] fear is controlling their actions.” Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 267. “[T]hey are scared.” Tannehill, *Luke*, 323. Minear contends that the apostles “had already secured the swords, secretly, fearfully, disobediently.” Minear, “Note,” 132. While I agree with Tannehill and Minear that the apostles are in some way part of “the lawless” ones (*ἀνομοί*), I do not think fear is the issue at this point, at least as far as Luke is concerned.

<sup>651</sup> E.g., after the miraculous catch of fish (Luke 5:1-11, esp. vv. 8-10); after Jesus calmed the storm (Luke 8:22-25); during Jesus’ transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36, esp. v. 34); when Jesus declares that the Son of Man will be betrayed (Luke 9:44-45); when the women see two men inside the empty tomb of Jesus (Luke 24:5); and, finally, when Jesus appears before the disciples after his resurrection (Luke 24:37).

garden. But Luke says absolutely nothing about them being afraid; he mentions neither fear nor their scattering and running away—for that detail one has to refer to Matthew or Mark.<sup>652</sup>

Rather than fear, Luke routinely depicts the apostles as passionate followers of Jesus who are predisposed to confront any opponent. For example, John attempts to stop someone who is casting out demons in Jesus' name but not following him (Luke 9:49-50). When the Samaritans refuse to receive Jesus because "his face was set toward Jerusalem," James and John are ready to call fire down from heaven (Luke 9:51-56). Even when they face a mob in Mount of Olives, the disciples are eager and willing to use their swords (Luke 22:49-50).<sup>653</sup> It is only after Jesus orders the disciples to put away their swords that one might introduce fear. However, even in this instance, I think it is better to characterize the apostles as disoriented after the garden scene instead of fearful. In other words, they do not know what to do, for when Jesus ordered them to stop, he overturned their taken-for-granted world (Luke 22:51).

That the apostles are guided by the "two-sword" *traditum* and not acting out of fear is also apparent when they produce *two* swords. Contra Minear, I do not think the two swords symbolize the law's proviso that requires two witnesses before a person can be found guilty (cf. Deut 17:6-7; 19:15).<sup>654</sup> Nor do I think it appropriate to disparage the apostles and claim that "the apostles manifest their dullness" by having the swords.<sup>655</sup> The possession of two swords—and no more—

---

<sup>652</sup> After Jesus' arrest, Mark states, "All of them deserted him and fled" (Mark 14:50 NRSV; cf. Matt 26:56). Fear as an attribute of the disciples is more common in Matthew and Mark (e.g., Matt 8:26; 14:27; 17:7; 28:5, 10; Mark 4:40; 6:50; 9:32; 10:32; 16:8).

<sup>653</sup> The apostles' audacity or boldness is a common attribute also found in Acts (e.g., 4:13, 29, 31; 9:27-28; 13:46; 14:3; 19:8; 28:31).

<sup>654</sup> Minear asserts, "The possession at the covenant table of *two* swords provides the *double* witness required by Deuteronomy and insisted upon by Luke, a witness to the fulfillment of Isa. liii 12." For Minear, this point further substantiates his claim that "the apostles without exception are the *ἀνομοί* with whom Jesus is to be 'reckoned' in his arrest, trial, and death." Minear, "Note," 133.

<sup>655</sup> Green, *Luke*, 775. A more egregious example is Frederick W. Danker who harangues the apostles with unwarranted condescension: "No band of followers could have been more knuckle-headed than the eleven apostles who came equipped to the final battle with two swords (22:38) and ended up slashing off a piece of ear (22:50)." Frederick W. Danker, *Luke* (Proclamation Commentaries; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 102. Although I do not entirely agree with Mosothoane's explanation that having two swords is "ridiculous," his assessment reflects a kinder and more appropriate attitude when addressing such a difficult passage. He states, "What he [i.e., Jesus] is saying is neither that two swords are enough (that would be ridiculous in the light of Lk.22:36) nor that the conversation must now be terminated. He is saying that his attempt to explain

is appropriate neither on legal grounds nor for any military or pragmatic considerations, but rather because the apostles believe they live in a divinely ordered realm. They will defeat their adversaries with two swords because the Lord is with them just as he was with their ancestors Simeon and Levi. That ancient feat was not about an ordinary battle between earth-bound enemies, but about what God can accomplish through his servants. The world of the “two-sword” *traditum* is the world of the apostles just as it was for Pharaoh’s son who acknowledged before Simeon and Levi, “[B]y these two swords of yours thirty thousand fighting men were cut down” (*Jos. Asen.* 23:3). The apostles are concerned about neither the number of their opponents nor the weapons they carry. On the contrary, what resonates with them is the “two-sword” *traditum* whose ideals are ensconced in the exuberant words of Simeon and Levi, “With these two swords the Lord God punished the insult of the Shechemites (by) which they insulted the sons of Israel, because of our sister Dinah whom Shechem the son of Hamor had defiled” (*Jos. Asen.* 23:14).

Despite insurmountable odds, the apostles remain confident. Not only are they aware of the heroic feats of Simeon and Levi, the apostles also have been shaped by other stories and traditions that routinely rehearse a cornucopia of triumphant victories over formidable foes (e.g., Moses vs. Pharaoh; Joshua against Jericho; Gideon and his army of 300 men vs. the Midianites; Samson vs. the Philistines; Elisha and the Arameans; Hezekiah vs. Sennacherib and the Assyrian army; and Judas Maccabeus vs. Antiochus Epiphanes).<sup>656</sup> All in all, the apostles’ display of *two swords* is no real surprise.<sup>657</sup>

---

and their failure to grasp the severe nature of the testing they are about to encounter is enough; the testing itself would now begin.” Mosothoane, “Violence in the Gospel Tradition,” 131.

<sup>656</sup> Besides these celebrated stories, the book of Joel (dated anywhere from the 8<sup>th</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.) includes a prophecy about taking up swords in the context of the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem (Joel 3:1-21): “Proclaim this among the nations: / Prepare war, / stir up the warriors. / Let all the soldiers draw near, / let them come up. / Beat your plowshares into swords, / and your pruning hooks into spears; / let the weakling say, ‘I am a warrior’” (Joel 3:9-10). If the apostles were familiar with this prophecy and its injunction to take up the sword, it would likely intensify their resolve to defend Jesus. In my opinion, what is even more intriguing is the implication that ensues if any part of Luke’s community also had appropriated the sentiments of Joel 3. In such a case, it is significant and perhaps more than coincidental that Luke quotes Joel in Acts. However, it is not the passage that exhorts the use of the sword, but a text that speaks of God pouring out his spirit so that all might call on the Lord’s name and be saved, not killed (Acts 2:16-21; cf. Joel 2:28-32).

<sup>657</sup> It is interesting to note in Luke that the disciples often act in pairs: (1) James and John want to call fire down upon a village of the Samaritans (Luke 9:52-56); (2) the seventy(-two) are sent out in pairs (Luke

After the apostles state that they have two swords, Jesus says, “It is enough!

[ἱκανὸν ἔστω].”<sup>658</sup> Yet he is not being sarcastic, dismissive, or revealing his frustration.<sup>659</sup> He is, in actuality, endorsing the apostles’ taken-for-granted world of the “two-sword” *traditum* for the moment. In other words, when the apostles hear Jesus tell them that two swords are enough, his retort confirms in their minds what they already believe to be true: that if the Lord is on their side, they cannot fail. Just as two swords were sufficient for Simeon and Levi long ago, two swords will suffice in the present. But what the apostles do not realize is that Jesus’ endorsement will be

---

10:1); (3) Jesus sent two disciples to obtain a colt for his entry into Jerusalem (Luke 19:29-35); and (4) Peter and John are sent to prepare the Passover meal (Luke 22:8).

<sup>658</sup> Of the forty occurrences of ἱκανός in the NT, twenty-seven are in Luke. According to Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, the word “does not usually have any particular emphasis.” That being said, Rengstorf says the following about its use in Luke 22:38: “This answer is not very clear in the context, and various explanations have been offered. Does He mean that two swords are adequate for what is ahead? Or does His saying imply censure rather than reassurance, i.e., that His disciples have completely misunderstood Him, that they have construed the metaphor of v. 36 as a command, and that they have met it by producing two swords?” Rengstorf then offers three possible meanings: (1) “Jesus breaks off the discussion as useless;” (2) the expression is irony, i.e., “two swords are absurdly inadequate;” and (3) the saying is “designed to shake the naive self-confidence of the disciples and to free them from hoping in the sword.” Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, “ἱκανός,” *TDNT* 3:293-296. Gormley also offers three meanings for Jesus’ declaration: (1) “Two swords are enough!” (2) “Enough has been said!” and (3) “Enough of this!” Gormley, “Final Passion Prediction,” 12. For Minear, this expression “may mean—‘This is quite enough to fulfill the prophecy.’” Minear, “Note,” 131. Archibald T. Robertson suggests, “Probably used to close discussion of the subject which they did not understand. Cf. Deut. iii.26.” Archibald T. Robertson, *A Translation of Luke’s Gospel with Grammatical Notes* (New York: Doran, 1923), 229. Creed refers to Deut 3:26 as well. This passage narrates Moses’ plea to enter Canaan. The Lord refuses and says to Moses, “Enough from you! Never speak to me of this matter again! [Ἱκανούσθω σοι, μὴ προσθήῃς ἔτι λαλήσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦτου]” (Deut 3:26 NRSV). For a brief survey on the use of ἱκανός in the NT, see Katter, “Farewell Address,” 248, n. 108. Bovon suggests that “the words...though difficult to interpret, are perhaps meant to signal that human means should certainly not be overestimated. Yet, fragile as they are, they are nevertheless indispensable.” Bovon, *New Testament Traditions*, 54. Whereas I agree with Bovon that the words are “difficult to interpret,” his explanation is sheer conjecture and an overreach.

<sup>659</sup> On the one hand, these sorts of interpretations are very common and examples could be offered *ad nauseum*. E.g., “His words, ‘It is enough!’ are an expression of his exasperation”—Green, *Luke*, 775; “[T]hey think in terms of a slight scuffle”—Danker, *Jesus and the New Age*, 353; “As if Jesus had been talking about the necessity of having and using literal swords! No wonder that his answer is curt and decisive”—Hendriksen, *Luke*, 977; “Jesus’ reply is ironic and dismissive”—Alan R. Culpepper, “*Luke* (NIB 9; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 430; “‘Enough,’ He said, ‘enough of dull misunderstanding, of trial and weariness! It was late, later than they thought.’”—Edward Musgrave Blaiklock, *Luke* (Bible Study Books; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 82; “It was with sad irony that Jesus replied, ‘It is enough.’”—Charles R. Erdman, *The Gospel of Luke: An Exposition* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1922); and finally, “the sense of this phrase is that, frustrated with the disciples’ lack of comprehension, Jesus wishes to break off the discussion”—Richard J. Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke’s Gospel* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1978), 45. On the other hand, two scholars did object to these characterizations. Although Goulder speaks of Jesus’ reply as “gruff,” he also recognizes that “[t]he words are non-committal, and not very meaningful.” Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 738. The best assessment of the tendentious projections of interpreters was Burton Scott Easton who long ago stated “Lk gives no hint of any irony in Christ’s reply; any such translation as ‘enough misunderstanding’ is arbitrary.” I wholeheartedly concur. Burton Scott Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1926), 328.

short-lived, since he will abruptly upend the world of the “two-sword” *traditum* when they are on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:49-51).

### 4.3.3 Summary of Exegesis

Luke placed his enigmatic sword-logion (Luke 22:35-38) within the broader landscape of the Jerusalem narrative (Luke 19:28-24:53) and the narrow confines of Jesus’ farewell address (22:14-38). After Jesus reminded the apostles of their previous expeditions (v. 35; cf. Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-12), he alerted them to a new, urgent situation with the adversative conjunction, “But now [ἀλλὰ νῦν],” and told them to buy a sword (v. 36). His command resonated with the “two-sword” *traditum* where identity and honor are preserved, honored persons are defended, and vengeance is justified. Jesus’ charge drew the apostles into the pathos of a celebrated tradition that began with Simeon and Levi and was refracted in the HB and later Jewish writings. As part of their narrative legacy, the “two-sword” *traditum* shaped the apostles’ identity, defined their values, and influenced how they understood Jesus’ words. However, the decree to buy a sword was not some veiled metaphor for courage in the face of imminent persecution. To reduce these words merely to symbols is unacceptable. It diminishes Luke’s literary genius. There was no symbolic or metaphoric response by the apostles; they were ready to fight, to avenge, and to defend.

For sacred confirmation, Luke’s Jesus turned to the prophet Isaiah. Yet when Jesus declared, “For I say to all of you that this scripture must be realized in me: ‘And he was counted among the lawless’” (v. 37), it was not about prophetic promise-fulfillment. Instead, with the Isaianic citation and Jesus’ paraphrase, Luke recognized Jesus as the embodiment of the archetypal servant of God. Early on Luke had anticipated the paradigmatic image of God’s servant with Simeon’s prophecy—Jesus is “to be a sign that will be opposed” (Luke 2:34)—and substantiated this reality near the gospel’s close with Isaiah’s declaration that God’s servant will be “counted among the lawless”—an image graphically realized during Jesus’ crucifixion. But Isaiah’s words and Jesus’ reiteration were misunderstood. The apostles had apparently forgotten or overlooked the archetypal figure that was embedded in Israel’s scriptures and traditions

because their understanding of God's servant had been too heavily influenced by the "two-sword" *traditum*.

Jesus' appeal to Isaiah ironically reinforced the apostles' determination to stand alongside their comrade and defend him at all costs. Although his declaration was perhaps unsettling at first, they quickly reconfigured Jesus' declaration that he was going to be considered a lawbreaker even though they knew that he was a righteous person worthy of honor. They were able to do this because they were living in the world of the "two-sword" *traditum* instead of the world of Isaiah's servant of God. For that reason after they regained their poise, they revealed that they were prepared to respond to any threat just as Simeon and Levi did. Rather than being utterly distraught by Jesus' assertion, the apostles responded instinctively because their identity had been shaped by an ancient, renowned tradition that compelled them to emulate their ancestors' heroic feats. Being unable to separate themselves from the "two-sword" *traditum* and its ethical code, Jesus' order to buy a sword and his invocation of Isaiah's words emboldened the apostles to defend him.

Thus, when the apostles heard Jesus say, "It is enough!" (v. 38), his retort confirmed a principle that they already believed to be true: that if the Lord was on their side, they could not fail. Just as two swords were sufficient for Simeon and Levi long ago, two swords would once more be adequate. But the apostles did not perceive the fleeting nature of Jesus' approbation, for he would shortly withdraw it when one of his disciples drew a sword on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:49-51).

Seen from this perspective, the sword-logion and the arrest scene on the Mount of Olives are merely the culmination of Luke's adroit literary strategy to extricate his community from the "two-sword" *traditum* where vengeance is justified when either an honored comrade is threatened or identity and honor are disparaged. That Luke rejected this tradition is evident not only by the sword-logion and Jesus' response in the garden, but also, I suggest, by the overall trajectory of the Gospel of Luke that promotes peace. In the final portion of this chapter, therefore, I will illustrate how Luke repudiates the "two-sword" *traditum* throughout the Gospel of Luke. As a

sophisticated, creative author, however, he does not engage in a frontal assault. Instead, he permits his community to remain within the world of the “two-sword” *traditum* for most of his gospel. He allows the fiction of the “two-sword” *traditum* to coexist alongside his vision of God’s community before finally reducing it to rubble. Although his strategy is oblique, Luke nonetheless adumbrates his renunciation of this ancient tradition in his gospel and ultimately topples that taken-for-granted realm and its ethic of violence.

## **4.4 The Trajectory of Luke in Light of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum***

### **4.4.1 Introduction**

In the preceding section I argued that Luke challenged his community to disavow an ethical model that attempts to execute the will of God via the sword rather than through the agency of service that seeks peace for all people. I also suggested that Luke’s juxtaposition of the sword-logion and Jesus’ arrest on the Mount of Olives was part of the gospel’s overall plot that reached its zenith during the Passion narrative and that peace is one of the gospel’s themes. If these inferences are sound, a reading of Luke ought to reveal other passages that sustain them.

Therefore, in the closing pages of this project, I will briefly consider a few selected passages in the Gospel of Luke and suggest how a hypothetical member of Luke’s community might respond to and interpret the trajectory of Luke in light of the “two-sword” *traditum*. As I proceed sequentially through Luke’s gospel I will identify passages where Luke’s thematic promotion of peace is self-evident, but more importantly, look at texts where the principles of the “two-sword” *traditum* emerge out of the written text’s background and into the narrative world of Luke’s community through the behavior of the narrative’s protagonists. This latter task is more decisive, since it adds further credence to my claim that Luke allowed the “two-sword” *traditum*—along with its presumed values—to remain cloaked before he finally disarmed it. In other words, I assert that the ethic of the “two-sword” *traditum* is embedded in Luke’s gospel in a latent form, but is reified through the narrative’s characters. As members of Luke’s community listened to the stories and identified with the protagonists and their (misguided) ideals, Luke swept his



community along in the narrative subplot. From my point of view, he adopted this indirect approach so that his community could eventually be persuaded—like Jesus’ apostles—to renounce the sword and reject the actions of the legendary heroes from that celebrated tradition.

#### **4.4.2 A Hypothetical Reading of Luke in Light of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum***

The opening pages of Luke eloquently indicate that peace is one of the gospel’s themes. After Zechariah confirms that his son will be called “John” and his speech is restored, he blesses God, praising him for his “tender mercy” because he will “guide our feet into the way of peace” (Luke 1:78-79).<sup>660</sup> When the angels announce Jesus’ birth to the shepherds, Luke declares that “a multitude of the heavenly host” praise God, saying, “Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace among those whom he favors” (Luke 2:13-14).

The theme of peace continues when Luke describes Simeon’s reaction upon seeing Jesus. Simeon will depart “in peace,” since he has seen God’s “salvation...a light for revelation to the Gentiles” (Luke 2:28-32). Luke, however, disrupts these tranquil contours when he also recites Simeon’s words to the mother of Jesus: “This child is destined for the falling and the rising of many in Israel, and to be a sign that will be opposed so that the inner thoughts of many will be revealed—and a sword will pierce your own soul too” (Luke 2:34-35). At once, Luke’s community is bewildered. If John is a guide to peace, angels sing of peace on earth at Jesus’ birth, and Simeon departs in peace when he sees the infant Jesus, how can it also be true that this same child will cause such great discord in Israel? In addition, how and why will he bring excruciating grief to his mother Mary that it will be like a sword has pierced her soul?

Prior to Simeon’s concluding prophecy, Luke’s stress on peace seemed straight-forward and uncomplicated. But now, Luke’s community begins to question what sort of peace Jesus will bring and how he will accomplish it. The succession of Luke’s narrative introduces ambiguity. Its double entendre divides his audience. Those who were anticipating a trouble-free path to peace experience confusion; they are mystified. But others whose moral compass was guided by the

---

<sup>660</sup> Unless otherwise noted, translations are from the NRSV in this section.

“two-sword” *traditum* hear something else in Simeon’s words: a summons to stand alongside Jesus—the one who is “a sign that will be opposed.” As they see it, when they come to his aid and display their loyalty, they will rise up as the Levites did with Moses and in the process inevitably cause others to fall as they defend Jesus. Although Simeon’s prophecy does not necessarily entail physical violence, neither does it rule it out in their minds. Whatever the unknown future holds, these believers understand that the schism will be vast and precarious, for even the soul of Jesus’ mother will be pierced with “a sword.”

Arguably, some believers in Luke’s community could have heard Simeon’s prophecy in this way. Living under the influence of the “two-sword” *traditum*, they also would have likely failed to detect Luke’s clever repudiation of that celebrated tradition in his ensuing narration of Jesus’ temptation and his rejection at Nazareth. After being tempted by the devil [διάβολος] for forty days in the wilderness, Jesus and the devil spar with each other in three final temptations (Luke 4:1-13). Yet despite the devil’s daring efforts to allure Jesus with a distorted view of the identity and honor of the Son of God, Jesus does not retaliate. Instead, each confrontation ends, not with Jesus calling God’s angels to destroy the devil, but merely with Jesus quoting Israel’s scriptures (cf. Luke 4:4, 8, 12).<sup>661</sup>

While the correlation between Simeon’s declaration about departing in peace and Jesus’ pacific response to the devil is subtle, his rejection at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30) instantly resonates with Simeon’s final prediction. For, after Jesus reads an excerpt from Isaiah and then interprets it in view of his life, the people are incensed by his insolent presumption and become enraged. Their anger is so fierce that they get up, drive him from the synagogue, and bring him to a hill on the outskirts of their town out “so that they might hurl him off the cliff” (Luke 4:29). However, once again, Jesus—the Son of God who presumably had access to unlimited divine power—does not

---

<sup>661</sup> Dennis T. Olson suggests that Jesus’ temptation in Luke 4 looks “backward to Israel’s temptation in the wilderness in Deuteronomy 6-11 and forward to the passion and resurrection narrative in Luke 22-24.” Specifically about Luke’s sword-logion, Olson characterizes this passage as a “temptation of political militarism.” Dennis T. Olson, “Temptations and Trials in Deuteronomy 6-11, Luke 4, and Luke 22-24: The Significance of a Recurring Three-Fold Pattern,” in *All Things New: Essays in Honor of Roy A. Harrisville* (Word and Supplement Series 1; St. Paul: Word & World Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary, 1992), 21, 26.

strike back as the “two-sword” *traditum* mandates. On the contrary, he somehow “passed through them and went on his way” (Luke 4:30).

These two episodes are evidence of Luke’s adroit literary skill and indicate his indirect way of repudiating the “two-sword” *traditum*. But his unobtrusive style probably went unnoticed by those who had imbibed the intoxicating elixir of justified vengeance too often and too freely. While they may have been perplexed by Jesus’ restraint, they could have easily rationalized their own beliefs and explained his behavior as nothing more than extraordinary patience as he waited for a more opportune time to act.

That Luke rejects the ethic of the “two-sword” *traditum* bit by bit is also evident when the reaction of the religious leaders to Jesus’ healing on the Sabbath is placed in close proximity to his teaching in the sermon on the plain. After describing two Sabbath healings (Luke 6:1-10), Luke includes the following notice: “[the scribes and the Pharisees] were filled with fury and discussed with one another what they might do to Jesus” (Luke 6:11). In this instance, rather than report any direct response by Jesus to the escalating hostilities of his adversaries, Luke casually inserts a brief account about Jesus’ choosing the twelve (Luke 6:12-16) and quickly turns to Jesus’ sermon on the plain. As Luke narrates Jesus’ teaching, a distinctive call to renounce vengeance emerges from his discourse. The way of the “two-sword” *traditum* seeks revenge, but Jesus tells his followers to “love their enemies [and] do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, and pray for those who abuse you. If anyone strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also” (Luke 6:27-29; cf. vv. 22-23, 30-38).

Given Jesus’ undeniable teaching on the plain, members of Luke’s community whose lives were ordered by the “two-sword” *traditum* may have had second thoughts about their initial interpretation of Simeon’s prophecy at this point. The trajectory of Luke’s gospel seems clear—Jesus is a man of peace and he expects his disciples to pursue it as well. When Luke narrates Jesus’ sending out of the twelve “to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal” and they are rejected, Jesus instructs them not to retaliate against those who did not welcome them. They are to do nothing more than “shake the dust off [their] feet as a testimony against them” (Luke 9:1-6;

cf. Luke 10:1-12). They are not to call down fire from heaven or get even (Luke 9:51-56). That prerogative belongs solely to God. They are not to concern themselves with those who refuse the good news of the kingdom of God, for even the alleged wicked cities from the past will condemn them (Luke 9:13-16).

Of course, those living in the world of the “two-sword” *traditum* might have thought that such teachings were reserved for ordinary times when the opposition was tamer, less threatening, and easier to manage. That they could have held such a conclusion is conceivable because as Luke takes up his narration of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:27), the adversarial temperament of Jesus’ opponents steadily intensifies and the conflict with the religious authorities escalates. As these hostilities become more frequent and palpable, and the gap between the early days of Jesus’ earthly ministry and his final days in Jerusalem becomes wider, the members of Luke’s community who adhered to the ideals of the “two-sword” *traditum* would finally begin to detect some support for their long-held tradition where identity and honor are protected, honored ones are defended, and vengeance is justified.

Indeed, for those hoping that the “two-sword” *traditum* had not been entirely abandoned, but rather is reserved for more tumultuous times, confirmation is not long in coming. For, in the first portion of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, Luke narrates Jesus’ dispute with those who accused him of casting out demons by Beelzebub (Luke 11:14-28). After describing the lunacy of thinking that one demon is going to cast out other demons, Jesus’ rhetoric unexpectedly shifts away from its previous idyllic tone and takes on a rather warlike hue. He speaks of “a strong man, fully armed” being attacked and overpowered by “one stronger.” But even more startling is Jesus’ reversal of one of his prior teachings. Whereas before he taught his disciples that “whoever is not against you is for you” (Luke 9:50), now he says to them, “Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters” (Luke 11:23). After Jesus tells a parable about an unclean spirit who returns to his former abode, a woman in the crowd cries out, “Blessed is the womb that bore you and the breasts that nursed you!” In response, Jesus says, “Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and obey it!” (Luke 11:27-28). Instead of affirming this

woman's blessing for his mother, Jesus' retort heartened those who were disinclined to pacifist ways, since his reply resonated with heroes of the "two-sword" *traditum*: Simeon and Levi, Moses, Phinehas, and Judith.

As Jesus continues on his way to Jerusalem, Luke again stokes the fire of the "two-sword" *traditum* when he includes another episode of Jesus' bellicose oratory. Although some may have initially thought that Luke's purpose was to promote peace based on the early chapters of his gospel, it appears that the reality turns out to be quite the opposite. How can it be otherwise, since Luke's Jesus says,

I came to bring fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled! I have a baptism with which to be baptized, and what stress I am under until it is completed! Do you think that I have come to bring peace to the earth? No, I tell you, but rather division! From now on five in one household will be divided, three against two and two against three; they will be divided: "father against son / and son against father, / mother against daughter / and daughter against mother, / mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law / and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law" (Luke 12:49-53).

At this moment, Luke's Jesus is no longer the minister of peace. The words and phrases are hostile, confrontational: "I came to bring fire to the earth;" "what stress I am under;" instead of "peace" he comes to bring "division;" and "one household will be divided." The apocalyptic language may have shocked some members of Luke's community, but those who identified with the "two-sword" *traditum* were encouraged; their resolve and courage were strengthened. For that reason, this passage, perhaps more than any other so far, confirms Luke's ingenious literary style that allowed the "two-sword" *traditum* to maintain its place as an acceptable ethical code while he shrewdly worked to demolish that tradition and promote peace in its place.

That Luke employed such a clever strategy also seems likely because of his careful editing. Whereas Matthew's Jesus said, "Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have come not to bring peace, but a *sword* [μάχαιραν]" (Matt 10:34, italics added), Luke's Jesus brings "*division* [διαμερισμόν]." Despite appearing to be inconsequential, the vocabulary change serves a vital purpose in the overall trajectory of Luke's gospel because it provides a way for him to remain in dialogue with champions of the "two-sword" *traditum*. Luke permits that tradition to remain as a sort of background radiation, but only up to a point. Those who adhere to

its ideals can project their own meaning onto Luke's narrative. In other words, Luke was not waging a direct assault on those who lived by that celebrated tradition. Since their presuppositions were likely to blind them to this slight redaction, Luke's narrative style permits their vision of the world and its ideals to co-exist temporarily alongside his vision until he can persuade them to put down the sword when the narrative reaches its pinnacle during Jesus' passion.

Luke's combination of this plot-subplot duality also comes to the surface when Jesus descends from the Mount of Olives and his disciples praise God, "Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord! / Peace in heaven, / and glory in the highest heaven!" (Luke 19:38). On the one hand, those in Luke's community who long for peace again have their expectations raised because the disciples' exclamation resonates with the angels' proclamation to the shepherds at Jesus' birth (cf. Luke 2:14). On the other hand, those who adhere to the ideals of the "two-sword" *traditum* find a different focus in this proclamation as their king enters Jerusalem, the city of David. While the declaration speaks of "Peace," it is "Peace in heaven," not peace on earth, which they believe will not and cannot be realized until the enemies of their king are destroyed.

Despite these contradictory viewpoints, Luke's penchant for peace soon becomes obvious. He emphasizes this theme more prominently and simultaneously adumbrates his repudiation of the "two-sword" *traditum* when Jesus tells his disciples that they will be arrested and persecuted on account of his name (Luke 21:12). But rather than retaliating, they are to view it as an opportunity to testify (Luke 21:13). In fact, they are not to prepare a defense in advance, since he will give them words of wisdom (Luke 21:14-15). Luke reminds his community of the full import of Jesus' earlier teaching (i.e., "Do you think that I have come to bring peace to the earth? No, I tell you, but rather division" [Luke 12:51]): family and friends will betray you, put some of you to death, and you will be hated (Luke 21:16-17). But rather than retaliating, they are to endure (Luke 21:18). Even when they see Jerusalem under siege, Jesus' disciples are to flee; they are not to take up the sword and fight. Vengeance, punishment, and striking back are the ways of

political powers and authorities who will inflict great pain and bring “wrath against this people [causing many to] fall by the edge of the sword” (Luke 21:23-24).

By now Luke’s arc of peace should have been self-evident to all. However, some members of his community were still not convinced that they had to renounce the “two-sword” *traditum*. Therefore, it was necessary for Luke to include the sword-logion and the arrest scene on the Mount of Olives before he could extricate that renowned tradition from their hearts and minds and persuade them to pursue peace in all circumstances. When Jesus instructed his apostles to buy a sword and they told him that they already had two swords in their possession, they disclosed one source that had shaped their character: the “two-sword” *traditum*. Luke’s anecdote about buying swords revealed not only the apostles’ identity, but also unmasked those in Luke’s community who thought the apostles had embraced the right solution for the approaching crisis. But Jesus’ command on the Mount of Olives ultimately made it clear that his disciples were not to take up the sword, but renounce it.

Undoubtedly, Luke’s task was difficult, because some members of his community had breathed the “common atmosphere” of the “two-sword” *traditum* for a long time. On account of it, they believed that vengeance was justified. They held firmly to the principle of retaliation when identity and honor were threatened or an honored one was in danger. However, in the end, Luke’s message for his community was unmistakable: not only were they not to prepare a defense before testifying, they were not to defend with the sword when threatened with physical harm. Instead, they were not to “fear those who kill the body, and after that can do nothing more” (Luke 12:4). As servants of God, they were to accept their fate and—like Isaiah’s servant and Jesus—be “counted among the lawless.”

#### **4.4.3 A Possible *Sitz im Leben* for Luke’s Community**

As I discussed at the beginning of this project, Jesus’ command to buy a sword is enigmatic and contrary to the general perception of his character. Yet why would Luke include this bizarre and discordant command to buy a sword in the first place? One possibility is that Luke

knew that a portion of his community identified with the moral values of religious zealots—a way of thinking that Luke hoped to repudiate. Like the apostles, these individuals believed that a person should take up the sword when identity and honor were threatened or an honored one was defamed. Thus, when Luke included the sword-logion in his gospel, his community involuntarily and reflexively made similar associations with that familiar tradition and shared heritage. As a result, they believed vengeance was justified because they breathed the “common atmosphere” of that narrative legacy. In short, some members of Luke’s community were ready to fight, avenge, and defend.

Nevertheless, in the strictest sense, I do not think the apostles were zealots; Hengel’s argument is too persuasive.<sup>662</sup> Yet by the time Luke was written this movement did exist and there may have been some members of Luke’s community who held similar tendencies. Admittedly, the specific destination for the Gospel of Luke and the composition of Luke’s community are unknown. However, if some latitude to speculate a little further is granted, it is plausible to infer that Luke was attempting to thwart some latent zealot predispositions or leanings, especially if members of his community were looking back and trying to understand a catastrophic event such as the destruction of Jerusalem.

With that event in the background, it is conceivable that some disciples were issuing calls to assemble an armed force—a summons to defend the identity and honor of fallen compatriots and family members, to exact revenge on the Romans, and to vindicate and honor those who were slaughtered in the Jerusalem’s destruction. This appeal would resonate with the “two-sword” *traditum*, the Maccabean revolt, and also would later be seen in the Bar Kochba revolt in the Second Jewish War.<sup>663</sup> Consequently, it should be no surprise that the Gospel of Luke follows a

---

<sup>662</sup> See chapter one, 50, n. 180.

<sup>663</sup> Reflecting on the influence of the historical setting on the Pseudepigrapha, Charlesworth states that “we have learned to see how sociologically conditioned are the documents in the Pseudepigrapha, reflecting consecutively the crises of the Maccabean era, and the growing stranglehold on Palestine by the Romans, beginning with Pompey’s entrance into the Temple in 63 BCE and culminating with the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.” Charlesworth, “In the Crucible,” 41. Extrapolating from Charlesworth’s premise, I propose that an analogous *Sitz im Leben* impacted how Luke’s community read his gospel in light of the “two-sword” *traditum*. It seems reasonable to conjecture that this tradition probably became more popular about the time



steady course to Jerusalem—and remains focused on that city during the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus. He does not go into Galilee as with Matthew and Mark; instead, he stays near Jerusalem so that they may see the “Son of Man” depart with glory—God’s glory, not human or earthly glory, for God is the one who will restore honor and identity.<sup>664</sup>

For that reason, Luke’s message is to let God vindicate, take vengeance, and redeem a person’s honor just as he had done with Jesus. In other words, one of Luke’s aims is to overthrow the “two-sword” *traditum*. Although Luke does not explicitly state that this is an objective, the exegesis of the sword-logion and survey of other passages seems to suggest that this is one possible objective for the Gospel of Luke.

## 4.5 Chapter Summary and Final Reflection

### 4.5.1 Chapter Summary

From the outset of this project I claimed that one way to understand Luke’s sword-logion was to explore it in light of the “two-sword” *traditum*, a tradition that was part of the “common atmosphere” in which Luke and his community lived. As part of the broader culture it reflected the non-literary and literary traditions, values, concepts, and metaphors of that era and also served as a reservoir that Luke drew upon when he wrote his gospel.

As the culmination of that endeavor, this chapter undertook three objectives. First, I examined how Luke made use of Israel’s scriptures and traditions. I established that he was a sophisticated writer whose routine use of Israel’s traditions by means of direct citation and allusion pointed to his thorough grasp of those traditions. I inferred that his adroit literary style indicated that his community shared the same reservoir of traditions and that they would recognize his references as well. In particular, I argued that Luke’s allusion to stories from extracanonical sources (e.g., Abraham’s bosom in *Jub.*) added further support to my thesis that

---

that the Gospel of Luke was written given the relatively recent destruction of Jerusalem and perhaps the approaching Bar Kochba revolt.

<sup>664</sup> The focus on Jerusalem also continues in Acts. The book opens with Jerusalem in view and it is the city to which Paul must go (cf. Acts 1:1-8:3; 19:21; 20:22-24; 21:1-16).

he was familiar with the “two-sword” *traditum*, a celebrated tradition that was frequently rehearsed in extracanonical sources.

Second, during the exegesis I made the case that Luke exploited the sword-logion incident and the “two-sword” *traditum* in order to dismantle a long-standing biblical tradition that sanctioned use of force in order to preserve identity and honor and justify vengeance. Luke’s narration of Jesus’ command to his apostles that they were to buy a sword (Luke 22:36) drew Luke’s community into the pathos of a celebrated tradition whose roots began with Simeon and Levi and was refracted in the HB and later Jewish writings. When Luke’s Jesus cited and paraphrased Isaiah (i.e., “For I say to all of you that this scripture must be realized in me: ‘And he was counted among the lawless.’ For indeed it concerns what comes to pass in me.” [Luke 22:37]), it was not about a simplistic prophetic promise-fulfillment scheme. On the contrary, Luke offered his community an archetypal figure by which they could understand Jesus: that God’s servant will be “counted among the lawless.” But this image was misunderstood both by the apostles and some members of Luke’s community because their understanding of God’s servant had been too heavily influenced by the “two-sword” *traditum*. Since they were unable to sever themselves from the “two-sword” *traditum* and its ethical code, Jesus’ order to buy a sword, his invocation of Isaiah’s words, and Jesus’ final statement to them “It is enough!” (Luke 22:38), created a constellation of data points that confirmed what they already believed to be true: that if the Lord was on their side, they could not fail. Just as two swords were sufficient for Simeon and Levi long ago, two swords would once more be adequate. But Jesus’ approbation was brief, for he would quickly withdraw it when one of his disciples drew a sword on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:49-51). Viewed in this light, then, the sword-logion and the arrest scene on the Mount of Olives were merely the apex of Luke’s adroit literary strategy to extricate his community from the “two-sword” *traditum* where vengeance was justified when either an honored comrade was threatened or identity and honor were disparaged.

In the third portion of this chapter I claimed that Luke did not engage in a direct attack on the fiction of the “two-sword” *traditum*. Instead, throughout his gospel, he allowed it to coexist

alongside his vision of God's community (i.e., one that always seeks peace) before finally demolishing that venerable tradition. In order to back up that assertion, I conducted a hypothetical reading of Luke's gospel and suggested how some members of Luke's community who were loyal to the "two-sword" *traditum* might have understood other passages in Luke, especially if their *Sitz im Leben* had heightened their allegiance to that celebrated tradition. In the final analysis, I concluded that despite the many challenges associated with Luke's sword-logion, its message repudiated the "two-sword" *traditum* and promoted peace in its place.

In closing, I raise the following question: have I sufficiently made the case that Luke's sword-logion was a response to the "two-sword" *traditum*? Lacking the ability to bring up Luke's spirit like the medium of Endor did for Saul when she brought up Samuel (1 Sam 28:3-25), I turn to Hays' seven tests about "hearing echoes," since I cannot ask Luke directly.<sup>665</sup> (1) "*Availability*. Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers?" The answer to this question is affirmative. The frequent refraction of the "two-sword" *traditum* in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods is too compelling to conclude otherwise. (2) "*Volume*. The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns." Strictly speaking, the "volume" of the echo is very low. The allusion is so oblique that little confidence can be assigned to this category. But if one expands Hays' definition to include ideas and values, then "volume" increases, for the Gospel of Luke certainly entails an aversion to the code of conduct espoused by the "two-sword" *traditum*. (3) "*Recurrence*. How often does [Luke] elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?" "Recurrence" is difficult to assess. If one grants my premise that the trajectory of Luke's gospel opposes the "two-sword" *traditum*, then "recurrence" occurs more frequently as long as "explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns" are not a requirement. To be sure, Luke resists the values of that ancient, celebrated tradition, but he does so without ever explicitly naming it. (4) "*Thematic coherence*. How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that [Luke] is developing?" In my estimation, I think

---

<sup>665</sup> See n. 555 above.

“the alleged echo” is extremely congruent with Luke’s “line of argument” that seeks to overturn the “two-sword” *traditum* and its ideals. (5) “*Historical Plausibility*. Could [Luke] have intended the alleged meaning effect?” Assuming the hypothetical historical setting, I think it plausible that Luke could “have intended the alleged meaning effect” because it is consistent with his emphasis on and call for peace. (6) “*History of Interpretation*. Have other readers, both critical and precritical, heard the same echoes?” Whereas others will concur with my view about Luke’s plea for peace, as far as I know, no one else has interpreted Luke’s sword-logion with the strategy that I have employed. As far as “history of interpretation” is concerned, my interpretative approach is unique. (7) “*Satisfaction*. With or without confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation?” Although there may not be any confirmation in the “history of interpretation” and other criteria may weaken my position, I do believe “the proposed reading makes sense.” Not only does it illuminate Luke’s sword-logion, but also other passages in Luke.” In sum, at least to some degree, my reading offers “a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation” between the “two-sword” *traditum* and Luke’s sword-logion.

#### 4.5.2 Final Reflection

In the opening paragraph of “The War Prayer,” Mark Twain wrote:

It was a time of great and exalting excitement...in the churches the pastors preached devotion to flag and country, and invoked the God of Battles beseeching His aid in our good cause in outpourings of fervid eloquence which moved every listener.<sup>666</sup>

When “Sunday morning came...the church was filled...a war chapter from the Old Testament was read...Then came the ‘long’ prayer”—an unforgettable prayer full of “passionate pleading and moving beautiful language.” With unparalleled expression and fervent desire, the pastor implored:

---

<sup>666</sup> Mark Twain’s “The War Prayer” is readily available both from hard-copy and on-line sources. This excerpt and those that follow are taken from [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The\\_War\\_Prayer](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_War_Prayer).

that an ever-merciful...Father...would watch over [the] noble young soldiers, and aid, comfort, and encourage them in their patriotic work; bless them, shield them..., bear them in His mighty hand, make them strong and confident, invincible in the bloody onset; help them crush the foe...<sup>667</sup>

Then, as the minister approached the end of his stirring entreaty, “[a]n aged stranger entered and moved with slow and noiseless step up the main aisle” and stood next to him as his oratory reached its rousing conclusion, “Bless our arms, grant us the victory, O Lord our God, Father and Protector of our land and flag!”<sup>668</sup>

After scanning “the spellbound audience with his solemn eyes,” the stranger announced, “I come from the Throne—bearing a message from Almighty God!” At once, he began to explain the prayer’s “import—that is to say, its full import.” He noted in particular that the minister’s prayer was not one prayer. Rather, it was two—“one uttered, the other not.” Although everyone heard “the servant’s prayer—the uttered part of it,” they did not hear the unuttered prayer, which they and the pastor “fervently prayed silently.” What the stranger then disclosed were the “many unmentioned results which follow victory—must follow it, cannot help but follow it.” The unuttered prayer asked God to tear “their soldiers to bloody shreds,” fill their fields with corpses and wounded, destroy their homes, and leave widows and orphans behind. It also petitioned God to “blast their hopes, blight their lives, protract their bitter pilgrimage, make heavy their steps, water their way with their tears, stain the white snow with the blood of their wounded feet!”<sup>669</sup>

In an analogous way, the Gospel of Luke is not one gospel, but two: one uttered; the other unuttered. The uttered gospel is the one that Luke wrote accurately, that his community could appropriate simply by listening to its stories, and whose trajectory clearly emphasized peace. From the opening chapter, Luke’s gospel speaks of God’s intention “to guide our feet into the way of peace” (Luke 1:79).<sup>670</sup> At the birth of Jesus, the angels sing, “Glory to God in the highest heaven, / and on earth peace among those whom he favors!” (Luke 2:14). Moreover,

---

<sup>667</sup> Ibid.

<sup>668</sup> Ibid.

<sup>669</sup> Ibid.

<sup>670</sup> Unless otherwise stated, translations in this section are from the NRSV.

when the sword-logion is juxtaposed against the arrest scene, it is obvious that Jesus renounces the sword. Even at its end, the theme of peace is not absent, for when Jesus greets the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, he says, "Peace be with you!" (Luke 24:36).

However, it is important to point out that a patent avowal is easy to ignore, forget, or overlook because a listener's identity is routinely shaped by the intertextual milieu in which a person lives. That a culture's time-honored narrative universe profoundly impacts the members of its society is also seen by the visceral reactions that frequently occur when a taken-for-granted value is challenged. Therefore, since a one-dimensional story does not necessarily have the power to transform identity and a direct confrontation with a widely held ideology is likely to fail, it makes sense that Luke did not openly challenge his culture's shared narrative world. Instead, he exploited the "two-sword" *traditum* via an oblique allusion so as to subvert a worldview that justified violence and preserved identity and honor and defended an honored one with the sword.

Like Twain's "The War Prayer," Luke embedded an unuttered message that rejected the "two-sword" *traditum*, an unuttered message that I have attempted to express. Yet in contrast to the stranger in "The War Prayer" who gave voice to the preacher's unuttered prayer, Luke's unuttered gospel did not stand in opposition to its uttered counterpart. On the contrary, it too promoted the way of peace via Luke's refined writing style that made use of an oblique allusion to an illustrious tradition. By carefully choosing his stories, editing his sources, and crafting a creative literary masterpiece, Luke provided his community with characters that shared their cultural and ideological values. But in the end, he did not permit his community to cling to the values of an ancient, well-established tradition, because they were contrary to Jesus' mission and expectations for his disciples.

In closing, I offer one final observation. When Jesus said, "It is enough!" (Luke 22:38), this remark entailed Luke's repudiation of the "two-sword" *traditum* and its values as personified in Simeon and Levi and refracted in subsequent Jewish writings. The remark was an oblique rebuke of an ancient tradition and expressed Luke's desire that his community sever themselves from such reprehensible conduct.

Furthermore, it was Luke's indirect acknowledgment that another ancient tradition was valid even though it had been commonly overlooked:

Simeon and Levi are brothers; / weapons of violence are their swords, May I never come into their council; / may I not be joined to their company— / for in their anger they killed men, / and at their whim they hamstringed oxen. / Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, / and their wrath for it is cruel! / I will divide them in Jacob, / and scatter them in Israel (Gen 49:5-7).

Even though Jacob's voice had been muted by the zeal of the "two-sword" *tradicum* and its inveterate transmission, Luke's sword-logion suggests that Jacob's words to Simeon and Levi had been correct all along: that his sons and the ethic of the "two-sword" *tradicum* that they embodied were justly cursed long ago.

## **Chapter Five:**

### **Summary and Significance of the Investigation**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

The sword-logion found in Luke 22:35-38 is a perplexing, cryptic, and unwieldy passage. Even a cursory reading brings to mind a myriad of topics that include uncertainties about its original source, history of redaction, and meaning. The pericope also appears to conflict with Luke's general characterization of Jesus' character as a pacifist and other pericopes in the Gospel of Luke (e.g., Luke 22:49-51; 9:1-6; 10:1-20). When scholars have attempted to unravel the text's mysteries, they have, by and large, failed to admit openly their own assumptions and exegetical distortions. In addition, rather than investing adequate time and effort to investigate the passage thoroughly, it is not uncommon for commentators either to offer insipid, vacuous, hortatory platitudes or to skip this terse, but notoriously problematic passage altogether.

Despite the preceding impediments, a number of researchers raised noteworthy questions when they engaged the complicated passage. For example, some of the queries included the following: What is the pericope's relationship to the Last Supper and the overall scheme of Luke's gospel? Does the passage tend to resonate or conflict with other portions of Luke? Why is Luke the only gospel to include the anecdote? What is Luke's source for the account? Is it authentic? Did Luke invent and/or adapt the exchange between Jesus and his disciples in order to address subsequent concerns of the church?

While it is appropriate to applaud the exegetes who wrestled valiantly with Luke's *Schwertwort*, their solutions to the dilemmas mentioned above as well as other ones were not ultimately satisfying. This state of affairs, therefore, led me to make use of a different approach in



order to conduct a fresh examination of Luke 22:35-38 whose chief goal was to scrutinize Luke's sword-logion in light of the "two-sword" *traditum* whose provenance goes back to Genesis 34.

## 5.2 Project Summary and Review

### 5.2.1 Prior Research

The project opened with a broad survey of relevant literature. The review examined contributors whose research was judged to be either innovative or influential in their respective research. In general, these scholars conducted extensive explorations and offered significant critical analyses about various aspects of the passage. As noted, prior research was dominated by traditional historical-critical methods.

Conzelmann's theological method viewed Luke 22:25-38 as a pivotal text within Luke's three salvific epochs: "the period of Israel," "the period of Jesus," and "the period of the Church." "The period of Israel" ended when John the Baptist's ministry ceased (Luke 16:16). "The period of Jesus" was defined by Satan's absence or inactivity (i.e., from the temptation of Jesus until Satan's dramatic return prior to the Last Supper [Luke 4:13; 22:3; respectively]). "The period of the Church" began at Jesus' Passion and marked the resumption of trial and conflict, both for Jesus and his followers. In Conzelmann's scheme, the expression, *ἀλλὰ νῦν* ("but now;" Luke 22:36), not only adumbrated the immediacy of this ominous reality for Jesus and his disciples, but also served as a metaphor for the on-going struggle with temptation that each believer in Luke's community faced.

Whereas Conzelmann analyzed Luke 22:35-38 within the global context of Luke's entire gospel, Minear's brief literary analysis emphasized the adjacent context (i.e., Jesus' supper dialogue and his arrest in the garden). For Minear, two aims were paramount: to elucidate the Isa 53 citation and identify the *ἄνομοι* ("lawless ones;" Luke 22:37). Based on a wider canonical and theological understanding, Minear asserted that the double witness requirement found in Deut 17:6, 7; 19:15 explains why the apostles had two swords: at least two witnesses were needed to condemn a lawbreaker. Since the apostles possessed two swords—that is, weapons that function

as self-incriminating witnesses—Luke unmistakably identified them as the ἄνομοι and Jesus as Isaiah’s “righteous Servant.” Minear also differed with Conzelmann’s interpretation of ἀλλὰ νῦν. Rather than anticipating “the period of the Church”—an era of conflict and persecution—this expression pointed to the tragic events in the garden when Jesus’ lawless disciples drew their swords.

Both Lampe and Gormley used source and redaction criticism as a way to investigate Luke’s editorial acumen—or lack thereof—especially as it related to his incorporation and adaptation of Isa 53:12 and Mark 14:47. According to Lampe, Luke clumsily inserted Luke 22:38 in order to link the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples (Luke 22:35-37) with the events on the Mount of Olives when the high priest’s ear was cut off (Luke 22:49-51). As he made his case, Lampe also affirmed facets of both Conzelmann and Minear, concurring with the former that a drastic change in the disciples’ situation was about to ensue and with the latter’s identification of the apostles as ἄνομοι. Thus for Lampe, Luke’s astute adaptation of Isaiah’s prophecy (i.e., Isa 53:12; cf. Luke 22:37) “imposed a quite new meaning on the old saying about the need to buy a sword” and revealed the hortatory aim behind the insertion of verse 38: the disciples must prepare for the “lonely struggle...in a bitterly hostile world,” echoing Conzelmann.

Gormley, too, saw a connection between Mark 14 and Luke 22:35-38. However, in contrast to Lampe who stressed Luke’s adaptation of Mark 14:47, Gormley asserted that Luke’s sword-logion was “a deliberate substitute for Mk. 14:27-28,” which alluded to Zechariah’s prophecy about the scattering of the shepherd’s disciples (Zech 13:7). In Gormley’s estimation, Luke altered Mark’s narrative because Luke omitted the disciples’ flight and concentrated on post-resurrection appearances near Jerusalem instead of Galilee. Moreover, the disciples were not ἄνομοι who took up swords as they were with Minear and Lampe, but rather viewed as commonplace sinners with whom Jesus was routinely numbered. For Gormley, then, Luke 22:35-38 was an editorial insertion that predicted and prepared the disciples for Jesus’ approaching Passion (like Minear) and not for any perpetual struggle about to begin (contra Conzelmann and Lampe).

Though dependent on source and redaction criticism in part, Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus utilized form criticism as the primary means by which to identify various historical situations that might possibly elucidate Luke 22:35-38. According to Heiligenthal, the Jewish Wars (66-74 C.E.) were unsatisfactory, since many believers had already left Jerusalem. However, if the text is read in light of the reign of Agrippa I (41-44 C.E.), Luke's sword-logion begins to make sense, because it would permit, but does not demand, self-defense in order to minimize martyrdom like the kind experienced during Agrippa I's reign. For Heiligenthal, those who have possessions („die Besitzenden“) and those who do not („die Mittellosen“) represented two groups and thus two responses to persecution. The “haves” were to flee, since they had the means; the “have-nots,” who could not flee, since they did not have the means, were thus given permission to take up weapons and defend themselves. Extrapolating from this understanding of the sword-logion, Luke, according to Heiligenthal, was providing sufficient rationale for his community to practice self-defense against unnecessary martyrdom like the kind suffered by earlier Christians during Agrippa I's reign.

Whereas Heiligenthal rejected the Jewish Wars as the historical backdrop for Luke's sword-logion, Bartsch viewed this time period as the most logical *Sitz im Leben*. In his opinion, scholars were responsible for generating many of the interpretative challenges associated with Luke's sword-logion. Their attempts to evade the text's obvious meaning have been feeble and misguided, since it is clear that Jesus authorized the use of force. In addition, these cowardly exegetes offered a variety of lame explanations, such as: it is a later scribal gloss; the swords are metaphors; it is a Lukan literary invention that adumbrates the garden scene; and, it exemplifies the disciples' obtuseness. In contrast, Bartsch believed that Luke used Jesus' sword-word as a way to remind his readers that Jesus stands alongside and with his followers, especially the “have-nots” whose circumstances forced them to take up the sword.

Even though Heiligenthal and Bartsch differed on the specific setting for Luke's sword-logion, both scrutinized it in light of a real, historical moment of the first century C.E. when Christians were threatened. For Vööbus, however, the *Sitz im Leben* was not affixed to a

particular historical occasion. On the contrary, Luke ripped the story from its original environs and transported it to his own time period so that he could teach and encourage his community of faith. First, he adapted Jesus' Supper dialogue so his congregation would be able to find deeper meaning in the Lord's Supper. Second, he invoked the sword-logion as a metaphor, hoping that his community of believers would be courageous when they faced trials and tribulations. For Vööbus, Luke's over-riding concern was for his community; it was neither for some remote community from the past nor for the historical roots of the Christian faith.

In contrast to Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus, all of whom were reticent to sanction unrestrained armed resistance, Brandon and Price presented ideologically-driven viewpoints that overtly endorsed the use of force by Christians. Although Brandon began with a presentation of the "ambiguity of evaluation" regarding this topic, his pro-violent agenda soon became apparent. After identifying Zealot origins with the revolt led by Judas the Galilean and Saddok in protest to the Roman census ordered in 6 C.E., Brandon traced his claim that Jewish Christians and the Zealots held a somewhat similar mindset about revolution and the use of force during the first century C.E. However, when Jewish Christianity and its belief in Jesus as Israel's Messiah encountered Pauline Christianity, the former lost to the latter as Jesus was transformed into the Savior of all.

Nevertheless Jewish Christians—who sympathized with Zealot ideals—did not stop proclaiming what Brandon called the "lost gospel," that is, Jesus will return as Israel's Messiah. To further corroborate this proposition, Brandon maintained that Mark's portrayal of Jesus was supportive of the Zealots, but such a depiction had to be muted, since the gospel's recipients lived in Rome. Since later gospels (i.e., Matt, Luke, and John) were not sent to Rome, the authors of these documents were free to convert Jesus into the "pacific Christ." Luke, in particular, was especially active in this effort, which the sword-logion aptly demonstrates. From Brandon's perspective, Luke's insertion of an "obscure passage of Isaiah" (Luke 22:37) was "artificial" and a pathetic attempt to mask the fact that Jesus' disciples were armed and, in all likelihood, with more

than two swords. In other words, Jesus encouraged his disciples to take up arms and favored armed resistance to achieve his objectives.

Price offered the other deliberate ideological reading scrutinized in the literature survey. His analysis initially considered two identities for Jesus: either he was a member of the first century revolutionary movement or “an apocalyptic visionary.” Favoring the former, Price put forward several pieces of evidence: the disciples’ nicknames suggest their revolutionary leanings (e.g., Simon *Bar-jona* “might mean Simon ‘the terrorist’;” Jesus’ “form of execution” implies that he was a rebel; the Triumphal Entry narrative that extols Israel’s Messiah who will resurrect David’s kingdom; and the “whitewashing of Pilate” by the gospel writers, especially Luke). Price also tried to demonstrate that Jesus was perceived as a rebel or revolutionary by the state, religious authorities, and the populace. For these reasons, when Price examined the sword-logion, he dismissed all efforts “to spiritualize this text” as “unconvincing,” because his ideological assumptions demanded such a conclusion. In sum, Price—like Brandon—encouraged and justified or, at the very least, permitted the use of force by Christians.

The final scholar to receive thorough consideration in the literature survey was Kruger. In his essay, he scrutinized two scenes from Luke 22 (i.e., Luke’s sword-logion and Jesus’ arrest in the garden) in light of two OT traditions: Yahweh’s Divine Warrior and Isaiah’s Suffering Servant. According to Kruger, Jesus was caught between two well-known, but conflicting traditions. As Yahweh’s Divine Warrior, Jesus was to take up the sword and violently punish the people for their sins. As Isaiah’s Suffering Servant, he was called to suffer violently rather than inflict it. Luke’s garden scene thus depicted Jesus vacillating between these two opposing identities—that is, visions of life—when he was momentarily tempted by both traditions. For this reason, Luke introduced the sword-logion before Jesus and his disciples went to the garden in order to explain how the authorities were able to catch Jesus with a sword—though it was actually his disciples who carried the swords. Once the swords were drawn, however, not only were Jesus and his disciples irrevocably linked with the ἀνομοί, their conduct also provided the means by which the authorities could charge him as a rebel (i.e., criminal). Ultimately, Jesus refused to take on the

identity of Yahweh's Divine Warrior. Instead, he accepted the identity of Isaiah's Suffering Servant even though he was caught between—at least momentarily—by two rival traditions.

### 5.2.2 Thesis and Method

At the beginning of this enterprise, I described the enigmatic nature of Luke 22:35-38. I also pointed out how this challenging text persistently vexed scholars despite being analyzed via a wide variety of critical methods. Since prior research failed to provide satisfactory results for the many problems entailed in Luke's sword-logion, which were highlighted in the literature survey, I advocated using a different strategy in order to make sense of the seemingly impenetrable dialogue between Jesus and his disciples.

For these reasons, I proposed that a “two-sword” *traditum*—whose provenance could be traced to Gen 34—stood behind Luke 22:35-38. This ancient heroic saga, which described the triumphant feat of Simeon and Levi when they avenged the violation of their sister Dinah, was refracted over time in the Apocrypha (i.e., *Jdt*, *4 Macc.*, *Sir*, *1 Esd*), the Pseudepigrapha (i.e., *Jub.*, *Ar. Levi*, *T. Levi*, *Theod.*, *Jos. Asen.*, *T. Sim.*), and other Jewish writings (i.e., Philo of Alexandria, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus). As the ancestral story about two brothers who pick up the sword for the sake of righteousness was rehearsed again and again in these documents, it became a well-known and popular tale, especially during the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods (i.e., second century B.C.E. through the first century C.E.). Thus, when Luke wrote that Jesus' disciples had two swords in their possession, he was stealthily alluding to an old, but admired, HB tradition, a tradition that I proposed was as a way to shed light on the meaning of Luke's perplexing sword-logion.

Though previous research identified significant issues (e.g., Conzelmann's stress on ἀλλὰ νῦν; Minear's exploration about the identity of “the lawless ones [οἱ ἄνομοι];” Lampe's and Gormley's source-redaction investigations of Luke's adaptation of Mark 14:47 and Mark 14:27-28, respectively; the form critical studies of Heiligenthal, Bartsch, and Vööbus that sought to find an appropriate *Sitz im Leben*; the ideological propositions of Brandon and Price that questioned

dominant metaphorical interpretative strategies; and Kruger's application of two competing OT traditions), no interpretative approach was entirely successful in breaking through the pericope's obstacles. Adding to this project's imprecision was the fact that Luke neither cites nor directly alludes to Simeon and Levi, the heroes of the "two-sword" *traditum*.

Despite that complicating factor, I suggested that by combining biblical intertextuality and cultural intertextuality it was possible to re-examine Luke's sword-logion in a novel way. In part, my thesis drew on Valantasis' understanding of "intertextuality as a cultural phenomenon," and thus sought to demonstrate that the "two-sword" *traditum* was in the religious and cultural atmosphere during Jesus' life and also when Luke wrote his gospel. In view of such an assumption, I claimed that the sword-logion text (i.e., Luke 22:35-38) reflected the taken-for-granted cultural (i.e., Jewish) milieu of the first century in its use of a common and well-known hagiographic tale of Simeon and Levi whose material base was derived from Gen 34 and later Jewish writings. The project's first objective was therefore to marshal sufficient evidence for the existence of the "two-sword" *traditum* and its *traditio* while the second objective was to demonstrate that a sound way to interpret Luke's sword-logion was to view the pericope via the "two-sword" *traditum* despite no unmistakable reference to it in the Gospel of Luke.

In order to meet these objectives, I made use of Rast's research that emphasized the importance of identifying themes and motifs that were embedded in a tradition. Specifically, I identified four motifs from the Gen 34 narrative and then traced them as they were refracted in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings from the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods. But whereas Kruger's critical strategy juxtaposed two OT traditions (i.e., "the Divine Warrior" and "the Suffering Servant") when he analyzed Luke's sword-logion and garden scene, I explored the pericope's meaning by viewing it against an entirely different HB tradition (i.e., the "two-sword" *traditum*) and thus embarked on my own literary, intertextual (i.e., both canonical and extracanonical) analysis of Luke 22:35-38.

### 5.2.3 The Canonical Roots of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum*

At the beginning of chapter two I proposed that the provenance of the “two-sword” *traditum* went back to Gen 34. Although this tradition was not called the “two-sword” *traditum* anywhere else in the canonical corpus, I used that appellation, since *two* brothers—Simeon and Levi—took up their *swords* to punish Shechem for shaming their sister Dinah. Via a careful exegesis of Gen 34, I identified four motifs and highlighted other literary elements found in the original narrative so that the *traditum’s* reappearance in the HB could be tracked.

Throughout the exegesis the narrative’s broader literary traits were emphasized by analyzing Gen 34 as if it were composed of six vignettes. The first scene (vv. 1-4) described the circumstances surrounding the initial encounter between Shechem and Dinah, their subsequent sexual relations, and Shechem’s request of his father. The reactions of both fathers and Dinah’s brothers to the improper liaison were revealed in the second scene (vv. 5-7). This brief vignette opened with Jacob hearing about Shechem’s misbehavior with Dinah and closed with her brothers apparently learning of the misdeed just as Hamor began to present his offer for Dinah. During the third scene (vv. 8-19a), the narrative rehearsed the offer made by Hamor and Shechem to get Dinah from Jacob. This lengthy scene ended as Jacob’s sons listened to the offer and made their deceptive counter-proposal, which was accepted by Hamor and his son. In the fourth scene (vv. 19b-24) Hamor and Shechem presented the proposal to male citizens of their city and obtained their approval. The fifth scene (vv. 25-29) described how Dinah’s brothers carried out their deceitful plan and took vengeance upon the people of Shechem. The denouement, specifically, Jacob’s reaction to his sons’ exploits and their rejoinder was reported in the story’s sixth and final scene (vv. 30-31). In sum, this ancient story narrated the clash between Shechem and Jacob’s sons and their subsequent ruse in order to punish Shechem for his inexcusable deed with their sister Dinah.

During the exegetical analysis, the narrator’s literary acumen was stressed, especially his ability to craft the *Leitwörter* “give” and “take” into an antiphonal chorus that resonated throughout the tale. The investigation also pointed out that a number of common Hebrew literary stylistic



attributes (e.g., character speech/action [Alter]; character identity/motive [Savran]) were employed ingeniously by the narrator to create a highly dramatic, tension-filled story. However, the most significant contribution of the exegesis was the identification of the narrative's four motifs: (1) family identity and honor; (2) abuse and vindication of an honored one; (3) national identity and justice; and (4) vengeance or justified retaliation.

Whatever Shechem's specific offense, his actions were obviously abhorrent in the eyes of Jacob's sons (i.e., "the men were indignant and very angry because he had committed an outrage in Israel by lying with Jacob's daughter, for such a thing ought not to be done" Gen 34:7). Their repudiation of Shechem and their concluding defiant pronouncement before their father (Gen 34:30) indicated that Shechem's actions threatened the identity and honor of Jacob's family. When Jacob's sons deceived Hamor and Shechem with their counter-offer (Gen 34:13-18), they also demonstrated that they would not tolerate the abuse of an honored one. If an honored one is harmed or humiliated, those who are loyal will act to vindicate or defend the abused or violated person, which Simeon and Levi did when they—along with their brothers—attacked and pillaged Shechem (Gen 34:25-29). Moreover, the declaration that "he [i.e., Shechem] had committed an outrage *in Israel*," as well as their father's final concern for the survival of his clan (Gen 34:30), pointed to an emerging awareness of national identity and honor. Finally, the rejection of the proposed merger between the precocious Israelites and the well-established Shechemites suggested that the Israelites were unwilling to sacrifice their own budding ethnicity; they had no interest in being assimilated. Therefore, the brothers' ruse and their pre-emptive act of vengeance against Shechem's irreverent act and deplorable conduct justified their vengeful assault.

After locating common references to Simeon and Levi by using their proper names (or related terms, e.g., "Simeonites," "Levites," "Levitical"), it was argued—albeit with some scholarly dissent—that there was only one explicit reference to the "two-sword" *traditum*: Jacob's blessing in Gen 49:5-7. This conclusion was based on the fact that Jacob's last will and testament to his sons, and specifically to Simeon and Levi, displayed an awareness of family identity, an

emerging national identity, and a concern with justice over the proper use of vengeance that remained unresolved despite the outcome of the earlier incident with Shechem.

In the final portion of chapter two, I used the narrative's four motifs in order to track the refraction of the "two-sword" *traditum* throughout the remainder of the HB and link it with Gen 34. Israel's national identity appeared in the story of Phinehas who showed no tolerance for the idolatrous practices of the Midianites and would not accept intermarriage (Num 25:1-18). It was also seen when Ezra called upon the people to put away their foreign wives (Ezra 9-10). The story of the Levite (Judg 19-21) was suggestive of the motif about vindicating an honored one. The incident also reflected a concern for family identity or honor though it was probably more along the lines of clan or tribal identity when the Benjamites withstood their distant kin before they were nearly wiped out. However, the most frequent motif that linked all the pericopes together and also with the "two-sword" *traditum* was the matter of vengeance or justified retaliation. Whether looking at the initial call of the tribe of Levi at Mt. Sinai (Exod 32:25-29), Phinehas' outrage against those who committed idolatry with Baal of Peor (Num 25:1-18), Moses' praise of the Levites' singular devotion to the Lord at Massah and Meribah (Deut 33:8-11; cf. Exod 17:1-7; Num 20:1-13), or the Levite's rallying of the nation's attack against the Benjaminites for the rape of his concubine (Judges 19-21), all these stories sanctioned or justified violent retribution for reprehensible and despicable misconduct. It was also noted that these vengeful deeds, which were frequently directed against their own blood relations, brought to the forefront once more the "two-sword" *traditum's* focus on national identity and honor.

In sum, both the tradition's provenance and subsequent refraction in the HB supported my claim that the "two-sword" *traditum* was an important biblical tradition that shaped Israel's later corporate religious heritage and identity, which was passed on and eventually formed part of the religious cultural milieu or cultural intertextuality of the first century C.E.

#### 5.2.4 The Extracanonial Transmission of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum*

In chapter three I examined how the “two-sword” *traditum* was refracted through later Jewish writings as it was reworked and rewritten in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings during the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. The survey of these texts was limited to a period of time that realistically allowed them to influence the religious and cultural background of the first century of the Common Era, specifically from the second century B.C.E. to the second century C.E. In most instances, only texts where a clear allusion to the “two-sword” *traditum* was apparent were examined, which I defined as the constellation of the story’s primary characters (i.e., Simeon, Levi, Shechem, and/or Dinah) along with one or more of the four literary motifs (i.e., family identity and honor, vindication or defense of an honored one, national honor, justified vengeance). Accordingly, the overall purpose of chapter three was to trace the refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum* in extracanonial writings, since they furnished a cultural context by which to understand Luke 22:35-38.

Two books in the Apocrypha were analyzed because *Jdt* and *4 Macc.* made unquestionable allusions to the Gen 34 narrative and incorporated three of the “two-sword” motifs: family identity and honor, national identity and honor, and justified vengeance. In addition, *4 Macc.* emphasized the vindication or defense of Israel (i.e., an honored one) as the book reached its conclusion. The association with the “two-sword” *traditum* was further strengthened, since *Jdt* and *4 Macc.* also mentioned Phinehas whose connection with the “two-sword” *traditum* was put forward in chapter two. It was also pointed out that very few of the story’s original details were transmitted in *Jdt* and *4 Macc.*; and even though *Jdt* transmits a few more details when compared to *4 Macc.*, there are significant omissions (e.g., circumcision, the negotiations) and alterations (i.e., God provides the sword to Simeon). Ultimately, it was determined that the story was primarily employed for illustrative purposes in *Jdt* and *4 Macc.* (i.e., justified vengeance in *Jdt*; extolling reason in *4 Macc.*).

The “two-sword” *traditum* incidences in the Pseudepigrapha far exceeded those found in the Apocrypha. The Shechem episode was specifically mentioned in *Jub.*, *Ar. Levi*, *T. Levi*,

Theod., and *Jos. Asen.* The motif of family identity and honor was present in *Jub.*, *T. Levi*, Theod., and *Jos. Asen.* The theme of national identity and honor turned up in *Jub.*, *T. Levi*, and *Jos. Asen.* Every pseudepigraphal book scrutinized—except for *Ar. Levi*—extolled the vindication or defense of an honored one and justified vengeance. Other features, such as repeated references to Levi’s zeal, his elevation to the priesthood, and wide-ranging emendations—all of which were especially prominent in *Jub.* and *T. Levi*—further enhanced the “two-sword” legend as it was refracted in the Pseudepigrapha. Besides corroborating the transmission of the “two-sword” *traditum*, the tradition was also significantly embellished: Simeon and Levi avenged the violation of Dinah because God decreed it (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*, Theod., *Jos. Asen.*); Dinah’s brothers received their swords from heaven (*T. Levi*); Levi received the priesthood because he acted righteously (*Jub.*, *T. Levi*); and supplemental battle details—such as Levi’s age, who killed whom, the number of Shechemites put to death—were added (*T. Levi*, Theod., *Jos. Asen.*)

The “two-sword” *traditum* was also attested by three other Jewish authors of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman periods: Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus. All three writers explicitly mentioned the Shechem episode and the “two-sword” motifs were regularly identified in their writings. Throughout the works of Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus, Simeon and Levi were consistently held in high regard because: they defended family identity and honor (*Migr.*, *Mut.*, *L.A.B.*, *Ant.*); they vindicated their sister and rescued her from a foreigner who acted impudently (*Migr.*, *Mut.*, *L.A.B.*, *Ant.*); they defended national identity and honor (*Migr.*, *Mut.*, *Ant.*); and their vengeance against Shechem was justified because his violation of their sister was both improper and atrocious (*Migr.*, *Mut.*, *L.A.B.*, *Ant.*).

In sum, the aim of chapter three was to describe the refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum* in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods as the ancestral tale was reworked and rewritten. In most instances, explicit reference or allusion to the Gen 34 narrative was used to identify the pertinent texts. Once the texts were identified, two additional parameters were utilized to analyze and track the evolution and refraction of the “two-sword” *traditum*: the four “two-sword” motifs identified in

the chapter two and significant changes to the Gen 34 tale (e.g., omissions, additions, and adaptations). During its *traditio*, a number of noteworthy modifications to the ancient patriarchal story occurred as the various authors used the “two-sword” *traditum* for a variety of diverse purposes (e.g., to proscribe intermarriage, to elevate the Levitical priesthood, to promote virtue). Yet despite these adaptations, as the four motifs were amplified and refracted, the basic identity and form of the tradition was consistently transmitted in such a way that it became part of the rich religious and cultural heritage of first century Judaism and thus contributed an important narrative for interpreting Luke 22:35-38.

### **5.2.5 Luke’s Use of the “Two-Sword” *Traditum***

Chapter four opened with a survey of the Gospel of Luke in order to demonstrate that Luke routinely made use of Israel’s scriptures and traditions. Based on the investigation it became evident that Luke knew many of Israel’s traditions, both from canonical and extracanonical sources. Examples included: (a) citations of specific HB texts (e.g., Luke 4:4-12; 18:38-39); (b) references to renowned people, places, stories, and expressions (e.g., Moses, David, Sodom, Solomon and the Queen of the South); and (c) the use of HB type-scenes (e.g., John the Baptist’s birth narrative; the healing of the centurion’s servant and the raising of the widow’s son).

Besides these more direct references or recognizable allusions, it was also obvious that Luke made use of oblique allusions, especially in the Passion narrative, where there was no explicit reference to a Jewish story, expression, or tradition (e.g., Luke 22:21, 67-68; 23:27-29, 34-36, 46, 50-54). A number of the oblique allusions also suggested that Luke was acquainted with traditions from extracanonical writings. For example, Luke’s description of Simeon’s and Anna’s messianic anticipation (Luke 2:25-38) was not only an Isaianic tradition (Isa 40:5; 42:6; 49:6), but also similar to one found in the *Psalms of Solomon* (*Pss. Sol.* 17:44; 18:6). In addition, Luke’s dove tradition appeared to reflect a comparable one in an *Ode of Solomon* (cf. Luke 3:21-22; *Odes. Sol.* 24:1).

However, two oblique allusions were particularly important because they not only demonstrated that Luke and his culture shared a common religious heritage based on Israel's scriptures and traditions, but they also indicated that he was familiar with at least two Jewish writings that were transmitted the "two-sword" *traditum*. First, Jesus' call that whoever comes to him must hate his or her family resonated with a story that formed part of the "two-sword" *traditum*: Moses' summon for warriors when the people were rebelling after Aaron made the golden calf (cf. Luke 14:26 and Exod 32:25-29). Second, the plain reference to "Abraham's bosom" in Luke 16:22 implied Luke's familiarity with an extracanonical tradition that is found only in *Jub.* (*Jub.* 22:26; 23:2).

Based on this analysis of Luke's use of Israel's scriptures and traditions, I argued that Luke was a sophisticated writer whose invocations of the HB confirmed that he knew Israel's scriptures and traditions and had internalized them sufficiently to make recurring allusions. This feature also suggested that he was confident his readers were sufficiently knowledgeable to grasp the references. Since Luke drew on oblique allusions to make connections between his gospel and Jewish traditions of that time period, I concluded that he was aware of and exploited oblique allusions, such as the "two-sword" *traditum*, when he wrote his gospel.

Building on that premise I conducted a careful exegesis of Luke 22:35-38 in light of the "two-sword" *traditum* in the second portion of chapter four. Luke's continual invocation of Israel's scriptures and traditions reflected his thorough grasp of that corpus and indicated that his community possessed the ability to recognize oblique allusions to Israel's scriptures and traditions. The "two-sword" *traditum*, in particular, was part of the broad intertextual heritage shared by Luke and his community. Throughout the analysis of Luke's sword-logion, I maintained that Luke exploited that shared narrative universe in order to subvert one of their long-standing traditions: that vengeance is justified when preserving identity and honor and defending an honored one.

After reviewing the narrative setting of Luke 22:35-38 in the Gospel of Luke (i.e., it is found at the conclusion of Jesus' farewell address in Luke's Passion narrative), I quickly

dispensed with v. 35 where Jesus reminded the apostles of their previous expeditions, since the primary dispute concerned the narrative's prior referent (v. 35; cf. Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-12) and moved on to address more crucial matters: the adversative conjunction, "But now [ἀλλὰ νῦν]" and Jesus' order to his apostles to buy a sword (v. 36). For, when they heard his command, I proposed that it immediately resonated with the "two-sword" *traditum* where identity and honor are preserved, honored persons are defended, and vengeance is justified. As part of their narrative legacy, that tradition shaped their identity, defined their values, and influenced how they understood Jesus' words. His charge instinctively drew them into the pathos of a celebrated tradition that began with Simeon and Levi and was refracted in the HB and later Jewish writings. That the decree to buy a sword was not some veiled metaphor for courage in the face of imminent or future persecution also seemed clear, since there was no symbolic or metaphoric response by the apostles. Instead, Luke reported that they were ready to fight, to avenge, and to defend Jesus.

In contrast to many scholars, I also argued that the appeal to an atomistic Isaianic excerpt was not about a simplistic prophetic promise-fulfillment scheme. Instead, when Jesus declared, "For I say to all of you that this scripture must be realized in me: 'And he was counted among the lawless'" (v. 37), and then paraphrased it, he highlighted a fundamental pattern that was embedded in Israel's scriptures and traditions. It was a pattern that the apostles and Luke's community had apparently forgotten or overlooked: God's servant will be "counted among the lawless" even when he is righteous and innocent of all charges.

But Isaiah's words and Jesus' reiteration ironically reinforced the apostles' determination to stand alongside Jesus and defend him at all costs. Although his words were perhaps unsettling at first, the apostles soon regained their composure and revealed that they were prepared to respond to any threat just as Simeon and Levi would have. They quickly accepted Jesus' declaration that he—like God's servant in Isaiah—was going to be considered a lawbreaker even though they knew that he was a righteous person worthy of honor. Rather than being rattled by Jesus' assertion, the apostles' reaction was reflexive and involuntary because their identity had

been shaped by an ancient, renowned tradition that compelled them to emulate their ancestors' heroic feats. Being unable to separate themselves from the "two-sword" *traditum* and its ideals, Jesus' order to buy a sword and his invocation of Isaiah's words emboldened the apostles to defend him. Finally, when the apostles heard Jesus say, "It is enough!" (v. 38), his retort confirmed what they already believed to be true: that if the Lord was on their side, they could not fail. Just as two swords were sufficient for Simeon and Levi long ago, two swords would once more be adequate. Even some members of Luke's community believed that two swords would be adequate because they, too, shared the same narrative legacy as Jesus and his apostles. Thus, as Luke narrated Jesus' words, Luke's community involuntarily, reflexively made similar associations with that familiar tradition and common heritage, a violent heritage that Luke was attempting to disarm.

At that moment, the apostles and Luke's community failed to realize that Jesus' approbation was fleeting, for it would immediately be withdrawn when a disciple drew his sword on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:49-51). That Luke rejected this tradition was evident not only by the sword-logion and Jesus' response in the garden, but also by the sublime overall trajectory of the Gospel of Luke. For, the sword-logion and the arrest scene on the Mount of Olives were merely the culmination of Luke's adroit literary strategy to extricate his community from the "two-sword" *traditum* where vengeance is justified when either an honored comrade is threatened or identity and honor are disparaged.

In the final portion of chapter four, I traced how Luke repudiated the "two-sword" *traditum* throughout his gospel by reading his gospel as a hypothetical member of his community. I also proposed a *Sitz im Leben* for Luke's readers when their emotions—spurred on by the legendary feats of Simeon and Levi and other heroes of the "two-sword" *traditum*—might motivate some members of Luke's community to take up the sword in order to retaliate against those who had defamed their identity and honor or shamed an honored one. In a setting of heightened fervor, then, I argued that Luke did not engage in a frontal assault—his literary style is too sublime for that. As a sophisticated, creative author, he permitted his community to linger within the world of



the “two-sword” *traditum* for most of his gospel just as Jesus’ had allowed his apostles to remain temporarily in that world of vengeance. Luke crafted his gospel so that the fiction of the “two-sword” *traditum* would coexist alongside his vision of God’s community before he finally reduced it to rubble. Although his strategy was indirect, Luke nonetheless adumbrated his repudiation of that ancient tradition and ultimately upended that taken-for-granted realm and its ideals. In the end, he challenged his community to disavow a world that attempted to execute the will of God via the sword rather than through the agency of service that seeks peace for all people.

### **5.3 Project Assessment, Significance, and Contribution**

This final section is a collection of musings that assesses the project. First, I will identify some of the project’s strengths and weaknesses. Second, I will discuss some of the project’s more significant achievements and its contribution to the field of biblical studies. Third, I will offer a few suggestions about directions for future research.

In my estimation, one of the chief strengths of this project was that it engaged in biblical interpretation in the broadest sense because it examined of a wide range of canonical and extracanonical writings (i.e., HB, NT, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and other Jewish writings). A second strength was the application of an eclectic mix of critical methods (e.g., primarily literary and tradition, but with some source, redaction, and textual components as well) in an attempt to offer a fresh interpretation of an exceptionally difficult text. A third strength was the preponderance of evidence that demonstrated not only the existence of the “two-sword” *traditum* but also how its *traditio* formed part of the shared narrative world that helped to shape the cultural and religious milieu of the first century C.E.

As to weaknesses, a glaring one was the project’s narrow focus on the Gospel of Luke. If the “two-sword” *traditum* was a background narrative for Luke’s gospel and peace is one of Luke’s themes, there should be continuing evidence that sustains these inferences in Acts. Although it was necessary to circumscribe this study, limiting the study to the Gospel of Luke—and primarily, to Luke’s sword-logion—meant that this theory was not tested as thoroughly as

possible. A second obvious weakness occurred when the exegesis moved into its hypothetical considerations (e.g., how might a member of Luke's community who adhered to the principles of the "two-sword" *traditum* understand the sword-logion and other passages in Luke?). As is true with all such speculative extrapolations, the analysis entered the indeterminate world of interior thought. This is especially true with Luke's sword-logion, because Luke revealed neither his thoughts nor those of his protagonists. In fact, as readers, we do not even know the specific identity of all the participants. We are not privy to the name of the person who said, "Lord, look, here are two swords!" and we do not know and cannot verify if Jesus' order to buy a sword triggered a nexus with the "two-sword" *traditum*. Only Jesus is mentioned by name; everyone else is subsumed under a vague generic group epithet: "the apostles," which is hopelessly prone to unsubstantiated inferences and outrageous psychological projections. In short, the hypothetical constructs prove absolutely nothing, are easily questioned, and are likely to be dismissed as inconclusive ramblings of an academic. A third weakness was my failure to offer exact guidelines or principles for detecting allusions in Luke. For instance, most of the connections were put forward because of similarities found in the NRSV and not on the basis of much philological work in the original language. In addition, my inductive approach—(i.e., primarily via my own reading and recollection of Israel's scriptures and traditions)—needs more definition. Fourth, the theory base of my research requires further refinement and clarification. Finally, the literary correspondences between Gen 34 and Luke 22 also need additional development and elucidation.

Admittedly, the "two-sword" *traditum* is a sobriquet not attested anywhere in Israel's scriptures and traditions. Yet my research in canonical and extracanonical literature suggests that this ancient tradition exists. It begins with the Shechem episode in Gen 34 where Simeon and Levi avenge the violation of their sister Dinah and entails four motifs (i.e., family identity and honor, vindication of an honored one, national identity and honor, and justified vengeance). While there is at most only one unmistakable reference to the tradition's provenance in the rest of the HB (i.e., Jacob's blessing on Simeon and Levi [Gen 49:5-7]), the four motifs routinely resurface

along with subtle allusions to the tradition that point to its on-going transmission throughout the HB (e.g., Moses' summon of the Levites [Exod 32:25-29]; Phinehas' outrage against fellow Israelites who committed idolatry [Num 25:1-18]; the vindication of the Levite's concubine against the Benjamites [Judg 19-21]; and Erza's decree to put away foreign wives [Ezra 9-10]).

More importantly, as the story is refracted in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and other Jewish writings of the Late Second Temple, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods, the tradition is reworked, rewritten, and mentioned routinely (e.g., *Jdt.*, *4 Macc.*, *Jub.*, *T. Levi*, *Theod.*, *Jos. Asen.*, Philo, Josephus). In short, the evidence for the tradition becomes increasingly compelling. Using Mallen's sliding scale of probability—that is, from probable to plausible to possible—I think the evidence for the “two-sword” *traditum* demonstrates that its existence attains, if not exceeds, the “probable” level.<sup>671</sup>

What is unknown, however, is whether Luke knew of and wrote his gospel with the “two-sword” *traditum* in mind. At this point, the argument is more uncertain. On the one hand, I think it is plausible that Luke was aware of the “two-sword” *traditum*. That conclusion seems likely given his remarkable penchant for mentioning or alluding to Israel's scriptures and traditions throughout his gospel. In my estimation, chapter four credibly established that Luke knew Israel's scriptures and traditions in both canonical and extracanonical writings and that his style of writing indicated that he was confident his community would recognize allusions to these writings too. On the other hand, there is no definitive way to ascertain beyond any reasonable doubt that Luke wrote his gospel with the “two-sword” *traditum* in mind.

While I do not think the “two-sword” *traditum* is Luke's meta-narrative foil, I do believe it is one narrative that possibly stands behind message of Luke's gospel and provides a way to access a challenging pericope. The “two-sword” *traditum* is a tradition that Luke thought

---

<sup>671</sup> This is Mallen's adaptation of G. K. Beale's system of classification for “John's textual use of the OT, and his reliance on the OT in general, [where] it is perhaps best not to speak of quotations but of allusions or references, or even better *dependence*.” For Beale, there are three categories of dependence: (1) “*clear dependence*,” (2) “*probable dependence*,” and (3) “*possible dependence or echo*.” See G.K. Beale, “A Reconsideration of the Text of Daniel in the Apocalypse,” *Bib* 67 (1986): 539-543. Cf. Mallen, *Isaiah in Luke-Acts*, 24.

abhorrent. For that reason, the sword-logion and his representation of Jesus throughout the gospel repudiate that ancient, celebrated tradition. In other words, the “two-sword” *traditum* is a Rosetta stone that provides a clue for understanding not only Luke’s sword-logion, but also the trajectory of Luke’s gospel and his revisions to the story of Jesus when compared to those found in Matthew and Mark.

It has been said that medicine is both science and art. I understand that to mean that it is an enterprise (endeavor) that combines exactitude of empirical data with imprecision of the humanities. An orthopedic surgeon once said something similar to me when he mentioned how he could follow the same procedure on two patients with identical injuries and inexplicably get two different results. One would heal beautifully with no complications while the other would not.

In a similar way, this project is like that. It is reasoned argument based on the probability that the “two-sword” *traditum* exists and because it was sufficiently refracted in many other Jewish writings, it formed part of the cultural and religious milieu of the first century C.E. In short, it was part of the “common atmosphere” shared by Jesus and his disciples as well as by Luke and his community. But the project is also artistry, a literary construct of this author. It put forward the thesis that the “two-sword” *traditum* is an important backdrop against which the Luke’s sword-logion could be read in order to reveal an innovative way to interpret this passage without resorting to the long-standing practice of viewing Jesus’ command as a metaphor for courage. It also pointed to Luke’s literary deftness and indicated one of his theological concerns. While my theoretical explanation may reach neither the “probable” nor “plausible” level, I believe it is, at the very least, “possible” in light of the evidence presented in this study.

Whether others will agree with the preceding assessment remains to be seen, but whatever my reviewers conclude, this investigation has been a profitable exercise for me. I hope others will benefit from it and be motivated to explore other passages using a this methodology. One significant question for future study is: does the “two-sword” *traditum* provide any insight for understanding the narrative of Acts? I also suspect there are other passages—besides those in Luke and Acts—whose subtle mysteries might be revealed if they were scrutinized in light of a

clearly identified and delineated tradition. In final analysis, this thesis and its argument are significant for the field of biblical studies, since the discourse presents a novel way of interpreting a problematic and bewildering passage. The application of literary and tradition criticism to Luke 22:35-38 was both an appropriate and constructive exercise, especially since previous interpretative attempts failed to explain Jesus' *Schwertwort* adequately.

## Bibliography

### The Gospel of Luke, Luke 22:35-38, and Other NT Writings

- Aland, Kurt, and Eberhard Nestle. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001. 8th repr. ed.
- Angliss, Morgan B. "Buy a Sword, Luke 22:36." B.D. thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1964.
- Bailey, John Amedee. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 7. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Bammel, Ernst, and C. F. D. Moule, eds. *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Barrell, E. V. and K. G. Barrell. *St. Luke's Gospel: An Introductory Study*. London: John Murray, 1982.
- Bartsch, Hans Werner. "Jesu Schwertwort, Lukas 22:35-38: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studie." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 190-203.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sword--Word of Jesus, Luke 22:35-38." *Brethren Life and Thought* 19 (1974): 149-155.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Relevance of Extracanonical Jewish Texts to New Testament Study." Pages 90-108 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Bieberstein, Sabine. *Verschwiegene Jüngerinnen, vergessene Zeuginnen: gebrochene Konzepte Im Lukasevangelium*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Blaiklock, Edward Musgrave. *Luke*. Bible Study Books. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 9:51-24:53*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 3b. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Bovon, François. "Le récit lucanien de la passion de Jésus (Lc 22-23)." Pages 393-423 in *Synoptic Gospels*. Edited by Camille Focant. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)*. 2d rev. ed. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*. Translated by Jane Haapiseva-Hunter. Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick Publications, 1995.
- Bowie, Walter Russell. *The Compassionate Christ: Reflections from the Gospel of Luke*. New York; Nashville: Abingdon, 1965.
- Brandon, Samuel George Frederick. *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

- Brawley, Robert L. "Resistance to the Carnivalization of Jesus: Scripture in the Lucan Passion Narrative." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 33-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New Updated Version. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Brown, Schuyler. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. Analecta biblica 36. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Cadbury, Henry Joel. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. Harvard Theological Studies 6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Making of Luke-Acts with a New Introduction by Paul N. Anderson*. New York: Macmillan, 1927. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Caird, George B. *The Gospel of St Luke*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. New York: Seabury, 1968.
- Caspary, Gerard E. *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1978.
- Chesterton, Gilbert K. *Heretics / Orthodoxy*. Nelson's Royal Classics. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 17. Herausgegeben am Gerhard Ebeling. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1954. Reprint, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of St Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Bushwell*. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "The Divine  $\Delta\epsilon\iota$  in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 168-190.
- Creed, John Martin. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: MacMillan, 1930.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, and Gail R. O'Day. *The New Interpreter's Bible, V 9: Luke, John*. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- Cunningham, Scott. *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 142. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Luke*. Proclamation Commentaries. Edited by Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St Luke's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. 2d rev. ed.
- Dawsey, James M. *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986.
- Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 141. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Dever, William G., and J. Edward Wright, ed. *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions—Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman*. Brown Judaic Studies 313. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Diefenbach, Manfred. *Die Komposition des Lukasevangeliums unter Berücksichtigung antiker Rhetorikenelemente*. Frankfurter Theologische Studien 43. Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1993.
- Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1977.
- Easton, Burton Scott. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.
- Eckey, Wilfried. *Das Lukasevangelium: Unter Berücksichtigung seiner Parallelen*. Teilband II: 11,1-24,53. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela Michelle. *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 156. Atlanta: Scholars, 1997.
- Erdman, Charles R. *The Gospel of Luke: An Exposition*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1922.
- Ernst, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1977.
- Evans, Craig A. "Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography." Pages 170-201 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Luke*. TPI New Testament Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1990.
- Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Evans, Craig A. and William F. Stinespring, eds. *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987
- Fearghail, Fearghus O. *The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Lk 1:1-4:44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work*. Analecta Biblica 126. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991.
- Field, Lester L., Jr. *Liberty, Dominion, and the Two Swords: On the Origins of Western Political Theology, 180-398*. Publications in Medieval Studies 28. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998.



- Finlayson, S. K. "The Enigma of the Swords." *Expository Times* 50 (1939): 563.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke 10-24*. Anchor Bible 28a. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985.
- Flender, Helmut. *St Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Ford, J. Massyngbaerde. *My Enemy Is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1984.
- Frein, Brigid Curtin. "The Literary Significance of the Jesus-as-Prophet Motif in the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles." Ph.D. diss., Saint Louis University, 1989.
- Funk, Robert M., and the Jesus Seminar. *The Acts of Jesus: The Search for the Authentic Deeds of Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins, 1988.
- Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989.
- George, Augustin. "Tradition et rédaction chez Luc: la construction du troisième Évangile." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 25 (1967): 100-129.
- Gilbrant, Thoralf, and Tor Inge Gilbrant. *The Complete Biblical Library*. Study Bible, Vol. 4, Rev. Ed. Edited by Ralph W. Harris. Springfield: The Complete Biblical Library, 1986. Reprint, 1991.
- Gillman, John. "The Temptation to Violence: The Two Swords in Luke 22:35-38." *Louvain Studies* 9 (1982): 142-53.
- Godet, Frederic L. *A Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke*. 2 vols. Translated by E W Shalders. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1875. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1981.
- Gormley, Joan Francis. "The Final Passion Prediction: A Study of Luke 22:35-38." Ph.D. diss., Fordham University, 1974.
- Goulder, Michael Douglas. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Grassi, Joseph A. *God Makes Me Laugh: A New Approach to Luke*. Good News Studies 17. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1986.
- Green, Joel B. *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*. 2. Reihe. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 33. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Greene, Michael Dwaine. "The Death of Christ in the Farewell Speech of Luke 22:14-38." M.A. thesis, Wake Forest, 1982.

- Harrisville, Roy A., Arland J. Hultgren, Donald Juel, and Jack Dean Kingsbury. *All Things New: Essays in Honor of Roy A. Harrisville. Word & World. Supplement Series 1*. St. Paul, Minn.: Word & World Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary, 1992.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hays, Richard B. and Joel B. Green. "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers." Pages 222-238 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Heering, G. J. *The Fall of Christianity: A Study of Christianity, The State, and War*. Translated by J. W. Thompson. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1930. Translation of *De Zondeval van het Christendom*, 1930.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 52. Edited by Sharon H. Ringe. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
- Heiligenthal, Roman. "Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz? Aspekte zum Verständnis des lukanischen Schwertwortes." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 39-58.
- Hendriksen, William. *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* Translated by David Smith. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989. Translation of *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur Jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. Bis 70 n. Chr.* Leiden/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- Hobbs, Herschel H. *An Exposition of the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1966.
- Horn, Friedrich W. *Glaube und Handeln in der Theologie des Lukas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra pagina 3. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Jones, Donald L. "The Title 'Servant' in Luke-Acts." Pages 148-165 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Karris, Robert J. *Luke: Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature*. New York: Paulist, 1985.
- Katter, Calvin K. "Luke 22:14-38: A Farewell Address." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1993.
- Kilgallen, John J. *A Brief Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. New York: Paulist, 1988.

- Kimball, Charles. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.
- Klassen, William. "Jesus and the Messianic War." Pages 155-176 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2. Reihe. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 5. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Luke's Gospel*. New Testament Readings. Edited by John Court. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1990.
- Koet, Bart J. *Dreams and Scripture in Luke-Acts: Collected Essays*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 42. Leuven—Paris—Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. *Review of Biblical Literature* 01/2006. Published January 22, 2006. Accessed on-line at: [http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4751\\_4916.pdf](http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4751_4916.pdf).
- Korn, Manfred. *Die Geschichte Jesu in Veränderter Zeit: Studien zur bleibenden Bedeutung Jesu im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. 2. Reihe. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 51. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.
- Kremer, Jacob. *Lukasevangelium*. Die Neue Echter Bibel: Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung 3. Herausgegeben am Joachim Gnllka und Rudolf Schnackenburg. Würzburg: Echter, 1988.
- Kruger, H. A. J. "A Sword over His Head or in His Hand: Luke 22,35-38." Pages 597-604 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Kurz, William S. "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 251-268.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts." Pages 147-170 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*. Edited by David P. Moessner. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1999.
- Kwong, Ivan Shing Chung. *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages*. Library of New Testament Studies 298 (formerly Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series). New York: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Lachs, Samuel Tobias. *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Hoboken, N. J.: Ktav, 1987.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. "The Two Swords (Lk 22:35-38)." Pages 335-351 in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

- Lane, Thomas J. *Luke and the Gentile Mission: Gospel Anticipates Acts*. European University Studies, Series 23, Theology, Vol. 571. Frankfurt am Main—Berlin—Bern—New York—Paris—Wien: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 282. London—New York: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Mallen, Peter. *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 367. Formerly the Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series. London—New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Matson, Archie. *A Month with the Master: For Twentieth-Century Christians—A Manual for Spiritual Growth Based on the Gospel of Luke and Suggested by the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.
- Matson, Mark A. *In Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 178. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- McComiskey, Douglas S. *Lukan Theology in the Light of the Gospel's Literary Structure*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Bletchley, UK and Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2004.
- Megbelavin, Ibitolu Olusevi Jerome. "A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Lukan Narrative of the Last Supper." Ph.D. diss., University of Ottawa, 2002.
- Meynet, Roland. *L'évangile selon Saint Luc: Analyse rhétorique, 2 V.* Paris: Cerf, 1988.
- Minear, Paul S. "Note on Luke 22:36." *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1964): 128-134.
- Mineshige, Kiyoshi. *Besitzverzicht und Almosen bei Lukas: Wesen und Forderung des lukanischen Vermögensethos*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.
- Modica, Joseph Benjamin. "The Function and Purpose of Suffering, Persecution and Martyrdom in Luke-Acts: An Exegetical and Theological Inquiry." Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1995.
- Moessner, David P., ed. *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*. Luke the Interpreter of Israel. Vol. 1. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.
- Moore, Thomas S. "Luke's Use of Isaiah for the Gentile Mission and Jewish Rejection Theme in the Third Gospel." Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1995.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. Reprint, 1984.

- Mosothoane, Ephraim K. "Violence in the Gospel Tradition." Pages 111-132 in *Theology & Violence: The South African Debate*. Edited by Charles Villa-Vicencio. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Murphy, Larry Edwin. "The Concept of the Twelve in Luke-Acts as a Key to the Lukan Perspective on the Restoration of Israel." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Napier, T. M. "The Enigma of the Swords." *Expository Times* 49 (1939): 467-470.
- Nelson, Peter K. *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24-30*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 138. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Nickle, Keith F. *Preaching the Gospel of Luke: Proclaiming God's Royal Rule*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2000.
- Nielsen, Anders E. *Until It Is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts 20*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 18:35-24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary 35c. Dallas: Word, 1993.
- Olson, Dennis T. "Temptations and Trials in Deuteronomy 6-11, Luke 4, and Luke 22-24: The Significance of a Recurring Three-Fold Pattern." Pages 21-28 in *All Things New: Essays in Honor of Roy A. Harrisville*. Word and Supplement Series 1. St. Paul: Word & World Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary, 1992.
- Pallis, Alexander. *Notes on St. Luke and the Acts*. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.
- Park, Hyung Dae. *Finding Herem? A Study of Luke-Acts in the Light of Herem*. Library of New Testament Studies 357. Formerly the Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Petzke, Gerd. *Das Sondergut des Evangeliums nach Lukas*. Zürcher Werkkommentare zur Bibel. Herausgeben am Siegfried Schulz und Hans Weder. Zürich: Theologischer, 1990.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St Luke*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What Are They Saying About Luke?* New York; Mahwah: Paulist, 1989.
- Price, Robert M. "Numbered among the Transgressors?" *Drew Gateway* 52 (1981): 33-40.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Studien zum Neuen Testament. Band 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 227-235.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, ed. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Ante-Nicene Fathers. 10 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

- Robertson, Archibald T. *A Translation of Luke's Gospel with Grammatical Notes*. New York: George H. Doran, 1923.
- Saint Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*. Translated by R. Payne Smith. Monastery of Saint John of Stoudios (Istanbul): Studion Publishers, 1983.
- Sanders, Jack T. "The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke-Acts." Pages 191-198 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1-13.
- Scheffler, Eben. *Suffering in Luke's Gospel*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 81. Herausgegeben am Oscar Cullman und Hans Joachim Stoebe. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1993.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Luke: A Critical Study*. Translated by Connop Thirlwall. Schleiermacher: Studies and Translations 13. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1993.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Zürcher Bibelkommentare. Herausgegeben am Georg Fohrer, et al. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1979.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Der Abendmahlsbericht Lucas, 22: 7-38: Als Gottesdienstordnung-Gemeindeordnung Lebensordnung*. Schriften zur Pädagogik und Katechetik, Heft 9. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesu Abschiedsrede Lk 22, 21-38: Iii. Teil Einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22, 7-38*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 20, 5. Münster Westf: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eine quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22, 7-38*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 19, 5. Münster Westf: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung des Lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, Lk 22:7-38, Pt 2: Der Einsetzungsbericht, Lk 22:19-20*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 20, 5. Münster Westf: Aschendorff, 1957.
- Schwarz, Günther. "κύριε, ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι ᾧδε δύο." *Biblische Notizen* 8 (1979): 22.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Good News According to Luke*. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1984.
- Segbroeck, Frans van. *The Gospel of Luke: A Cumulative Bibliography, 1973-1988*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- Sellew, Philip. "The Last Supper Discourse in Luke 22:21-38." *Forum* 3 (1987): 70-95.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 14. Edited by David Hill. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

- Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Steen, Norman Bruce. "The Interpretation of Jesus' Sword-Saying in Luke 22:35-38." M.Th. thesis, Calvin Theological Seminary, 1981.
- Stegemann, Wolfgang. *Zwischen Synagoge und Obrigkeit: zur historischen Situation der lukanischen Christen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Stenschke, Christoph. *Luke's Portrait of the Gentiles Prior to Their Coming to Faith*. 2. Reihe. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 108. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, & Gentiles*. New Haven & London: Yale, 1994.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Summers, Ray. *Commentary on Luke: Jesus, the Universal Savior*. Waco: Word, 1972.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Promise and Fulfillment in Lukan Theology." Pages 91-103 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation, V 1: The Gospel According to Luke*. Foundations and Facets. Edited by Robert W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels*. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*. Edited by Owen E. Evans. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.
- Tiede, David L. *Luke*. Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.

- Trueblood, Elton. *The Humor of Christ: A Significant but Often Unrecognized Aspect of Christ Teaching*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Tuckett, Christopher Mark, ed. *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 131. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament. Examples of the Use of Old Testament Quotations in Luke and Acts." Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- Van Doren, William Howard. *A Suggestive Commentary on St. Luke: With Critical and Homiletical Notes*. 2 vols. The Standard Series. Edited by James Kernahan. New York: I. K. Funk & Co., 1881.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *The Prelude to the Lukan Passion Narrative: Tradition-, Redaction-, Cult-, Motif-Historical and Source-Critical Studies*. Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1968.
- Wagner, Gunter. *An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament, V 2: Luke and Acts*. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Evangelienkommentare*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.
- Western, W. "The Enigma of the Swords." *Expository Times* 50 (1939): 377.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Enigma of the Swords, St. Luke xxii. 38." *Expository Times* 52 (1941): 357.
- Winter, P. „Eine quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22, 7-38." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1958): 223-227.
- Wright, J. Edward. "Hebrews 11:37 and the Death of the Prophet Ezekiel." Pages 147-158 in *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions—Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman*. Brown Judaic Studies 313. Edited by William G. Dever and J. Edward Wright. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

### **Hebrew Bible, Genesis 34, and Other Jewish Writings**

- Aberbach, Moses, and Bernard Grossfeld. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text*. Center for Judaic Studies, University of Denver. Denver: Ktav Publishing House, 1982.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. *Understanding the Old Testament*. Abridged 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1998.
- Anderson, H. "4 Maccabees: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 531-64 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.



- Baarda, Tjitze. "The Shechem Episode in the Testament of Levi: A comparison with other traditions." Pages 11-73 in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. van der Woude*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Florentino García Martínez. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 5. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1992.
- Bailey, Clinton. "How Desert Culture Helps Us Understand the Bible: Bedouin Law Explains Reaction to Rape of Dinah." *Bible Review* 7 (1991): 14-21,38.
- Barr, J., W. A. M. Beuken, A. Gelston, J. C. L. Gibson, C. J. Labuschagne, C. Van Leeuwen, and L. R. Wickham. *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis*. Papers read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at London, 1973. Edited by A. S. Van Der Woude. *Oudtestamentische Studiën* XIX. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- Beale, G.K. "A Reconsideration of the Text of Daniel in the Apocalypse." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 539-543.
- Bechtel, Lyn M. "What If Dinah Is Not Raped? (Genesis 34)." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 19-36.
- Begg, Christopher. "Josephus' Retelling of Genesis 34." Pages 599-605 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. Leuven: University, 2001.
- Blum, Erhard. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57. Freudenstadt: Neukirchener, 1984.
- Bowie, Walter Russell. "The Book of Genesis." *Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 1. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon/Cokesbury, 1952.
- Bremmer, Jan, and Florentino García Martínez, ed. *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. van der Woude*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 5. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1992.
- Brenner, Athalya, ed. *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*. The Feminist Companion to the Bible 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Brisman, Leslie. *The Voice of Jacob: On the Composition of Genesis*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1990.
- Brodie, Thomas L. "Genesis as Dialogue: Genesis' Twenty-Six Diptychs as a Key to Narrative Unity and Meaning." Pages 297-314 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. Leuven: University, 2001.
- Brook, George J., John Collins, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- Burchard, C. "Joseph and Aseneth: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 177-247 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost*

- Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Buttrick, G. A. et al., eds. *Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 1. New York: Abingdon/Cokesbury, 1952.
- Carmichael, Calum M. *Law and Narrative in the Bible: The Evidence of the Deuteronomic Laws and the Decalogue*. Ithaca—London: Cornell, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Women, Law, and the Genesis Traditions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, 1979.
- Caspi, Misha'el Maswari. "The Story of the Rape of Dinah: The Narrator and the Reader." *Hebrew Studies* 26 (1985): 25-45.
- Charles, R. H. *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis: Translated from the Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Edited from Nine MSS. Together with The Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs with an introduction by Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D.* New York: Macmillan, 1917.
- Charlesworth, James H. "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation." Pages 20-43 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans, eds. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Odes of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 725-771 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Coats, George W. *Genesis: With an Introduction to Narrative Literature*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Collins, John J. "Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans," *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 91-104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- Coote, Robert B. and David Robert Ord. *The Bible's First History*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

- Cosgrove, Charles H., ed. *The Meanings We Choose: Hermeneutical Ethics, Indeterminacy and the Conflict of Interpretations*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 411. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Davidson, Richard M. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Davidson, Robert. *Genesis 12-50*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. London—New York—Melbourne: Cambridge, 1979.
- Davis, Ellen F. "Critical Traditioning: Seeking an Inner Biblical Hermeneutic." *Anglican Theological Review* LXXXII:4 (2000): 733-751.
- De Hoop, Raymond. *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context. Oudtestamentische Studiën* 29. Leiden—Boston—Köln: Brill, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of the Past to Address the Present: The Wife-Sister-Incidents (GEN 12,10-20; 20,1-18; 26,1-16)." Pages 359-369 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. Leuven: University, 2001.
- De Jonge, Marinus. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pages 193-246 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Edited by Marinus de Jonge. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Interpretation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Recent Years." Pages 183-192 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Edited by Marinus De Jonge. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII." Pages 247-260 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Edited by Marinus de Jonge. Leiden: Brill, 1975), 247-260
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 1953.
- Driver, S. R. *The Book of Genesis: With Introduction and Notes*. Westminster Commentaries. 9th ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1913.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. "Zusatz: Bermerkungen—Die levitischen Traditionen in Gen 34 und 49, Dtn 33 sowie Jdc 17-18 und 19-21." Pages 76-79 in Johannes Lindblom, *Erwägungen zur Herkunft der josianischen Tempelurkunde*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1971.
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977.
- Fallon, F. "Theodotus: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 785-793 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

- Feldman, Louis H. "Remember Amalek!" *Vengeance, Zealotry, and Group Destruction in the Bible according to Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union, 2004.
- Fensham, F. C. "GEN. XXXIV AND MARI." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 4 (1975): 87-90.
- Fewell, Danna Nolan and David M. Gunn "Tipping the Balance: Sternberg's Reader and the Rape of Dinah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 193-211.
- Fischer, Irmtraud. *Die Erzeltern Israels: Feministisch-theologische Studien zu Genesis 12-36*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 222. Berlin—New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Fishbane, Michael. "Composition and Structure in the Jacob Cycle (Gen. 25:19-35:22)." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 26 (1975): 15-38.
- Fisk, Bruce Norman. *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 37. Sheffield: Sheffield, 2001.
- Fleishman, Joseph. "Shechem and Dinah—in Light of Non-Biblical and Biblical Sources." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004): 12-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Towards Understanding the Legal Significance of Jacob's Statement 'I Will Divide Them in Jacob, I Will Scatter Them in Israel' (GEN 49,7b)." Pages 541-559 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. Leuven: University, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Why Did Simeon and Levi Rebuke Their Father in Genesis 34:31?" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 26 (2000): 101-116.
- Fokkelman, J. P. *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis*. Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975.
- Fox, Everett. *In the Beginning: A New English Rendition of the Book of Genesis*. New York: Schocken, 1983.
- Freedman, David Noel. "Dinah and Shechem, Tamar and Amnon." *Austin Seminary Bulletin: Faculty Edition* 105 (1990): 51-63.
- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. "Law and Philosophy: The Case of Sex in the Bible." *Semeia* 45 (1989): 89-102.
- Geller, Stephen A. "The Sack of Shechem: The Use of Typology in Biblical Covenant Religion." *Prooftexts* 10 (1990): 1-15.
- Graetz, Naomi. "Dinah the Daughter." Pages 306-17 in *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. The Feminist Companion to the Bible 2. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1993.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*. Translated by W. H. Carruth. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 18-50*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

- Hare, D. R. A. "The Lives of the Prophets: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 379-399 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Harrelson, Walter. "Life, Faith, and the Emergence of Tradition." Pages 11-30 in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Harrington, D. J. "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 297-377 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York—Oxford: Oxford University, 1993.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. Leiden—New York—Köln: Brill, 1996.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. *Abraham and All the Families of the Earth: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 12-50*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Jeansonne, Sharon Pace. *The Women of Genesis: From Sarah to Potiphar's Wife*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1990.
- Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.
- JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew Text and the New JPS Translation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1999.
- Kass, Leon R. "Regarding Daughters and Sisters: The Rape of Dinah." *Commentary* 93 (1992): 29-38.
- Kee, H. C. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 775-828 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 1. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.
- Keefe, Alice A. "Rapes of Women/Wars of Men." *Semeia* 61 (1993): 79-97.
- Kessler, Martin. "Genesis 34: An Interpretation." *Reformed Review* 19/1 (1965): 3-8.
- Kevers, Paul. "Les "Fils De Jacob" À Sichem." Pages 41-46 in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies*. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1990.
- King, Philip J. "Circumcision—Who Did It, Who Didn't and Why." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 32/4 (July/Aug 2006): 48-55.
- Klein, Ralph W. "Israel/Today's Believers and the Nations: Three Test Cases." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 24 (1997): 234-237.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Kselman, John S. "The Book of Genesis: A Decade of Scholarly Research." *Interpretation* 45 (1991): 380-392.
- Kugel, James L. "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993): 1-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Story of Dinah in the Testament of Levi." *Harvard Theological Review* 85 (1992): 1-34.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kunin, Seth Daniel. *The Logic of Incest: A Structuralist Analysis of Hebrew Mythology*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 185. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995.
- Labuschagne, C. J. "The Tribes in the Blessing of Moses." Pages 97-112 in *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis*. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at London, 1973. Edited by A. S. Van Der Woude. *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 19. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Lapointe, Roger. "Tradition and Language: The Import of Oral Expression." Pages 125-42 in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Lehming, Sigo. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Gen 34." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1958): 228-250.
- Lemaire, Andre and Benedikt Otzen, ed. *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen, May 8<sup>th</sup>, 1993*. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 50. Leiden—New York—Köln: Brill, 1993.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Levy, B. Barry. *Targum Neofiti 1 A Textual Study: Introduction, Genesis, Exodus*. Studies in Judaism 1. Lanham—London: University Press of America, 1986.
- Lindblom, Johannes. *Erwägungen zur Herkunft der josianischen Tempelurkunde*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1971.
- Lipka, Hilary B. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006.
- Luke, K. *Studies on the Book of Genesis*. Pontifical Institute Publications 21. Alwaye, India: Pontifical Institute of Theology and Philosophy, 1975.
- Lund, Shirley and Julia A. Foster. *Variant Versions of Targumic Traditions within Codex Neofiti I*. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- Macchi, Jean-Daniel, et Thomas Römer, ed. *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Gen 25-36*. Mélanges offerts à Albert de Pury. *Le Monde De La Bible* 44. Geneve: Labor et Fides, 2001.

- Macho, Alejandro Diez. *Neofiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana*. Tomo I Génesis. Madrid—Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968.
- Mendels, Doron. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- Miller, James E. "Sexual Offences in Genesis." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 90 (2000): 41-53.
- Mulder, Martin Jay, and Harry Sysling. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum—Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Murphy, Frederick J. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York—Oxford: Oxford University, 1993.
- Myers, Jacob M. *1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 12. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.
- Niditch, Susan. *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence*. New York: Oxford, 1993.
- Nielsen, Eduard. "The Levites in Ancient Israel." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 3 (1964): 16-27.
- Noble, Paul. "A 'Balanced' Reading of the Rape of Dinah: Some Exegetical and Methodological Observations." *Biblical Interpretation* 4 (1996): 173-204.
- Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated with an Introduction by Bernhard W. Anderson. Chico: Scholars, 1981.
- Parry, Robin Allinson. *Old Testament Story and Christian Ethics: The Rape of Dinah as a Case Study*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Bletchley, UK—Waynesboro, Ga.: Paternoster, 2004.
- Phillips, Anthony. "NEBALAH—a term for serious disorderly and unruly conduct." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 237-42.
- Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson and Rev. G. H. Whitaker et al. 10 vols. and 3 suppl. vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1968.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian Alfred. *The Fate of Shechem or The Politics of Sex: Essays in the Anthropology of the Mediterranean*. Cambridge—London—New York—Melbourne: Cambridge University, 1977.
- Porton, G. G., J. Neusner, et al. "Rabbinic Literature." Pages 889-909 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Leicester: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 19-40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 2A. New York: Doubleday, 2006.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Origins of Infant Circumcision in Israel." *Hebrew Annual Review* 11 (1987): 355-70.
- Pummer, Reinhard. "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982): 177-188.
- Pury, Albert de. "Genèse 34 et l'histoire." *Revue biblique* 71 (1969): 5-49.
- Ramras-Rauch, Gila. "Fathers and Daughters: Two Biblical Narratives." Pages 158-69 in *Mappings of the Biblical Terrain: The Bible as Text*. Edited by Vincent L. Tollers and John Maier. London: Associated Presses, 1990.
- Rashkow, Ilona N. "Hebrew Bible Translation and the Fear of Judaization." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21/2 (1990): 217-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Phallacy of Genesis: A Feminist-Psychoanalytic Approach*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Robinson, Alan. "Process Analysis Applied to the Early Traditions of Israel: A Preliminary Essay." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 549-566.
- Rosenblatt, Naomi H. and Joshua Horwitz. *Wrestling with Angels: What the First Family of Genesis Teaches Us About Our Spiritual Identity, Sexuality, and Personal Relationships*. New York: Delacorte, 1995.
- Roth, Wolfgang M. W. "NBL." *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960): 394-409.
- Sandmel, Samuel. *The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to their Literature and Religious Ideas*. New York: Oxford University, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York—Oxford: Oxford University, 1979.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis : The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia—New York—Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Schmitt, Götz. „Der Ursprung des Levitentums." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 575-599.
- Scholer, David M. "Foreword: An Introduction to Philo Judaeus of Alexandria." Pages xi-xviii in *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition*. Translated by C. D. Yonge. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Scholz, Susanne. *Rape Plots: A Feminist Cultural Study of Genesis 34*. Studies in Biblical Literature 13. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Was It Really Rape in Genesis 34: Biblical Scholarship as a Reflection of Cultural Assumptions." Pages 182-198 in *Escaping Eden: New Feminist Perspectives on the Bible*. Edited by Harold C. Washington, Susan Lochrie Graham, and Pamela Thimmes. Biblical Seminar 65. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Schroeder, Joy A. *Dinah's Lament: The Biblical Legacy of Sexual Violence in Christian Interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.



- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Vol. 117. Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Septuaginta*. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935, 1979.
- Sheres, Ita. *Dinah's Rebellion: A Biblical Parable for Our Time*. Foreword by David Noel Freedman. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Simpson, Cuthert A. "The Book of Genesis." *Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 1. Edited by G. A. Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon/Cokesbury, 1952.
- Skinner, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. International Critical Commentary. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. "Genesis Kapitel 34: Eros und Thanatos." Pages 133-135 in *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen, May 8<sup>th</sup>, 1993*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 50. Edited by Andre Lemaire and Benedikt Otzen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Das Buch Genesis: Kommentar*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997.
- Speiser, E. A. *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 1. Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "The Shechem Temple: Where Abimelech Massacred a Thousand." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 29/4 (July/Aug 2003): 26-35, 66-69.
- Stallman, Robert C. "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1992): 163-189.
- Sternberg, Meir. "Biblical Poetics and Sexual Politics: From Reading to Counterreading." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 463-488.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1985.
- Tal, Abraham. "The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch." Pages 189-216 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum—Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- The Testament of Levi: A First Study of the Armenian Mss of the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*. Jerusalem: St James, 1969.
- Tigay Jeffrey H., ed. *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985.
- Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. Overtures to Biblical Theology 13. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

- Tromp, Johannes. "Two References to a Levi Document in an Epistle of Ammonas." *Novum Testamentum* 39 (1997): 235-247.
- Troost, Arie. "Reading for the Author's Signature: Genesis 21.1-21 and Luke 15.11-32 as Intertexts." Pages 251-72 in *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*. Edited by Athalya Brenner. The Feminist Companion to the Bible 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Van Seters, John. "The Silence of Dinah (Genesis 34)." Pages 239-47 in *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Gen 25-36*. Mélanges offerts à Albert de Pury. *Le Monde De La Bible* 44. Edité par Jean-Daniel Macchi et Thomas Römer. Geneve: Labor et Fides, 2001.
- Van Wolde, Ellen. "The Dinah story: Rape or worse?" *Old Testament Essays* 15/1 (2002): 225-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Does 'INNÁ Denote Rape? A Semantic Analysis of a Controversial Word." *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002): 528-44.
- VanderKam, James C. "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees." Pages 96-125 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 359-373.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Visotzky, Burton L. *The Genesis of Ethics: How the Tormented Family of Genesis Leads Us to Moral Development*. New York: Crown, 1996.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*. Vol. 1. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York—Hagerstown—San Francisco—London: Harper & Row, 1962. Translation of *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels*. BD 1. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions*. Vol. 2. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York—Hagerstown—San Francisco—London: Harper & Row, 1965. Translation of *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels*. BD 2. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1960.
- Wenham, George. *Genesis 16-50*. Word Biblical Commentary 2. Dallas: Word, 1994.
- Wénin, A., ed. *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Leuven: University, 2001.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 12-36: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by John J. Scullion, S.J. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995. First published by Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn, in the *Biblischer Kommentar* Series, 1981. First published in English by Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1985.

- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Whiston, William, trans. *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. New Updated Edition. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Wintermute, O. S. "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 35-51 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. New York: HarperCollins, 1996.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1947.
- Wright, R. B. "Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 639-670 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Yamada, Frank M. "Dealing with Rape (in) Narrative (Genesis 34): Ethics of the Other and a Text in Conflict." Pages 146-65 in *The Meanings We Choose: Hermeneutical Ethics, Indeterminacy and the Conflict of Interpretations*. Edited by Charles H. Cosgrove. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 411. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Yonge, C. D., trans. *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition*. Complete and Unabridged. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Zakovitch, Yair. "Assimilation in Biblical Narrative." Pages 185-92 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1985.
- Zobel, Hans-Jürgen. *Stammesspruch und Geschichte: Die Angaben der Stammessprüche von Gen 49, Dtn 33 und Jdc 5 über die politischen und kultischen Zustände in damaligen „Israel.“* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 95. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1965.

### **Methodology, References, and Miscellaneous Entries Cited and/or Consulted**

- Aichele, George, and Gary A. Phillips. "Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7-18.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- Armstrong, Terry A., Douglas L. Busby, and Cyril F. Carr, eds. *A Reader's Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.
- Austen, Jane. *Seven Novels*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2006.
- Barr, James. *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of a Millennium*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University, 2000.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1961.
- Beardslee, William A. "Poststructuralist Criticism." Pages 253-67 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979-1988. Rev. ed.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-1985.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon, with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Based on the lexicon of William Gesenius and reprinted from the 1906 edition originally published by Houghton, Mifflin and company, Boston. 6th printing. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Broyles, Craig C. *Interpreting the Old Testament: A Guide for Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Callaway, Mary C. "Canonical Criticism." Pages 142-55 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Clarke, Kent D. "Canonical Criticism: An Integrated Reading of Biblical Texts for the Community of Faith." Pages 170-221 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Davis, Ellen F. "Critical Traditioning: Seeking an Inner Biblical Hermeneutic." *Anglican Theological Review* 82 (2000): 733-751.
- Eslinger, Lyle M. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category." *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992): 47-58.
- Evans, Craig A. "Source, Form, and Redaction Criticism: The 'Traditional' Methods of Synoptic Interpretation." Pages 17-45 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Evans, Craig A., and Stanley E. Porter. *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Downers Grove—Leicester: InterVarsity, 2000.
- Fee, Gordon D. *New Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002. 3d. ed.
- Freedman, David Noel. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Gesenius, William. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament; Edited by Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs*. Translated by Edward Robinson. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001. Reprint, 6th printing, August 2001.

- Green, Joel B., I. Howard Marshall, and Scot McKnight. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Gunn, David M. "Narrative Criticism." Pages 201-29 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- HarperCollins Study Bible: New Revised Standard Version with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Based on the First, Second, and Third Editions of the Koehler-Baumgartner Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.
- Keck, Leander E. *The New Interpreter's Bible, V 1: General Articles on the Bible; General Articles on the Old Testament; Genesis; Exodus; Leviticus*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- Kelley, Page H., Daniel S. Mynatt, and Timothy G. Crawford. *The Masorah of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: Introduction and Annotated Glossary*. Grand Rapids—Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia, 1980.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. with rev. suppl., P. G. W. Glare and A. A. Thompson, eds. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lust, J., E Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. With the collaboration of G. Chamberlain. Part I: A – I. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Part II: K – Ω. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.
- McKenzie, Steven L., and Stephen R. Haynes, eds. *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- McKnight, Edgar V. "Reader-Response Criticism." Pages 230-52 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Miller, J. Maxwell. "Reading the Bible Historically: The Historian's Approach." Pages 17-34 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Morgan, Robert with John Barton. *Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

- Morgan, Thais E. "Is There an Intertext in This Text? Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality." *American Journal of Semiotics* 3 (1985): 1-40.
- O'Connor, M., and Bruce K. Waltke. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Patte, Daniel. "Structural Criticism." Pages 183-200 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Literary Approaches to the New Testament: From Formalism to Deconstruction and Back" Pages 77-128 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Porter, Stanley E., and David Tombs, eds. *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Rast, Walter E. *Tradition History and the Old Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Edited by Gene Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. "Modern Linguistics and the New Testament: A Basic Guide to Theory, Terminology, and Literature." Pages 222-65 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Richter, Philip. "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: An Appraisal and Extended Example." Pages 266-309 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 3. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- Sanders, James A. *Torah and Canon*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Savran, George W. *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative*. Bloomington—Indianapolis: Indiana University, 1988.
- Segovia, Fernando F. "Reading the Bible Ideologically: Socioeconomic Criticism." Pages 283-306 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Seow, Choon Leong. *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995. Rev. ed.
- Soulen, Richard N., and R. Kendall Soulen. *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*. 3<sup>rd</sup> rev. and enl. ed. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2001.
- Stamps, Dennis L. "Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament." Pages 129-69 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the

- Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Steck, Odil Hannes, and James Nogalski. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology*. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995. 2d ed.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 33-38.
- Streete, Gail P. C. "Redaction Criticism." Pages 105-21 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Stuart, Douglas K. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001. 3d ed.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. "Form Criticism." Pages 58-89 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Tate, W. Randolph. *Biblical Interpretation: An Integrated Approach*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997. Rev. ed.
- Tombs, David. "The Hermeneutics of Liberation." Pages 310-55 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 120. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Twain, Mark. "The War Prayer." Available at [http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The\\_War\\_Prayer](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_War_Prayer).
- Valantasis, Richard. "The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The *Acts of Thomas* and Cultural Intertextuality." *Semeia* 80 (1997): 261-76.
- Viviano, Pauline A. "Source Criticism." Pages 35-57 in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes. Rev. and exp. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Yoder, Perry B. *From Word to Life: A Guide to the Art of Bible Study*. Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1982.

## Appendix A: Abbreviations

(Alphabetized by Abbreviation)

AB	Anchor Bible
<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACNT	Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament
act.	active
a.k.a.	also known as
AnBib	Analecta biblica
<i>ANF</i>	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
aor.	aorist
<i>ASTI</i>	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>AThR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907.
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CC	Continental Commentaries
cf.	<i>confer</i> , compare
1-2 Chr	1-2 Chronicles
<i>1-2 Clem.</i>	<i>1-2 Clement</i>
cohort.	cohortative
Col	Colossians
consec.	consecutive
const.	construct
1-2 Cor	1-2 Corinthians
<i>CurTM</i>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
D	Deuteronomist source (of the Pentateuch)
Dan	Daniel
dat.	dative
dep.	deponent
Deut	Deuteronomy
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
<i>DJG</i>	<i>Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels</i>
<i>DrewG</i>	<i>Drew Gateway</i>
E	Elohistic source (of the Pentateuch)
Eccl	Ecclesiastes
ed(s).	editor(s), edited by
Eph	Ephesians



1-2 Esd	1-2 Esdras
Esth	Esther
<i>ETR</i>	<i>Études théologiques et religieuses</i>
Exod	Exodus
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
Ezek	Ezekiel
FCB	Feminist Companion to the Bible
fem.	feminine
f(f).	and the following one(s)
FF	Foundations and Facets
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
fut.	future
GBS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
Gen	Genesis
gen.	genitive
<i>Gen. Rab.</i>	<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>
<i>GNS</i>	<i>Good News Studies</i>
Hab	Habakkuk
Hag	Haggai
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
HB	Hebrew Bible
Heb	Hebrews
hiph.	hiphil
hith.	hithpael
Hos	Hosea
<i>HS</i>	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>IB</i>	<i>Interpreter's Bible</i>
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ibid.	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place
ICC	International Critical Commentary
idem	the same
<i>IDS</i>	<i>In die Skriflig</i>
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is
impf.	imperfect
impv.	imperative
indic.	indicative
inf.	infinitive
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
Isa	Isaiah
<i>ISBE</i>	<i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i>
J	Jahwist or Yahwist source (of the Pentateuch)
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
Jdt	Judith
Jer	Jeremiah
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPS	<i>JPS Hebrew English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew Text and the New JPS Translation—Second Edition</i>
<i>Jos. Asen.</i>	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>
Josh	Joshua
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>

JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>Jub.</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
Judg	Judges
juss.	jussive
<i>KB</i>	<i>Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek</i> . Edited by Schrader. 6 vols. Berlin, 1889-1915.
1-2 Kgs (3-4 Kgdms)	1-2 Kings (3-4 Kingdoms [LXX])
<i>L.A.B.</i>	<i>Liber antiquitatum biblicarum</i>
Lam	Lamentations
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
<i>Leg. 1, 2, 3</i>	<i>Legum allegoriae I, II, III; Allegorical Interpretation 1, 2, 3</i>
LEH	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Compiled by J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. 2 vols. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.
Lev	Leviticus
<i>Liv. Pro.</i>	<i>Lives of the Prophets</i>
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LPT	Levi-Priestly Tradition
<i>LS</i>	<i>Louvain Studies</i>
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9 <sup>th</sup> ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.
LXX	Septuagint (the Greek OT)
1-2 Macc	1-2 Maccabees
<i>4 Macc.</i>	<i>4 Maccabees</i>
Mal	Malachi
masc.	masculine
Matt	Matthew
Mic	Micah
mid.	middle
<i>Migr.</i>	<i>De migratione Abrahami; On the Migration of Abraham</i>
Mp	Masorah parva
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic Text
<i>Mut.</i>	<i>De mutatione nominum; On the Change of Names</i>
NA <sup>25</sup> , NA <sup>27</sup>	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , Nestle-Aland, 25 <sup>th</sup> , 27 <sup>th</sup> ed.
Nah	Nahum
N.B.	<i>nota bene</i> , note carefully
Neh	Nehemiah
neut.	neuter
<i>NIB</i>	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i>
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i>
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
niph.	niphal
n(n).	note(s)
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NT	New Testament
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTSM	New Testament Studies Monograph
Num	Numbers
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology

<i>Odes Sol.</i>	<i>Odes of Solomon</i>
op. cit.	<i>opere citato</i> , in the work cited
opt.	optative
OT	Old Testament
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
P	Priestly source (of the Pentateuch)
p(p).	page(s)
par.	parallel
pass.	passive
per.	person
1-2 Pet	1-2 Peter
pf.	perfect
Phil	Philippians
pl.	plural, plate
poss.	possessive
<i>Praep. ev.</i>	<i>Preparatio evangelica</i> , Preparation for the Gospel
pref.	prefix
prep.	preposition
pres.	present
<i>Proof</i>	<i>Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History</i>
Prov	Proverbs
Pss/Pss	Psalms
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
ptc.	participle
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RefR</i>	<i>Reformed Review</i>
Rev	Revelation
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
S	Syriac
1-2 Sam (1-2 Kgdms)	1-2 Samuel (1-2 Kingdoms [LXX])
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and It Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
sg.	singular
Sir	Sirach/Ecclesiasticus
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
<i>Somn. 1, 2</i>	<i>De somniis I, II; On Dreams 1, 2</i>
Song (or Cant)	Song of Songs (Song of Solomon, or Canticles)
subjunc.	subjunctive
subst.	substantive, substantival
suf.	suffix
suppl.	supplement
<i>T. 12 Patr.</i>	<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>
<i>T. Job</i>	<i>Testament of Job</i>
<i>T. Levi</i>	<i>Testament of Levi</i>
<i>T. Mos.</i>	<i>Testament of Moses</i>
<i>T. Naph.</i>	<i>Testament of Naphtali</i>
<i>T. Sim.</i>	<i>Testament of Simeon</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
Targ(s).	Targum(s), Targumic

<i>Tg. Neof.</i>	<i>Targum Neofiti</i>
<i>Tg. Onq.</i>	<i>Targum Onqelos</i>
<i>Tg. Ps.-J.</i>	<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>
Theod.	Theodotus, <i>On the Jews</i>
Tob	Tobit
TPINTC	TPI New Testament Commentaries
trans.	translator, translated by; transitive
vol(s).	volume(s)
vs.	versus
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
v(v).	verse(s)
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WC	Westminster Commentaries
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WWSup	Word and World Supplement Series
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
Zech	Zechariah
Zeph	Zephaniah