1

War and Peace in the Gospel of Luke

The Senate and the People of Rome to Imp[erator] Titus Caesar Vespasianus, son of the Deified Vespasian, pontifex maximus, with *tribunicia potestas* for the tenth time, hailed as Imp[erator] for the seventeenth time, consul for the eighth time, their princeps, because on the instructions and advice of his father, and under his auspices, he subdued the race of the Jews and destroyed the city of Jerusalem, which by all generals, kings, or races previous to himself had either been attacked in vain or not even attempted at all. CIL 6.944 = ILS 264 (Millar, trans.)[1]

Claudia Aster, captive from Jerusalem. Tiberius Claudius Proculus(?), imperial freedman, took care [of the epitaph]. I ask you to make sure you take care that no-one casts down my inscription contrary to the law. She lived 25 years. CIL 10.1971 = ILS 8193 (Noy, trans., modified)[2]

In 70 CE, Titus' Roman legions besieged and captured Jerusalem. The victory was celebrated in the city of Rome with a triumph for Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian; the *Judaea capta*, *adoratio*, and *pax* coins; the Temple of Peace, filled with the loot of the temple in Jerusalem; the Colosseum, paid for (at least in part) with the spoils of Judaea; and triumphal arches, including the Arch of Titus in the Circus Maximus with the "blatantly false" inscription quoted in the first epigraph to this chapter (CIL 6.944).[3] The claim that, of all the generals, kings, and peoples in the history of the world, Titus alone successfully captured Jerusalem indicates the significance of this victory for the Flavian regime. Imperial propaganda figured Vespasian as a new Augustus, conquering

[1] Millar 2005, 120.
[2] Noy 1993, 44. The inscription was found near Naples.
[3] Millar 2005, 120.

the world, extending the boundaries of the empire, and bringing peace, and his sons followed his example. The victory over rebellious Judaea legitimated their rule.

The propaganda of the Flavian conquest tells only part of the story. The second inscription quoted at the start of this chapter hints at another: As the city of Rome was being enriched with new monuments, the city of Jerusalem was in ruins. Claudia Aster, a captive slave, represents the Judaean side of the Roman victory. Her story would not have been unusual in Flavian Rome, which, according to Josephus, was flooded with captives from the war in Judaea (e.g., *J.W.* 6.416–420) – men, women, and children who had survived famine, civil violence, Roman siege, and the destruction of Jerusalem only to be sold as slaves by and to the victors. The captives whose bodies, marked by war as they must have been, were displayed in the Flavian triumph and sold in the slave markets were also signs of the Roman victory.

Titus' arch was dedicated in 81 CE, and Claudia Aster's funerary inscription dates to approximately the same time (between 70 and 95 CE).[4] Both inscriptions represent imperial power. They provide an indication of the broad availability of reminders of this power in the city of Rome and across the Empire: imperial inscriptions, statues, and arches; public works funded with the spoils of war, and carried out by captives; coinage; and slaves. The Gospel of Luke is located in the same general time and space, the Roman Empire at the end of the first century, after the Roman victory in Judaea. And like the inscriptions quoted at the start of this chapter, the Gospel of Luke portrays the defeat of Jerusalem in its descriptions of the city surrounded by siegeworks, razed, and trampled by enemies (19:43–44, 21:20, 21:24). More precisely, the power of Jerusalem's enemy is reified in the bodies of the women and children who are abandoned in Luke 13:34–35, smashed on the ground in 19:44, killed by sword and, like Claudia Aster, taken captive in 21:23–24, and blessed with infertility in 23:28–29.

The destruction of the city in Luke is part of a story that begins with the announcement of God's salvation and the redemption of Jerusalem. The "peace on earth" proclaimed by the angels at the birth of Jesus in Luke 2:14 resounds through the Gospel, which has more lexical references to peace than the other three Gospels combined – the majority of

[4] Noy 1993, 43; Millar 2005, 120. Arguably, Claudia Aster's funerary inscription can be placed well before 95 CE, since she was apparently mature enough at the time of her capture in 70 CE to maintain her identity as a Jerusalemite (cf. Hezser 2005, 50–51).

these unique to Luke.[5] While peace is voiced almost entirely by male characters in Luke, two references are directed toward women (7:50, 8:48), and peace is symbolized by pregnant women and newborn infants in chapters 1 and 2. In the biblical and classical worlds, women and children, especially pregnant women and newborn infants, represent the future of the people that would be lost in defeat.[6] The vulnerability and endangerment of women and children in war make them poignant signs of peace, a connection reinforced by the general understanding of the violent action of war as the work of men.[7] The proclamation of peace at the births of John and Jesus in Luke 1–2 entails safety and security for the most vulnerable, and a future for the people of Israel.

Numerous commentators emphasize the theme of peace in the Gospel of Luke, sometimes even identifying it as a pacifist Gospel.[8] As the warnings of the destruction of Jerusalem indicate, though, there is an equal interest in war. The texts relating to war, like the references to peace, are almost entirely unique to the Gospel. Two of the warnings are unparalleled in Mark or Matthew (19:41–44, 23:28–31), and the warning in 21:20–24 reinterprets the apocalyptic abomination of desolation in Mark 13:14 and Matt. 24:15 as the siege of Jerusalem. In addition to the warnings, various parables of Jesus are given a militarized setting: A strong man in full armor is conquered, disarmed, and looted by a stronger man (11:21–22[9]); a king surrenders to a king with a larger army before battle even begins (14:31–32); a client king has his enemies, who are also his subjects, slaughtered (19:12, 27). One of Jesus' disciples is a Zealot (rather than a "Cananaean," as in Mark and Matthew; Luke 6:15), and the disciples have swords (22:36–38, 22:49–50). The power of the Roman Empire over the province of Judaea is evident in the census (2:1–2); the centurion whose orders are obeyed (Luke 7:1–10, par. Matt. 8:5–13); Pilate's violence (Luke 13:1); the Herodians, their soldiers, and

[5] εἰρήνη occurs fourteen times in Luke: 1:79, 2:14, 2:29, 7:50, 8:48 (par. Mark 5:34, Matt. 9:22), 10:5–6 (3x; par. 2x in Matt. 10:12–13), 11:21, 12:51 (par. Matt. 10:34), 14:32, 19:38, 19:42, 24:36.

[6] Isa. 13:16–22; Hos. 9:11–14; Homer, *Il.* 6.57–60; Horace, *Carm.* 4.6.17–24; Livy 28.20.6–7; etc.

[7] 1 Sam. 4:9; Ps. 127:3–5; Homer, *Il.* 5.529–530; Aristophanes, *Lys.* 519–20; Livy 5.6.4–5; etc.

[8] E.g., Caird 1963, 169; Cassidy 1979, 41–44; Swartley 1983, 25; Ford 1984, 36, 63, and throughout; C. F. Evans 1990, 207, 684; N. Wright 1996, 329, 568–71; J. Green 1997, 690; Byrne 2003, 88–89, 92; and Scheffler 2006, 297–98, 309.

[9] Luke's version of this synoptic tradition incorporates additional militaristic terminology in comparison with Mark 3:27, Matt. 12:29. See ch. 2, p. 40.

the tax collectors, all acting on Rome's behalf (3:12–14, 13:31–32, 19:2–10, 23:11); and the enemies who abuse (Luke 6:27–30, par. Matt. 5:38–44). War and military occupation are ingrained in the Gospel of Luke.

So, then, Luke's Gospel is at the same time a message of peace and of the destructive, dangerous violence of war. This conundrum is no minor inconsistency. Rather, it frames the narrative. In Luke 1–2, a barren woman and an unmarried woman become pregnant through divine intervention. Fertility is here a blessing (1:24–25, 1:42). The newborn Jesus signifies peace (1:79, 2:10–14, 2:29), and Jerusalem and Israel are saved and redeemed (1:54, 1:68–79, 2:38). In light of the pattern of the fulfillment of expectation established in the infancy narratives, the reader anticipates the realization of peace throughout the story of Jesus.[10] Instead, when Jesus enters Jerusalem in 19:41–44, he warns of war, and as he goes to his crucifixion, Jesus tells the daughters of Jerusalem to weep for themselves and their children – in days to come, barrenness, wombs that have never borne children, and breasts that have never nursed an infant will be blessed (23:28–29). The blessing of infertility here precisely inverts the blessing on fruitful wombs in 1:42. The promise of peace in Luke 1–2 becomes by the end of the Gospel a threat of war.

EXPLAINING PEACE AND WAR IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Is there peace and salvation for Jerusalem, or the destruction of war? One approach to the conundrum of peace and war in the Gospel of Luke defines the peace of the infancy narratives as messianic, eschatological salvation.[11] This explanation separates the peace brought by Jesus from the problem of war. For C. F. Evans, for instance, the peace of Luke 1–2 is shalom, by which he means the peace of the eschatological age brought about by the messiah. The peace of 19:42, however, only indicates surrender to a superior military force.[12] Since peace is equated with salvation in this perspective, it consequently has nothing to do with Rome; Rome is no enemy.[13] After all, Mary and Joseph obey the emperor's demand

[10] See esp. Johnson 2011, 26–29, on the pattern of expectation and fulfillment in Luke.
[11] So Swartley 1983, 26–27; Johnson 1991, 48; J. Green 1997, 59; Byrne 2003, 88.
[12] C. F. Evans 1990, 207, 684. See also Giblin 1985, 54.
[13] So Caird 1963, 15; Fitzmyer 1981, 384; Walaskay 1983, 25–49; Johnson 1991, 51–52. A benevolent view of Roman rule is represented in Acts 10:1–8, 10:17–48, 13:7–12, etc.; cf. Walton 2002, 22–23.

for a census (2:4–5). A centurion is a benefactor to the local community (7:4–5), and the Roman authorities proclaim Jesus innocent (23:4, 14–16, and 47). Proponents of this perspective point out that the warnings of war do not name Rome. Instead, the enemy in Luke is general spiritual oppression, and salvation from this oppression – peace – comes through the ministry of Jesus.[14] There is thus no conundrum to solve.[15]

The enemy in Luke is certainly greater than the Roman Empire (10:18–19, 11:17–20), and some Romans are presented positively. However, Rome is one face for the enemy, apparent in the implicit contrast of Jesus and Augustus in 2:1–14, the oppressive practices of tax collectors and soldiers in 3:12–13, and Pilate's violence in 13:1.[16] Moreover, peace and war are woven together in the infancy narratives themselves, as J. Massyngbaerde Ford shows in great detail.[17] The peace of the infancy narratives belongs to the same story as the war of Jesus' adult ministry, and it is a story deliberately set in the context of Augustus' *pax Romana*, established by victory over Rome's enemies. The separation of Luke's peace and war from their imperial context offers an insufficient explanation of these themes in the Gospel.

A second approach identifies the conundrum of peace and war as one aspect of the question of the Jews and the fate of Jerusalem in Luke and Acts.[18] One perspective on this question insists that the author favors Jerusalem, its temple, and its people. The destruction imagined in the warnings lasts only until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled (21:24).[19] Once the city and its people welcome Jesus as their king upon his triumphal reentry at the Parousia, destroyed Jerusalem will be restored.[20]

[14] Caird 1963, 36, 55, 216; Swartley 1983, 29–35; Danker 1988, 6–9, 12–13.

[15] See esp. Walaskay 1983, 25–27; Robbins 1991, 220–21; Scheffler 2006, 297–98, 302–6, 309. A (somewhat) related approach separates Luke 1–2 from the remainder of the Gospel, avoiding the problematic contrast of peace and war entirely (Conzelmann 1960, who does not even address the infancy narratives, and Ford 1984, 13). However, the integration of the vocabulary, themes, and imagery of the infancy narratives in the Gospel as a whole argues against the separation of chapters 1 and 2. See further Brown 1993, 242; Boxall 2009, 36; J. Edwards 2015, 99–100.

[16] Ford 1984, 3–4; Walton 2002, 23–28; S. Kim 2008, 76–92; Brink 2014, 101.

[17] Ford 1984, 13–35; Reid 2012, 429–30.

[18] On the use of the term "Jew" (rather than "Judean"), see Levine 2014, 391.

[19] Tiede 1980, 89; Tannehill 1986, 156; Brawley 1987, 125; C. A. Evans 1990, 313, and 1993, 181–82. See also D. Allison 1983, 76–77, and 1985, 157–58, and Fisk 2008, 169, 174, on contingency in Luke 13:34–35 and 19:41–44.

[20] Since the prophetic texts alluded to in Luke's warnings include promises of restoration, it is argued that Luke must also imply the restoration of Jerusalem: Tiede 1980, 93–94; Tannehill 1986, 155; Brawley 1987, 125, 130–32; Chance 1988, 131, 134–35; C. A. Evans 1990, 216, and 1993, 178–79; Fisk 2008, 165–66.

Proponents of this perspective find support in the repentant Jews in Luke 23:48; the expectation of Israel's messianic restoration in Acts 1:6–8; and the consistent presence, if not priority, of Jewish believers in the story of the church in Acts (e.g., 2:37–42, 14:1, 15:15–18, 28:23–24) – a story that repeatedly returns to Jerusalem as a central location for the life of the church (e.g., 2:46–3:1, 15:2–4, 21:17–26).[21] From the birth narratives of Luke through the ministry of the apostles in Acts, according to Robert Tannehill, "it is God's purpose to bring redemption to Jerusalem and to Israel."[22] In this perspective, peace triumphs over war.

Alternatively, Luke's warnings have been interpreted as representing the complete destruction of the city and temple, with no promise or hope of restoration.[23] Proponents of this perspective argue that the opportunity for repentance in the welcoming of Jesus as king in 13:34–35 is met with rejection in 19:37–44.[24] The "until" of 21:24 ends only in the terrifying chaos of the eschaton in verses 25–28.[25] There is no limit to the destruction of Jerusalem in the Gospel of Luke, and no salvation for "the Jews" who reject God's prophets and execute Jesus. The hope of restoration present in the infancy narratives is lost in the judgment of war, a threat that drives the shift of the identity of the people of God from the Jews to the Gentile converts in Acts (13:46–48, 28:23–28). The story that begins in the temple in Jerusalem in Luke 1 finds a conclusion in Rome in Acts 28.[26]

Of course, a number of interpreters recognize both perspectives on the Jews and Jerusalem in Luke and Acts.[27] There is undoubtedly division, rejection, and judgment. Not all Jews receive the gospel of Jesus (nor do all Gentiles). At the same time, Jews in Jerusalem and elsewhere

[21] See esp. Tiede 1980, 89–94, 113–16; Brawley 1987, 130–32, 139–44; Chance 1988, 68–71, 82–84, 129–30, etc.; C. A. Evans 1993, 174–79, 181–82; Strelan 2008, 138–39. This interpretation of Jerusalem and the Jews in Luke and Acts does not ignore or deny the issue of judgment, but limits the rejection to the Jewish leaders (Chance 1988, 67–71, 117–20; Talbert 2003, 109–10), or identifies a division in Israel between repentant believers and stubborn rejecters of Jesus' message (Brawley 1987, 139–44; Chance 1988, 55; C. A. Evans 1993, 174–77, 210). See also J. Green 1995, 69–74; Talbert 2003, 107–9; Johnson 2011, 34–38.

[22] Tannehill 1986, 163.

[23] Conzelmann 1960, 74–75, 133–35; J. T. Sanders 1987, 30–31, 54; Levine 2014, 394–95.

[24] Tiede 1980, 73 (though Tiede overall seems to support the eventual restoration of Jerusalem); Giblin 1985, 42–43; J. T. Sanders 1987, 193.

[25] Giblin 1985, 90–91; J. T. Sanders 1987, 218; C. F. Evans 1990, 752; J. Green 1997, 739; Vinson 2008, 83.

[26] Origen, *Cels.* 8.42; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on Luke*, homily 100; Conzelmann 1960, 15, 88–91, 133–34, 140, 145; J. T. Sanders 1984, 107–9, and 1987, 9–17, 26, 63, 304, 315–17; Matthews 2013, 388–89, 393; Levine 2014, 393–402.

[27] E.g., Tiede 1980, 73; Giblin 1985, 89–91, 100–6; J. Green 1995, 69–72, and 1997, 691, 816–17; Ahn 2006, 136–39.

are receptive to the gospel all the way through the end of Acts (28:24), even after Paul's great declaration of the turn to the Gentiles in 13:46–48 (note 14:1).[28] Similarly, biblical and Jewish tradition is celebrated in Luke and Acts, not rejected.[29] As Daniel Marguerat argues, that both perspectives are so well supported within the narratives is itself important, reflecting the tension inherent to the inclusion of both Jews and Gentiles within the people of God in the history of the early church.[30] A mediating approach to the conundrum of peace and war in Luke points out that the warnings of the destruction of Jerusalem are not heartless or vicious. Jesus weeps, and he encourages his audience within the story to weep for the fate of the city and its residents (19:41–44, 23:28–31). Moreover, the warnings allude to the same biblical traditions used to interpret the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in Josephus' *Jewish War*, 4 Ezra, and early rabbinic commentary. Luke's warnings can therefore be read as part of a larger (Jewish and Christian) conversation around the events of 70 CE.[31]

I am convinced by the mediating position on the question of Jew and Gentile in the Gospel of Luke, but I remain dissatisfied with the mediating position on the question of Jerusalem. The inclusion of both Jew and Gentile in the community of the church does not answer (or balance) the apparent loss of Jerusalem's peace in war. The continued presence of the church in Jerusalem, even in the temple, in Acts cannot redress the shift from the blessing of fertility and the peace represented by pregnant women and newborn infants in Luke 1–2 to the blessing of infertility and the destructive violence of war represented by smashed, slaughtered, and captive bodies of children and pregnant and nursing women in the warnings. And although the warnings of war go unfulfilled within the narrative of Luke and Acts (which concludes before the events of the First Revolt), the probable historical context of the Gospel of Luke in Flavian Rome sharpens its message of war.[32] The imperial rhetoric of conquest,

[28] See Jervell 1988, 42–45; Brawley 1987, 71–72, 139–44; Chance 1988, 82–84, 101–4; C. A. Evans 1990, 9–12.

[29] So much so that Jervell 1988, 11–12, argues the author and audience were Jewish, or at least God-fearers or proselytes. See also C. A. Evans 1993, 173–75; Strelan 2008, 106, 110–12, 117; Moreland 2013, 37–39, 40–41.

[30] Marguerat 1994, 129–34, 144–46.

[31] E.g., Tiede 1980, 66–68; Lampe 1984a, 162–66; C. A. Evans 1990, 15, 312–13, and 1993, 210; Johnson 1991, 323, 326.

[32] Ford 1984, 2; Lampe 1984a, 162–65; Moreland 2013, 27–28, 40. O'Neill 1970, 80–81, 85; Johnson 1991, 326; and Kurz 1999, 154–55, suggest that Luke's warnings were, for the earliest audiences, fulfilled by the events of the First Revolt (cf. Origen, *Cels.* 8.42; Eusebius, *Eccl. theol.* 3.7).

the captive slaves in households across the Empire, the coins minted in Rome and even in Judaea itself, the ruins of Jerusalem – these representations of defeat make the implication of war in the Gospel all the more apparent, and the conundrum of war and peace all the more insistent.[33]

This study therefore offers a new approach to the question of peace and war in the Gospel of Luke, one which centers on the imagery of women, children, and infants in the promises of peace and warnings of war. The significance of the representation of war and peace with women and children in Luke has largely gone unnoticed, an unsurprising state of affairs considering the general absence of interest in women and children from studies of peace and war in antiquity until very recently. When pregnant women, nursing mothers and their infants, and women and children more generally are made the lens for interpreting peace and war in Luke, the message of destruction becomes more clearly evident. The gendering of war and peace in Roman tradition and the biblical expectations of war and peace, especially in Jerusalem, offer a powerful explanation for Luke's focus on war and peace.

READING THE GOSPEL OF LUKE IN ITS CONTEXTS

The promise of peace in the first chapters of Luke and the threat of war that hangs over Jesus' last days in Jerusalem frame the Gospel's narrative. There are multiple contexts within which the significant concern with war and peace in Luke can be addressed. In terms of literary context, several of the references to war and peace have parallels in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, offering the opportunity to address the particular interpretations of these traditions in Luke.[34] The promises of peace and the

[33] Moreland 2013, 17–19, 41–43, argues that the ambiguity of the fate of Jerusalem in Luke-Acts reflects the recent history of the city and the uncertainty over its position in Flavian and Hadrianic Rome (Moreland dates Luke-Acts to the early second century); cf. Goodman 2007, 447–49; Klawans 2010, 302–3. Notably, however, Gambash 2015, 137–39, 150–64, suggests that any immediate uncertainty over the fate of the city would have been settled by the Flavian interpretation of the events of 70 CE as the utter defeat of an enemy of Rome, witnessed in the imperial humiliation of the Jews across the Empire (see also Magness 2008, 209–11).

[34] This study will not be overly concerned with source criticism, however. A number of excellent commentaries thoroughly address the adaptations of tradition in Luke; see, e.g., Marshall 1978, Fitzmyer 1981 and 1985, or Klein 2006; and on the infancy narratives in particular, Brown 1993, 244–47.

warnings of war also use biblical vocabulary, imagery, and quotations. The numerous citations of, allusions to, and models drawn from Israel's scriptures identify the Septuagint as an important theological context for the Gospel. Finally, in terms of historical context, the story told within the Gospel is set in villages, houses, synagogues, fields, and the temple in pre-Revolt, Roman-occupied Galilee and Judaea. Beyond the narrative world, the author and his community lived in a particular time and space. Their knowledge of their world, especially of how wars are fought, what peace means, and what had recently happened in the Roman province of Judaea, offers an important framework for interpretation.

While attention will be given to the literary and theological contexts of the Gospel, this study primarily focuses on Luke's social, cultural, and historical contexts. Luke's story of Jesus is told by and for people within a particular social and cultural context. It concerns characters in a particular historical space and time that would have had some degree of familiarity to the authorial community – the author and the community with whom and for whom he wrote.[35] The narrative reflects, interacts with, and challenges the shared knowledge of the authorial community. The ideal reader approaches the text within this shared knowledge. Especially in consideration of the central concern with war and peace in this study, a thorough survey of the conceptual world of war and peace in the Roman Empire establishes a background against which the promises of peace and warnings of war in the Gospel of Luke can be interpreted.

The idea of a conceptual world draws on the work of Steve Mason, Charles Talbert, and Joel Green. First, Mason addresses the significance of the authorial community for interpretation. Authors in Greco-Roman antiquity, he argues, "wrote necessarily for real local groups, whose knowledge, values, and prejudices they knew and could manipulate."[36] With reference to the study of the Gospel of Luke in particular, Talbert emphasizes the importance of the values, presuppositions, and standard expectations for communication shared by the author and the "authorial audience" (his term for the audience for whom the author intended

[35] On the concept of an "authorial community," see G. Green 2002, 58–59. The process of communal authorship and interpretation of letters discussed by Green is equally important for narratives. In Roman antiquity, authors read works-in-progress to audiences and incorporated changes based on feedback (Tacitus, *Dial.* 2–3; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 7.17.7–8, 7.17.13–15, 7.20.1–4; Suetonius, *Claud.* 41; Starr 1987, 213–14; Mason 2005, 78–84, and 2011, 1642–43; Marincola 2009, 14).

[36] Mason 2011, 1643.

to write).[37] This shared knowledge, the conceptual world of Luke and Acts, thus provides an essential context for the interpretation of the work.[38] Joel Green similarly emphasizes the specificity of the story of Luke within a particular time and space, in which the author and his intended audience held in common certain historical and cultural knowledge.[39] Of course, the Gospel of Luke is not somehow an accurate reflection of reality, nor has the author written his reality into the text. As noted by Mason, Green, and others, texts like Luke are part of the forces that shape or construct (a particular vision of) reality.[40] For Green, it is therefore important to understand the shared cultural context of the author and his ideal readers to interpret the world envisioned in the Gospel.[41]

A number of scholars have approached the Gospel of Luke as a product of, and a text in conversation with, its social and cultural location. Particularly notable examples include Frederick W. Danker on benefaction, Peter J. Scaer on Greco-Roman noble death traditions, and Brittany E. Wilson on Roman masculinity.[42] This study adds the concerns of war and peace to this mix. However, I am not concerned with identifying explicit literary influences on Luke, as, for instance, in the work of Dennis R. MacDonald, who finds numerous allusions to Greek and Roman epics in Luke and Acts.[43] As Loveday Alexander notes, while some readers of

[37] For Talbert 2003, 15, the authorial audience includes the model reader found inscribed in the text, and also the intended reader whom the author assumes to share certain knowledge, values, and expectations. Talbert's conceptual world is comparable with the "rhetoricized mentality" of the author and his audience in Mason 2011, 1677–78.

[38] "To read as authorial audience is to attempt to answer the question: If the literary work fell into the hands of an audience that closely matched the author's target audience in terms of knowledge brought to the text, how would they have understood the work?" (Talbert 2003, 15; see also pp. 11–12, 15–17).

[39] J. Green 1997, 12.

[40] J. Green 1997, 11–12; C. Conway 2008, 7; Mason 2011, 1643; Parsons 2014, 53.

[41] See J. Green 1995, 2–5, and 1997, 11–14. Green's interest is in the world (or worldview) that Luke projects and encourages his audience to adopt, but he also notes the significance of the Gospel as a "cultural product"; the culture in which the Gospel was created is the context for interpreting the author's vision for the world. See also Parsons 2014, 53; B. Wilson 2015, 37.

[42] Danker 1988, 5–9 (note also his discussion of Greco-Roman conceptions of ἀρετή, 3–4; peace and justice, 51; the political ideology of Augustus, 53–54; prediction in Greco-Roman drama, 267; funerary practices, 371; etc.); Scaer 2007, 6 (and throughout); and B. Wilson 2015, 21–23 (and throughout). See also Bauckham 1995, 422; Bock 1996, 1846; Brent 1999, 83–101; Kinman 1999, 281–94; D'Angelo 2002, 50–62; Walton 2002, 26–28; C. Conway 2008, 127–32; Matthews 2013, 381–99; Parsons 2014, 53–71.

[43] E.g., MacDonald 2005; 2015a, 4–5; 2015b, 1–5. See also Bonz 2000, 26, 56–58, etc., and Taylor 2007, 85, 88, etc.