

## LUKE'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AS A KEY TO HIS SOTERIOLOGY

William J. Larkin, Jr.\*

One of the "theological accusations" brought against Luke's theology by many NT scholars since 1950 is his lack of a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death.<sup>1</sup> They note that Luke does not use Mark 10:45 in his gospel.<sup>2</sup> If the shorter reading of the words over the bread and cup (Luke 22:15-19a) is accepted as authentic, Luke again fails to include words that interpret Jesus' death soteriologically, particularly as a vicarious atonement.<sup>3</sup> References to Jesus' death in the early Church preaching recorded in Acts mention its divine necessity as a fulfillment of Scripture, but not its saving significance (Acts 3:18; 13:29; 26:22-23; cf. Luke 24:25-27, 44-48).<sup>4</sup> Acts 20:28, which refers to the Church as that which the Lord obtained with his own blood, has not gone unquestioned as a piece of evidence for Luke's soteriological understanding of Jesus' death. Either the verse is viewed as traditional wording that Luke uses to represent Paul's view but not his own,<sup>5</sup> or if it is accepted as representing Luke's view it is evaluated as having little weight in the light of the many times Luke mentions Jesus' death without also presenting its soteriological significance.<sup>6</sup>

A final piece of evidence is Luke's use of Isaiah 53. On the two occasions when he quotes from the passage, he appears to studiously avoid those portions of the chapter that refer to vicarious atonement.<sup>7</sup> At the Last Supper, Jesus quotes Isa 53:12d ("and he was reckoned with transgressors"). He does not quote what immediately follows ("yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors"; Isa 53:12e, f). Luke reports that as Philip joins the Ethiopian eunuch, the eunuch is reading Isa 53:7c-8c (Acts 8:32-33). Luke concludes the quo-

\*William Larkin is professor of New Testament and Greek at Columbia Graduate School of Bible and Missions, Columbia, South Carolina.

<sup>1</sup>W. G. Kümmel, "Current Theological Accusations Against Luke," *ANQ* 16 (1975) 134 n. 18, gives a representative list of those who hold this view.

<sup>2</sup>H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of Luke* (New York: Harper, 1960) 201.

<sup>3</sup>E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975) 66.

<sup>4</sup>E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 92.

<sup>5</sup>Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 201.

<sup>6</sup>C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: Epworth, 1961) 59.

<sup>7</sup>H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1927) 280; M. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus [Gerd Mohn], 1969) 98; W. E. Pilgrim, *The Death of Christ in Lucan Soteriology* (Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary; Princeton, 1971) 153.

tation just before the phrase "stricken for the transgression of my people" (Isa 53:8d).

From all of this evidence it appears that a strong case can be made for Luke's non-soteriological understanding of Jesus' death. C. H. Talbert, in a recent evaluation of the state of current research in Lukan studies, concludes: "Conzelmann said that Luke did not develop a positive doctrine of the redemptive significance of the passion or the cross. There was no connection with the forgiveness of sins. Recent research has either sustained this judgment or modified it only slightly."<sup>8</sup> Yet for several reasons it may be beneficial to re-examine this generally accepted estimate of Luke's soteriology. No consensus has been achieved regarding the precise theological significance for Luke of Jesus' death. Is he dying as a martyr?<sup>9</sup> Is he suffering as the Servant who must undergo death if he is to be glorified?<sup>10</sup> Is he suffering as the Christ who dies to fulfill Scripture?<sup>11</sup> Is he dying as the Lord for whom death is simply an interruption in his triumphal progress into glory?<sup>12</sup> Equally, there is no consensus concerning the precise source of salvation in Luke's soteriology. Is it the resurrection-ascension exaltation?<sup>13</sup> Is it Jesus' position as the Lord presently reigning in heaven?<sup>14</sup> None of these alternative estimates of Luke's soteriology appears to adequately integrate into their expositions those places, although few, in Luke-Acts that do interpret Jesus' death as a vicarious atonement. In the light of this lack of consensus and comprehensiveness in approach, it seems appropriate to re-examine the evidence and see whether the objections to a Lukan redemptive interpretation of Jesus' death can be maintained or effectively answered. If the latter is the case, then as each piece of evidence is again scrutinized we will find good reason to maintain, as some scholars have, that Luke does, indeed, have a redemptive understanding of Jesus' death.<sup>15</sup>

Yet effectively answering the objections to the view that Luke understood Jesus' death redemptively will leave us with only two pieces of

<sup>8</sup>C. H. Talbert, "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke," *Int* 30 (1976) 389.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Franklin, *Study*, p. 65; R. P. Martin, "Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel," *Int* 30 (1976) 367; G. Voss, *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen* (StudNeot 2; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965) 129.

<sup>11</sup>Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 200.

<sup>12</sup>Barrett, *Luke*, p. 60.

<sup>13</sup>Martin, "Salvation," p. 367.

<sup>14</sup>Franklin, *Study*, p. 67.

<sup>15</sup>N. B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (London: Tyndale, 1951) 170; I. H. Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (eds. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin; Exeter: Paternoster, 1971) 106. Kümmel, "Current," p. 138, cautiously observes, "While Luke by no means entirely removes the redemptive significance of the death of Jesus he does not stress it and . . . his chief interest lies in the fact that the death of Jesus corresponds to the will of God."

positive evidence: Luke 22:19-20 and Acts 20:28. If other supporting evidence were found, we could with greater confidence assert that our estimate of Lukan soteriology is to be preferred. This study will attempt to do this by showing how a proper understanding of the use of Isa 53:12 at Luke 22:37 reveals the interaction of certain theological themes in the passion narrative that serve as the objective foundation for understanding the death of Jesus as a vicarious atonement. Before we consider this use of Isaiah 53, let us briefly re-examine the evidence for objections to Luke's soteriological understanding of Jesus' death.

Luke's failure to use Mark 10:45 need not be accounted for solely or primarily by his soteriology. Mark 10:45 is part of an incident, James' and John's request for places of prominence in the kingdom, that Luke does not include either out of respect for the twelve;<sup>16</sup> because of his desire to closely connect a passion prediction (Luke 18:31-34) with a display of miraculous power, the healing of the blind man (Luke 18:35-43; cf. a similar reaction of Mark with regard to an earlier passion prediction, Luke 9:37-43, 44-45, where Luke deletes Mark 9:28-29);<sup>17</sup> because of his editorial practice, in order to avoid repetition of similar though independent material<sup>18</sup> at Luke 22:24-27; or simply because of his preoccupation with the mass of non-Markan material in his travel narrative (Luke 9:51-18:14).<sup>19</sup>

Concerning the textual problem at Luke 22:19-20, there is good reason for following the lead of Jeremias and Schürmann<sup>20</sup> and accepting the longer reading as authentic. When the extrinsic probabilities that favor the longer reading are combined with the transcriptional probability that the short form developed under the influence of *disciplina arcani* over a limited number of copies that had been produced for distribution among pagans, then we have good reason for accepting the longer reading as authentic. If it is authentic, a redemptive explanation of Jesus' death is an integral part of one of Luke's most explicit presentations of the significance of that death for mankind: "This is my body which is given for you. . . . This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood" (Luke 22:19-20).<sup>21</sup>

The lack of redemptive interpretation of Jesus' death in Luke's report

<sup>16</sup>E. Lohse, *Martyrer und Gottesknecht* (FRLANT 64; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963) 118.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Martin, "Salvation," p. 377.

<sup>19</sup>W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), I, 122.

<sup>20</sup>J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (NT Library trans. from 3rd German ed.; London: SCM, 1966) 139-159; H. Schürmann, "Lk 22, 19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung," *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Kommentar und Beiträge zANT; Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968) 159-197.

<sup>21</sup>Contrast Martin, "Salvation," p. 378, who comments, "It seems that his understanding of Jesus' death was less that of concern with the significance of atonement than with the practical pastoral mediation of forgiveness by establishing the new covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-34."

of early Church preaching may be because Luke limited himself in his historical reporting to summary forms of proclamation rather than expanded dogmatic reflection.<sup>22</sup> Luke reports an interpretation of Jesus' death that sees it as a fulfillment of the OT and identifies Jesus with the suffering Servant of Isaiah, though mainly in his humble obedience that leads to exaltation (Acts 3:13, 26-27, 30; 8:32-33; 22:14).<sup>23</sup> In doing so, however, he shows that early Church preaching presented the objective elements of the righteous Jesus' unjust suffering and made the association of Jesus with an OT figure who suffers vicariously for the sins of others.<sup>24</sup> Though they are not as explicitly related as we would like, all the basic elements for constructing a soteriology based on a redemptive death are consistently present in the Lukan reports of early Church preaching. The offer of forgiveness of sins is normally preceded by a declaration of Jesus' innocence and his disgraceful death on the cross (Acts 5:30-31; 10:39-43; 13:28, 38). Such suffering of an innocent person could only bring forgiveness to the sinner if it were vicarious. When this evidence is combined with the several explicit references to vicarious atonement (Luke 22:19-20; Acts 20:28), we arrive at a coherent understanding of Luke's soteriology.

Other options that find Luke's soteriology centered in his resurrection-ascension exaltation or the position from which he at present dispenses salvation<sup>25</sup> rightly emphasize the importance Christ's triumph has for Luke's soteriology (e. g., Acts 2:33; 4:12; 5:31; 10:43). Yet they fail to consider that what they present as evidence for either Jesus' exaltation (Acts 2:33; 5:31) or his present powerful name (Acts 10:43; 13:38) as the reason why salvation can come to individuals now does not clearly connect these bases of salvation with its product, the "forgiveness of sins." Luke's redemptive interpretation of Jesus' death, though not emphasized as much, probably should be taken as the true basis of a Lukan soteriology that offers forgiveness of sins, as expressed in his report of early Church preaching.

As for the importance of Acts 20:28 the tendency has been to minimize its significance for Luke's thought, though none deny its vicarious atonement content. There is no sufficient reason for not accepting it as a true expression of Luke's soteriological understanding. True, it is a representation of Paul's teaching. But Luke, by his inclusion of it in a farewell discourse at Ephesus as a summary of early Church kerygma, shows the importance it had for him.

The Isaiah quotations (Luke 22:37; Acts 8:32-33) admittedly do not make explicit reference to vicarious atonement. Yet they do not stand in the way of it. Indeed, as we have already noted, they may be said to positively promote it by supporting the basic objective facts (the

<sup>22</sup>Stonehouse, *Witness*, p. 140.

<sup>23</sup>Martin, "Salvation," p. 377.

<sup>24</sup>I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971) 171.

<sup>25</sup>Barrett, *Luke*, p. 59; Franklin, *Study*, p. 67; Martin, "Salvation," p. 378.

innocent Jesus suffering a transgressor's death), which may be theologically interpreted by means of vicarious atonement. Also, the identification of Jesus with the suffering Servant, who does make vicarious atonement for the people, serves as a foundation on which such a soteriological understanding of Jesus' death may be built.

If Jesus' death as a vicarious atonement is the proper way to understand the basis of Luke's soteriology, how may his use of Isaiah 53 in the passion narrative provide supporting evidence? At the climax of his farewell discourse to those around the Last Supper table, Jesus instructs his disciples to take precautions in the future by making provision for their sustenance and defense. The reason he gives for the warning is: "For I tell you this scripture must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was reckoned with transgressors'; for what is written about me has its fulfillment" (Luke 22:37/Isa 53:12). The introductory formula, as well as the comment immediately following the quotation, indicate and emphasize that this OT quotation has a dual function. It gives a reason for the necessity of obeying Jesus' command. This reason is in the form of a prediction. The quotation is then also a prophecy which must come to fulfillment in Jesus' experience. It is the way Luke portrays the OT quotation's fulfillment in his passion narrative that is important for perceiving Luke's soteriology.

In its original context, "And he was reckoned with transgressors" is the second member of a fourfold concluding summary of the fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:12). Giving the reason for the servant's glorification, this statement summarizes the song's account of a human agent's suffering, which involves a death that atones for the sins of "the many." The four-member summary may be understood as two couplets. The first presents the objective facts of the Servant's sufferings: "Because he poured out his soul to death and was numbered with the transgressors" (Isa 53:12c, d). The second couplet presents the theological significance of that suffering: "Yet he bore the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors" (Isa 53:12e, f). The first member of each couplet seems to state the subject matter in general terms, while the second member is more specific. Luke's quotation is the "specific" member of the couplet that deals with the objective facts of the Servant's suffering. The basic meaning of the clause, as the LXX renders it and Luke uses it, is that the Servant is someone who has been "classified, identified, numbered"<sup>26</sup> with a certain class of persons, "transgressors" (*anomoï*). These transgressors may be understood either as criminals outside the law of man or transgressors outside God's law. Since in Israel man's law is based on God's law, theological or religious overtones probably accompany any use of *anomos*.

Where does Jesus' prediction about being classed as, evaluated as,

<sup>26</sup>The Hebrew verb *mnh* ("he counts") is rendered in the LXX by the less than literal *logizomai* ("I reckon"), possibly under the influence of a double occurrence of *hsh-logizomai* earlier in the chapter (Isa 53:3, 4). The use of *logizomai* might also be seen as an attempt to interpret the summary phrase in the light of that earlier description of the people's low estimation of the suffering Servant.

treated as a criminal find its fulfillment, according to Luke? The transgressors may be identified with the disciples and the Scriptures fulfilled when they take up swords and behave like outlaws at the arrest (Luke 22:49/Mark 14:47).<sup>27</sup> Those who hold to such an interpretation see Luke as introducing this quotation into the farewell discourse in order to soften Jesus' instruction with respect to arming oneself. They must assume that Luke presents Jesus as one who gives the order in an ironic or at best enigmatic way: He did not mean it (Luke 22:38, 51), yet at the same time he wanted to mislead his disciples so that they thought he meant it.<sup>28</sup> This interpretation creates more problems than it solves.

Three other specific details that have been proposed as the fulfillment are the arrest,<sup>29</sup> the exchange for Barabbas,<sup>30</sup> and the crucifixion between two criminals.<sup>31</sup> The declaration at the arrest, "Have you come out as against a robber with swords and clubs?" (Luke 22:52), is not a satisfactory proposal. While containing material parallelism it lacks verbal parallelism. Besides, Luke omits Mark's explicit statements that the arrest fulfills Scripture (Luke 22:53/Mark 14:49). The Barabbas incident (Luke 23:18-25) contains neither clear material or verbal parallelism nor an editorial comment indicating Scriptural fulfillment. The third suggestion has much to commend it. Luke's crucifixion narrative contains a multiple mention of the two *kakourgoi* ("criminals") with whom Jesus was crucified (Luke 23:32-33, 39-43). Yet the lack of verbal parallelism<sup>32</sup> and an editorial comment indicating Scrip-

<sup>27</sup>P. S. Minear, "A Note on Luke 22:36," *NovT* 7 (1964-65) 128-134; S. G. Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 335.

<sup>28</sup>Minear, "Note," p. 132; cf. R. Summers, *Jesus the Universal Savior: Commentary on Luke* (Waco, Texas: Word, 1972) 282, and F. F. Bruce, *This is That* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1969) 94. Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 83, believes the function of the quotation is to help the disciples avoid the misunderstanding about the swords, for it interprets the instruction by saying Jesus is one who does not fight but willingly is treated as a transgressor.

<sup>29</sup>T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Kommentar zNT 3; Leipzig: A. Deichertische, 1920) 685; A. Loisy, *L'Évangile selon Luc* (Frankfurt: Minerva G. M. B. H., 1971) 533; G. H. P. Thompson, *The Gospel According to Luke in the RSV* (Oxford: University Press, 1972) 261. J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930) 271, thinks that Luke 22:37 is intended to replace Mark 14:49b.

<sup>30</sup>D. G. Miller, *Saint Luke* (London: SCM, 1960) 163; cf. J. Calvin, *A Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Calvin's Commentaries; Edinburgh: Saint Andrew, 1972), 3. 183.

<sup>31</sup>Rese, *Motive*, p. 156; L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des AT im Neuen* (Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1966) 123; F. K. Fleigel, *Der Einfluss des Weissagungsbewusstes und Anderen Motiven auf die Leidensgeschichte* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1910) 86; F. Hauck, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Cologne: Deichert, 1934) 284. Loisy, *Luc*, p. 555, sees Isa 53:12 as the source of this historical detail. Contrast K. Weidel, "Studien über den Einfluss des Weissagungsbewusstes," *TSK* 85 (1912) 253; M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (London: SPCK, 1959) 91.

<sup>32</sup>Rese, *Motive*, p. 156, argues that Luke's use of the general term *kakourgos* (cf. John 19:18, *allos* ["others"]); Mark 15:27, *lēstois* ["robbers"]) in his expansion at Luke 23:32 and in his use of tradition that he may have held in common with John (Luke 23:33/John 19:18) shows that he interpreted this fact as the fulfillment of Isa 53:12. If Rese's explanation is correct the question still arises why Luke did not go all the way in his verbal parallelism and use *anomoí* (Pilgrim, *Death*, p. 150 n. 3). Possibly the fact that *anomoí* might be misunderstood and be taken to mean "Gentiles" motivated Luke's choice of a clearer term. In addition to this difficulty Rese fails to explain why Luke uses *syn* ("with") instead of the *meta* ("with") that may already be present in his tradition, since it occurs in John 19:18.

tural fulfillment prevent us from concluding that this detail alone is the fulfillment of the Luke 22:37 prediction.

This lack of success in identifying the fulfillment detail points us to the possibility that Luke wants us to see the whole of the passion, the suffering and death of Jesus, as the single event that fulfills this unit of prophecy.<sup>33</sup> Two other indications that this may indeed be the case are the quotation's position at the climax of the farewell discourse and Luke's use of the other fulfillment proof-texts in his gospel. Luke places this quotation at the climax of a farewell discourse that contains a theological interpretation of the events about to take place. This position at the end of Jesus' interpretation of the passion and at the beginning of the action of the passion may then indicate that the quotation finds its fulfillment in the course of events of the passion narrative as a whole.

It is interesting to note that the theological interpretation of the farewell discourse deals with Jesus' impending suffering in general, not specific terms (Luke 22:15, 20, 22). It would be natural, then, to take the intended application of Isa 53:12 as also general. No one detail, but the narrative as a whole, fulfills it. Two of the three other explicit OT quotations in Luke that function as fulfillment proof-texts stand at the head of narratives in which their fulfillment is elaborated. Luke 3:4-6/Isa 40:3-5 precedes the description of John the Baptist's ministry. Luke 4:17-19, 21/Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 is placed at the beginning of Jesus' preaching and healing ministry.<sup>34</sup> The exception is Luke 7:27/Mal 3:1; Exod 23:20, which is part of Jesus' review of John's ministry. Yet this quotation too provides a general description of John's entire ministry and does not focus on fulfillment in a particular detail.

<sup>33</sup>Cf. Voss, *Christologie*, p. 110, who observes that the detail of the two criminals should not be seen as the only fulfillment. Rather, the quote is so placed in the narrative that it becomes a "heading" (*Überschrift*) for the whole passion. H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke* (trans. from 5th German ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884) 319, makes a similar comment about finding the fulfillment in the arrest scene: "The completion (the Messianic fulfillment, xviii. 31) of the prophecy began with the arrest (ver. 52), and comprehended the whole subsequent treatment until death." Cf. Pilgrim, *Death*, p. 150 n. 3.

<sup>34</sup>L. C. Crockett, *The OT in the Gospel of Luke* (Dissertation, Brown University; Providence, 1966) 277, discusses at length the programmatic use of Isa 61:1-2 in Luke's narration of Jesus' ministry. He concludes, "It can be said that while he seems to have drawn many nuances of meaning from the text (Isa 61:1-2), he has not taken pains to do this in a mechanically literal way. That is, every phrase in the quotation can be linked up with another passage in the Gospel, but the link is not always obvious." Crockett calls these elaborations "illustrations." While Crockett's understanding of Luke's use agrees in one sense with our own findings so far, in another sense the conclusion that he draws—that Luke does see fulfillment of various parts of Isa 61:1-2 in various passages by way of material parallelism—differs from our findings. The fact that there is more than one thought expressed in Isa 61:1-2; 58:6/Luke 4:17-19 means that different details of the succeeding narrative will fulfill different parts of the OT passage. Thus comparison with Luke 22:37/Isa 53:12 with its one thought is unfair. Crockett's understanding of Luke's method of interpretation centers around a midrashic approach that above all seeks to identify in the gospel tradition what is identical with the elements of the OT passage. Thus when considering Luke 22:37 Crockett asks about the identity of the *anomoí*, and being satisfied that they are the disciples he does not inquire further. The fact that Jesus dies as one surrounded by *anomoí*, including the disciples, is the fulfillment of Luke 22:37. Because he focuses on the identity of the *anomoí* Crockett fails to ask the further question: How does Luke show the fulfillment in Jesus himself? Thus, though we would expect a more definite identification of details in the passion that could be called the fulfillment of Luke 22:37, if only as material and not "mechanically literal" parallels, Crockett finds fulfillment in nothing more specific than the death itself.

If it is accepted as probable that Luke finds the fulfillment of Isa 53:12d in the whole of the passion narrative, it is necessary to ask: "What is the precise content from Isaiah 53 that is fulfilled?" Is the fulfillment limited only to what is explicitly cited by Luke, or is this brief quotation a pointer to the rest of the original context? Further, if the Luke 22:37/Isa 53:12 quotation is a "context pointer," is the vicarious atonement significance of the Servant's death something to which Luke intends to point and present as fulfilled in Jesus' death?

Two tests, which Morna Hooker<sup>35</sup> proposes for determining whether a brief OT quotation is being used as a "context pointer," are the presence of allusions to other portions of the immediate OT context in the immediate NT context and the presence of "a unified interpretation . . . in this case, of the whole Isaianic Servant concept."<sup>36</sup> Luke's passion narrative fails the first test. There are no more quotations and only two possible allusions: Jesus' silence (Luke 23:9/Isa 53:7), and his intercession for his executioners (Luke 23:34/Isa 53:12).<sup>37</sup> Further, Luke appears to omit, either through source choice or stylistic improvement, other Markan allusions to the Servant Songs: the arrest (Mark 14:21, 43-49/Isa 53:12; contrast Luke 22:22, 52); Jesus' silence (Mark 14:61; 15:4/Isa 53:7; contrast Luke 22:67-68; 23:3-4; cf. Luke 23:9); the amazement of the rulers (Mark 15:5, 39, 44/Isa 52:15; contrast Luke 23:3, 4, 47, 52); rich Joseph of Arimathea's provision of a burial place (Mark 15:43/Isa 53:9; cf. Matt. 26:57, which has closer verbal agreement; contrast Luke 23:50).

Luke passes the second test. As we have already noted, Luke does interpret Jesus' ministry through a unified understanding of the Isaianic Servant's mission of obedient innocent suffering that leads to glory. What provides the most convincing evidence, however, is the relationship between the content of the quotation and the kind of fulfillment it receives. Taken by itself, the clause "he was reckoned with transgressors" is not immediately understandable as OT content that meets its fulfillment in the whole of Luke's passion narrative. The preceding phrase in Isa 53:12, "he poured out his soul to death" (Isa 53:12c), would have functioned better in that way. To properly understand the fulfillment of Luke 22:37/Isa 53:12 in the whole of the passion narrative, we must understand that Luke did intend the quotation as a pointer to the larger original context.

The method by which Luke worked out the fulfillment of Isa 53:12 in his passion narrative was to treat the verse as a text, the basis for a theme that would constantly recur throughout the narrative. The narrative of the historical events becomes an interpretive midrash on this OT text. The theme is that Jesus, though innocent, suffers as a con-

<sup>35</sup>Hooker, *Jesus*, p. 22.

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

<sup>37</sup>Goppelt, *Typos*, p. 123, sees Luke as representing Jesus as the Servant interceding for sinners at Luke 23:34a/Isa 53:12 and Luke 23:43/Isa 53:11.

demned criminal according to the action of men and the plan of God. Two special interests of Luke combine to expound this theme: Jesus' innocence, and his unjust treatment as a transgressor. As Isaiah before him, Luke presents the objective facts of an innocent person suffering unjustly according to the will of God prophesied in the Scriptures. He does this in order to drive his readers to ask for an explanation of this God-ordained injustice. Luke's readers are driven to the same conclusion as the vicarious atonement interpretation couplet in Isa 53:12 expressed, though for good reason Luke does not spell out this redemptive significance explicitly in this passion narrative, save at Luke 22:20. He does, however, through the development of these two themes—Jesus' innocence and his unjust suffering—give us the foundation of objective fact upon which a redemptive understanding of Jesus' death may be built. Luke develops these themes through interpretive comments, arrangement of the narrative's details, and special emphases.

Luke gives most of his interpretive comments through the words of Jesus. At his arrest, as recorded by Luke alone, we have the astonished question, "Judas, would you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" (Luke 22:48; cf. Mark 14:45). At the conclusion of the arrest scene, in words that have been seen as the specific fulfillment of Luke 22:37/Isa 53:12, Jesus again interprets his treatment as a criminal as unjustified: "Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs? When I was with you day after day in the temple, you did not lay hands on me" (Luke 22:52-53/Mark 14:48-49). On the way to the cross, in words found only in Luke, Jesus uses the unjustified treatment he is receiving as a warning to the inhabitants of Jerusalem concerning coming judgment: "For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?" (Luke 23:31). Finally, the prayer for his executioners, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34; only in Luke), seems to assume in part that if the executioners realized they were causing the innocent to suffer they would not have crucified Jesus. Luke, by pointing out that Jesus so prays, emphasizes again the essential injustice of what has happened.

The clearest interpretation of Jesus' death in this way comes in the words of the penitent criminal as he remonstrates with his fellow condemned criminal. The penitent criminal rebukes the mockery of Jesus by comparing their own punishment with that of Jesus: "And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds, but this man has done nothing wrong" (Luke 23:41). Luke, himself, shows restraint and does not develop this theme by adding his own editorial comments.

Luke has at least two ways of expressing this theme through his arrangement of details in the narrative. First, Jesus' treatment as a transgressor is introduced into the narrative abruptly. It occurs without provocation. The mockery of the temple guard takes place before the Sanhedrin hearing and its judgment that Jesus is guilty (Luke 22:63-65, 66-71; contrast Mark 14:65, 55-64). In the account of the mockery by the Jewish leaders at the cross, Luke omits the recitation of Jesus'

claim that he would destroy the temple. Admittedly this charge does not figure in Luke's report of the Sanhedrin hearing, because he removes the detail concerning false witnesses from his account. The effect of the omission in both places is to remove even the testimony of false witnesses, which might serve as a basis for justifiable abuse (Luke 22:66; contrast Mark 14:56; Luke 23:35-38; cf. Mark 15:29-30; cf. the mockery introduced by Luke in the "two criminals" episode, which is also unprovoked as the penitent criminal's response shows, Luke 23:39-41). Luke 23:11 seems to be an exception. The silence of Jesus appears to provoke Herod and his entourage to ridicule and mistreat Jesus. Yet the accusations of the Jewish leaders intervene between Jesus' silence and Herod's mockery. Luke, then, shows Jesus' innocence and his unjust suffering through presenting the abuse heaped on Jesus as coming in the form of unprovoked attacks.

Second, Luke consistently presents Jesus' righteous response to his treatment as a transgressor. At his arrest he heals the servant with the severed ear (Luke 22:51). On the way to the cross, Jesus' concern is for the coming plight of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Luke 23:27-31). He prays for his executioners immediately after being crucified (Luke 23:33-34). In the midst of mockery, he ministers to the penitent criminal (Luke 23:35-38, 39-43).

Luke, more than the other synoptists, especially emphasizes that before the political leaders Jesus was innocent (Luke 23:4, 15, 22; cf. 23:47). Yet Jesus' innocence is seen in not just political, legal, or even moral terms. The witnesses to Jesus' innocence at the cross show that they understood that he was innocent before God. The penitent criminal's request indicates that he considered Jesus as righteous before God, who would vindicate him with the glory of the messianic kingdom (Luke 23:40-42). The centurion is reported as glorifying God when he says, "Certainly, this man was innocent!" (Luke 23:47). The mourning repentance of the crowd returning from the crucifixion (Luke 23:48) points to the coming judgment of God on those who have condemned one who was righteous. In explicit and implicit ways, then, Luke tells his readers to view Jesus' innocence within the context of God's justice as well as man's.

It is because of this development of these theological themes that we may appropriately see the basic content of Isa 53:12d as the foundation for and a pointer to the soteriological significance of Jesus' suffering. The objective details, the unjust suffering of the innocent, upon which a vicarious atonement interpretation may be built are clearly presented. Yet, the question still remains: Why did Luke not explicitly spell out this theological significance? The reason is probably to be found in the basic historical perspective from which Luke wants us to view these events. Luke wants us to see the plan of salvation history unfold before our eyes as we read. He wants us, as much as possible, to relive the events as though we were actually participating in them. He does not remind us consistently of the difference in time between our day and Jesus', as Matthew does when he informs us by his editorial

quotations that the Scriptures were indeed fulfilled in given details of Jesus' ministry. For Luke to use editorial comments to point out a vicarious atonement interpretation of Jesus' death would be to destroy the perspective from which he desires his readers to view the events as they advance to fulfillment.

It would be possible for Luke to take this quote, which was already in his source as on the lips of Jesus, and to lengthen it in order to bring in the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death without having to resort to editorial comment (cf. Luke's lengthening of Luke 3:5-6/Isa 40:4, 5; Mark 1:3). Other factors may have prevented such an expansion. Luke's respect for the content of the words of Jesus may have precluded it. Luke emphasizes the fact that the fulfillment of the event, the death and resurrection, had to take place before the disciples would understand its true theological significance (Luke 24:6-8, 25-27, 44-48). Luke stresses that the disciples could not comprehend the simple fact of the God-appointed necessity of Jesus' suffering (Luke 18:34; cf. Mark 10:34). Finally, his intention to show how the story unfolds would be destroyed if he introduced a theological interpretation of the cross' saving significance into a pre-cross conversation (cf. Luke 22:20). The time for the full exposition comes later in its correct place in the historical sequence (Luke 24:25-27, 44-48; the Acts speeches). We have already seen how this full exposition in the report of early Church preaching in Acts, though it does not contain many explicit interpretative comments concerning the redemptive significance of Jesus' death, does—through its association of Jesus with the Isaianic servant and the juxtaposing of a description of Jesus' death as the unjust suffering of the righteous one with the description of the benefits of salvation as the forgiveness of sins—call for the conclusion that Luke's soteriology is based on Jesus' vicariously atoning death.

In presenting the fulfillment of Isa 53:12, Luke shows us an innocent Jesus suffering as a guilty transgressor before God. This is the historical basis for the doctrine of vicarious atonement on the basis of which forgiveness of sins may be offered. This historical basis or groundwork in the passion narrative gives us supporting evidence for the conclusion that Luke's soteriology does indeed have vicarious atonement as its foundation. Because its presentation concentrates on the objective historical basis, not the explicit theological interpretation that may be built on it, this aspect of Luke's soteriological thought is often missed. Still, Luke's use of the OT, especially Isa 53:12 at Luke 22:37 and its fulfillment in the passion narrative, helps us to see that the proper way to understand Luke's soteriology is with Jesus' death as vicarious atonement at its base.