

## **Dr. Robert A. Peterson, The Theology of Luke-Acts Session 10, Marshall, The Promised Savior, Kingdom of God.**

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson and his teaching on the theology of Luke-Acts. This is session 10. I, Howard Marshall, The Promised Savior and The Kingdom of God.

Onward and upward with the lectures on Luke and theology.

Please pray with me. Father, thank you for your word. Thank you for your Holy Spirit. Thank you for the privilege of knowing, loving, and serving you. Bless us as we look into your word and are taught by Howard Marshall concerning Luke's teachings. We pray these things in Jesus' name. Amen.

The interpretation of these passages is disputed by Hans Konzelman. He argues that Luke regards the time of salvation as something which is now over and finished in contrast with Paul who sees his own time as the eschatological time.

And further, the coming of Jesus is not the end but only a picture of the future time of salvation. The reason given for this statement is that in Luke 22:35 and following, Luke distinguishes between the period of Jesus and the present time. However, this reference will not bear the weight which Conzelmann tries to impose upon it.

It does, to be sure, make a distinction between the period of the ministry and the period which began with the passion of Jesus. But its primary reference is to the immediately following events, including the scene in Gethsemane. Luke 22:35 and following.

And Jesus said to them, when I sent you out with no money or knapsack or sandals, did you lack anything? Nothing, they said. He said to them, but now let the one who has a money bag take it, likewise a knapsack. Let the one who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one.

For I tell you, this scripture must be fulfilled in me. And he was numbered with the transgressors, for what is written about me has its fulfillment. And they said, look, Lord, here are two swords.

Is it enough? But the primary reference is to the immediately following events, including the scene in Gethsemane. And it is a warning that persecution and suffering are at hand. There's certainly nothing in the text to suggest a distinction between a past time of fulfillment and the presence of salvation on the one hand and a present time of a different kind on the other.

There's no indication that the era of fulfillment has come to an end. In fact, the reverse is the case. For over the new period, there hang the words of the prophecy.

For I tell you, this scripture must be fulfilled in me. And he was reckoned with the transgressors, for what is written about me has its fulfillment. The passage, therefore, so far from proving Conzelmann's case actually works against it.

For it places the period after the ministry in the category of fulfillment. The point is confirmed by Luke 24:46, and following, where the post-resurrection mission is said to be a fulfillment of scripture. Conzelmann's mistake is that he has made a distinction between the ministry of Jesus, which in his view, Luke has de-eschatologized and the future time of the end.

It is more correct to say that Luke has broadened out the time of the end, so that it begins with the ministry of Jesus, includes the time of the church, and is consummated at the parousia. Luke has not pushed the end into the distant future. He has lengthened it to include the whole era of salvation from the time of Jesus onwards.

Salvation is not a thing of the past, belonging to the ministry of Jesus. It takes its start from then. The today of fulfillment continues right through into the time of the church.

Second, the time of fulfillment is to be characterized as the error of salvation. It's a positive view, which was adopted by Jesus. Joachim Jeremias has drawn attention to the way in which the closing part of Isaiah 61:2, which proclaims the day of vengeance of our God, is omitted from the quotation in Luke 4:18 and 19.

It is not enough to say that this phrase is omitted because it refers to the parousia rather than to the ministry of Jesus. The point is rather that the ministry of Jesus is primarily concerned with salvation. This is brought out in the wording of the quotation.

There's a certain amount of overlap with the quotation of Luke 7:22 mentioned above so both passages must be considered together. The latter passage is concerned exclusively with the works done by Jesus and refers to various classes of people, unfortunate classes, whose needs were met by the mighty works and preaching of Jesus. They are unfortunate in their need.

They were fortunate to have Jesus minister to them. Luke 7:22, John the Baptist questions if Jesus is the Messiah. Go and tell John what you've seen and heard.

The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good news preached to them, and blessed is the one who is not offended by me. That passage I just read gives a list of actions which, according to the gospel tradition, were actually carried out by Jesus. He gave sight to the blind, restored the lame, cleansed lepers, made the deaf hear, raised the dead, and preached the good news to the poor.

Some commentators have held that the prophecy was originally taken metaphorically of the effects of preaching, but there's no evidence that such a stage of understanding ever existed. It's an unlikely hypothesis. Rather, both the mighty works and the preaching of Jesus are regarded as the fulfillment of the prophecy.

The way in which the various parts of the quotation have been brought together from a number of Old Testament passages is proof that the ministry itself has dictated the choice of Old Testament texts. Rather than the description of the ministry was influenced, rather than that the ministry, rather than that the description of the ministry was influenced by the wording of the prophecy, there are, as we have seen, incidents illustrative of nearly every aspect of the prophecy in Luke itself. And in every case, further evidence may be given from the different streams of the gospel tradition.

This means that if the tradition is correct in narrating that Jesus did such acts, then it is wholly possible that the use of the quotation may go back to his own estimate of what he was doing. The attempt by Peter Stuhlmacher to upturn the general consensus of scholarly opinion that the saying goes back to Jesus himself is scarcely convincing. In his characterization of the ministry, Luke is thus making use of traditional material, which, in all probability, stems from Jesus.

The climax of the saying comes in the reference to the preaching of the gospel to the poor. Here, two important terms demand our attention. The object of the preaching is the poor.

Patokoi, the occurrence of this term in the opening verse of the Sermon on the Mount, or Plain, Luke 6:20, parallel Matthew 5:3, has caused great discussion, especially by E. Percy and others. The word in the Old Testament refers to those who are literally poor. It took on the nuance of oppressed since the poor were helpless against the exploitations practiced by the rich.

This meant that the poor were forced to depend upon Yahweh as their helper since they had no human help. The word thus combines the ideas of weakness and dependence upon Yahweh. Those who are poor depend upon God's favor.

E. Percy has strongly contested the view that the word had come to mean pious, but he has made his point in a somewhat exaggerated fashion. The point is that the word

does not stress the positive performance of pious actions calculated to win God's favor but rather draws attention to the needy condition of the sufferer, which God alone can cure. The poor are thus the needy and downtrodden whose wants are not supplied by earthly helpers.

As Matthew makes clear, this meaning of the word is not restricted to literal poverty. For Matthew said, blessed are the poor in heart, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Matthew 5:3. It was to such people that Jesus preached the good news, euangelismai.

Here again, we come upon a concept that has been the subject of considerable debate. Both the meaning and the origin of the concept are disputed. Etymologically, the root is connected with the proclamation of good news, but this fairly generally accepted meaning has been thought to run into difficulty when the usage in Revelation 14:6 is considered.

Here, the content of the message is judgment rather than salvation. Then I saw another angel, Revelation 14:6, flying directly overhead with an eternal gospel to proclaim to those who dwell on earth, to every nation and tribe and language and people. And he said with a loud voice, fear God and give him glory because the hour of his judgment has come.

And worship him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the springs of water, Revelation 14:6 and 7. A fresh survey of the evidence by Peter Stuhlmacher has suggested that the connotation of good news is not as scarcely securely tied to the root and to its Hebrew equivalent as was generally thought and that the verb can, therefore, be used in a somewhat neutral sense. As to the origin of the word, despite the use in Hellenism, which in some respects comes close to that of the New Testament, Stuhlmacher concludes that the Jewish influence was primary. He then argues that the use in Revelation 14, 6 is, from a traditio-historical point of view, the most primitive in the New Testament.

Here, there is a proclamation by an angel in which the coming judgment is announced, and the peoples of the world are summoned to worship God. However, we have a message of hope for the humiliated and persecuted church that God is about to act in kingly power for their benefit. It is this eschatological use of the verb which Stuhlmacher finds in Luke 7:22.

The message for the poor is the announcement that the kingdom of God is at hand bringing salvation. The exposition given by Stuhlmacher is not completely convincing. It should perhaps be emphasized more strongly that two factors are at play in the New Testament.

There is first, the etymology of the word in Greek, which would undoubtedly lend way to the thought of good news. Then, second, the primary source for the New Testament use of the word lies in Isaiah, where the word is used especially of good tidings. Isaiah 49:41, 27:52, 7, 61:1. Although the indications of joy associated with the tidings may lie in the context rather than in the verb itself, it seems likely that the result of this would be to associate the verb with good tidings.

We would, therefore, be more positive than Stuhlmacher in affirming the positive note of joy, which is to be found in Luke 7:22. This has implications for our estimate of other passages in Luke. Stuhlmacher holds that in a number of Luke, we have the same neutral sense of the word, which is sometimes used in parallel with the verb to preach, *kerusso*, and conveys the same meaning.

One may agree with this statement insofar as it is clear that Stuhlmacher's aim is to deny that the technical sense of to preach the Christian gospel is present in these passages. It is questionable, however, whether the verb has no connotation of good news in these passages. This is certainly not true for Luke 1, 19 and Luke 2, 10, where the thought of joy is clearly present.

So, in those places it is good news. Luke 1:19. I am Gabriel.

I stand in the presence of God. This is the word to Zechariah, John the Baptist's dad, and I was sent to speak to you and bring you this good news. That sounds rather good, like good news to me.

Oh, that's how the ESV translates the word. It is possible to translate it in other ways, but they definitely, the committee of the ESV, thought there was a good news quality to the giving of news. And likewise, 2:10, I bring you good news of great joy that will be for all the people.

Today in the city of David is born a savior who is Christ the Lord, even says it. Moreover, once the basic meaning of the term has been established at Luke 4:18, the same sense is likely in the following passages. Luke 4:18, the spirit of the Lord is upon me.

He's anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor, liberty to the captives, recovery of sight to the blind, set at liberty those who are oppressed, and so forth. The same sense as that one is likely in the following passages, especially in those where the content of the preaching is named as the kingdom of God. The problem passage is Luke 3:18, where the activity of John the Baptist is described as preaching good news to the people.

So, with many other exhortations, he preached good news to the people. Conzelmann in particular is already denied on more general grounds that John could

be regarded as preaching the gospel, since this would contradict the Lukan scheme of salvation history and since no object is given to the verb. Neither objection is valid.

The immediately preceding verses contain John's answer to the question of whether he was the Messiah. They are a statement promising that the Messiah is coming. The general content of John's preaching was an exhortation to prepare for the coming of the Lord, the time at which all men would see the salvation of God, Luke 3:4 to 6. This was undoubtedly good news, the announcement of the coming of the Deliverer.

Thus, the description of John given by Luke is at variance with Conzelmann's view of Luke's historical scheme, and, at the same time, Luke has, in fact, supplied the content of John's preaching of good news. Three, we've now established that the prophecy from Isaiah 61:1, and 2, used in Luke 4:18, and 19, and 7:22, shows that the time of Jesus is the era of salvation. Before this statement receives further clarification from the rest of the gospel, we must establish a third fact, which arises particularly from Luke 4, 18 and following.

Same fulfillment of Isaiah 61, 1, the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, anointing me to proclaim the good news and so forth, Jesus said at the synagogue in Nazareth. This is that Jesus himself is regarded as the fulfillment of the prophecy. He is the person promised in the prophecy, for he does not merely prophesy that God is going to save his people. He actually brings salvation to them by his preaching.

The quotation describes the effects of his preaching in metaphorical terms as bringing release to the captives and sight to the blind. He announces that the year of God's favor has come, but the important thing is that this activity is inseparable from Jesus himself. It is not a prophetic proclamation that something is going to happen. The gospel as a whole makes it plain that salvation actually comes to people through the activity of Jesus.

Julius Wellhausen rightly saw that in Luke the message of Jesus is about himself rather than about the kingdom of God. But what significance is attached to the person of Jesus here? Since the passage quoted is one in which the prophet himself speaks, it is tempting to think of Jesus as the eschatological prophet. For the fairly considerable use of the category of a prophet to interpret the person of Jesus in Luke affords some presumption that the idea is present in the passage.

Twice in Mark, the people refer to Jesus as a prophet. Once, he likens his fate to that of a prophet. Friedrich claims Jesus did not explicitly call himself a prophet here but uses a proverbial saying to compare his faith with that of a prophet, his fate.

This is an inadequate verdict for the saying is not really different in form from the independent saying in Luke 13:33. Moreover, so long as no precise parallel to the saying is produced, it cannot be labeled proverbial but must rather be regarded as a

fresh creation in which Jesus deliberately likens himself to a prophet. There's no reference to Jesus as a prophet in the Q material.

However, in Luke's special source, the crowd at Nain say of Jesus crowds at Nain say of Jesus "a great prophet has arisen among us," Luke 7:16. And Simon, the Pharisee has such an estimate in mind when he thinks that Jesus lack of clairvoyance is inconsistent with his being a prophet Luke 7:39. As we saw, Luke 13:33 likens the fate of Jesus to that of a prophet slain in Jerusalem.

Finally, the opinion of the disciples on the road to Emmaus was that Jesus was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people (Luke 24:19). That such a view of Jesus continued in the early church and was taken over by Luke himself is apparent from the book of Acts.

We see this in Acts 3:23 and Acts 7:37 is also a feature of Johannine Christology. It can account, it can satisfactorily account for much of Jesus' activity. As Luke 24:19 makes clear, there the mention of words and deeds reminds us that the activity of a prophet was not restricted to the proclamation of a message by word of mouth.

Such features as the visionary experiences of Jesus, his supernatural knowledge of men's thoughts, and his foreknowledge all fit into this pattern. It is fitting therefore to understand Luke 4:18 and following in terms of Jesus being a prophet when he quotes Isaiah 61 one at the synagogue in Nazareth. But we must go further and ask whether Jesus is regarded in Luke as the prophet of Jewish expectation.

The description of Jesus as a great prophet in Luke 7:16 may imply this, but it is doubtful whether this is implied in Luke 7:39. So far as Luke 4:18 and following is concerned, this explanation is probable. It receives some confirmation from the use of the same passage from Isaiah in a Qumran hymn if it is correct to take the reference here as being to the teacher of righteousness.

Stuhlmacher claims that the same description of Jesus as the eschatological prophet is found in Luke 7:22 where Jesus is described as the wonder-working prophet of the end. But a difficulty arises here because John the Baptist's question raises the question of whether Jesus is the coming one, Luke 7:19 and 20. Could this phrase be used to indicate the eschatological prophet, or did it refer to the Messiah? In favor of the former view, it is argued the deeds described in Luke 7:22 are not those done of the kindly Messiah, but rather those of the prophet who restores the paradisiacal conditions of the wilderness period.

But on the other hand, in John's preaching, the coming one must be identified with the Messiah unless we accept as unlikely the view that John thought himself to be the prophet who announced the coming of the eschatological prophet rather than the eschatological prophet himself. Again, the evidence shows that the word coming

was certainly used of the Messiah. If then Jesus is the Messiah, how do we account for his prophetic deeds? The solution to this problem lies in uncovering a confusion that lurks in the idea of the eschatological prophet.

Actually, two streams of tradition can be unraveled here, showing that there were expectations of the return of Elijah and of the coming of a prophet like Moses. This tension is reflected in the early church. In the early church, John the Baptist was regarded as the Elijah, even though he himself modestly declined, disclaimed the role, but not as the new Moses.

Although some of the actions of Jesus were understood in terms of Elijah and Elisha typology, he himself was not identified with Elijah, but with the new Moses. While Elijah was not generally identified with the Messiah, the prophet like Moses was described in messianic terms as the eschatological deliverer. In Luke 24, 19 to 21, the description of Jesus as a prophet is followed by the account of his life and then the words, but we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel.

Friedrich takes this to mean that the prophet like Moses was to redeem the people in the same way as Moses had done. Acts 7:35 to 37. If so, the task of the Messiah could be understood in terms of the functions of the mess, mosaic prophet.

Hence a distinction, which has been drawn by various scholars in their discussions of Luke 7:19 to 22, between the deeds of the eschatological prophet and the Messiah. Those of the Messiah proved to be a false one as the eschatological prophet. Jesus is the Messiah.

If we now return to Luke 4:18 and following, it will be remembered that we earlier raised the question of whether the speaker in Isaiah 61 following was regarded as the servant. If this is the case, then the task of the servant is already understood in Isaiah as a repetition of that of Moses and as being prophetic. He restores the conditions of the wilderness period as idealistically conceived, and he takes on the role of a prophet who opens blind eyes and sets free the prisoners.

The early church made the identification between the servant of the Messiah, between the servant and the Messiah, an identification which, in our opinion, was already made by Jesus. This means that in Luke 4:18 and following, and Luke 7:19 to 22, we have a description of the work of the Messiah in terms of the activity of the eschatological prophet like unto Moses and the servant of Yahweh, and of the servant of Yahweh. In Luke 4:18 and following the quotation of Isaiah 61, 1, Jesus applies to himself.

And 7, 19 to 22, this is a bit of a conclusion that Marshall is reaching. 7:19 to 22, where John the Baptist asks, is this the one, are you the one who is to come, or



should we look for another? And Jesus says, go tell John what you've seen and heard. Blind receive their sight, lame walk, and so forth.

The poor hear good news. Jesus rehearses those deeds from the Old Testament and says he has done those deeds. This means that in Luke 4:18 and following, and in the passage I just alluded, just read from, Luke 7:19 to 22, we have a description of the work of the Messiah in terms of the activity of the eschatological prophet like unto Moses, number one, and number two, of the servant of Yahweh, the servant of the Lord in Isaiah.

The claim has often been made that Jesus understood the activity of the Son of Man in terms of the work of the servant of Yahweh, who suffers and dies. Our investigation has shown that the influence of the servant concept is wider than this and extends to the ministry of Jesus as a whole. The messianic activities of Jesus were those of the servant.

As Matthew, 8:17, 12, 17 to 21, correctly perceived. In our discussion, we've gone back behind Luke to the traditions which he inherited. The result has been to show that Luke took up a view of Jesus which saw him not merely as a prophet, but as the final prophet, the servant, and the Messiah.

This is a significance which is attached to the person of Jesus and it is of such a character that we are bound to conclude that in the view of Luke, the message of Jesus was very much concerned with his own person. It is true that while these titles are not applied to Jesus or applied only with restraint in the gospel, the activities associated with them are plainly present and have been shown to rest on tradition. In Acts, these hints could be made more precise.

The gospel, however, is sufficient to make it clear that Jesus is the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies, which, in varied terms, promised the coming of a savior. The kingdom of God in all three synoptic gospels, the evangelists state that the preaching of Jesus was primarily concerned with the kingdom of God. Although Luke does not have the summary of the preaching of Jesus contained in Mark, his general statements show that he shared this point of view.

Luke's presentation has subordinated the theme of the kingdom to that of the proclamation of good news, but the kingdom remains the subject of the good news. It is, therefore, important to determine the meaning of the concept in Luke. The main lines of the teaching of Jesus are not in doubt and can be briefly presented.

The term kingdom is used mainly of the action of God in intervening in human history to establish his rule. A number of texts show that Jesus regarded the end and the manifest coming of the kingdom as imminent. Another set of texts indicates that

Jesus saw his own ministry as a time of fulfillment with regard to the coming of the kingdom.

These texts imply that the kingdom had already come during the ministry of Jesus, and they draw the conclusion that Jesus spoke of explaining this polarity, that Jesus spoke both of the presence and the future coming of the kingdom. Conzelmann claimed that Luke's treatment of the theme of the kingdom regarded the kingdom as exclusively future and also as imminent. He then contends that Luke has modified the tradition, so the concept has become even more transcendental than that in the other gospels.

It has lost contact with history and has been shifted into the distant future. It is our contention that this is a misunderstanding of Luke's view. Conzelmann's mistake is that he failed to do justice to the teaching about the presence of the kingdom.

Which was already part of the tradition. Since Matthew and Luke agree in the words that they give, we may be certain that the kingdom is spoken of as a present entity. The evidence of these texts is sufficiently clear.

They're not awkward embarrassments to be explained away; rather they must be taken in conjunction with the sayings of Jesus, which speak in a more general way of the present as a time of fulfillment and with the actions which he regarded as signs of the present activity of God through the spirit. They demonstrate that for Jesus, the kingdom was already present in his ministry. The presence of the kingdom is then firmly rooted in the tradition.

But Conzelmann claims that for Luke, what belongs to the present time is not the kingdom itself but only the message of the kingdom. Howard Marshall disagrees with the Conzelmann, claiming that both the message and the kingdom are present. From this survey then of the kingdom text, it emerges that the presentation in Luke is not significantly different from that in the earlier tradition, where the presence and the eminence of the kingdom were both affirmed.

We must admit that the hope of the future coming of the kingdom is not at the center of Luke's thought, but he has certainly not given up the idea. Luke 11 2, Luke 22 29 and 30, Luke 23 42. Luke's emphasis is on the presence of the kingdom.

Through the preaching of Jesus, the power of the kingdom is manifested. This fits in with the Old Testament concept of God's word, which in itself is powerful and affects the will of God. One other point remains to be considered.

We've argued that Luke retains the idea of the eminence of the kingdom found in the tradition. But there's a strong objection to this view, namely that the other eschatological teaching in Luke implies that the events associated with the coming of

the kingdom have been pushed away into the indefinite future. Although Luke has retained the traditional terminology about the coming of the kingdom, he has in fact given up the idea.

In our view, this objection represents an exaggeration of the situation. In the first place, despite the way in which Luke has ordered the material in chapter 21, the fall of Jerusalem is still regarded as an eschatological event. It retains its character as an event associated with the end.

In Mark, it's described as the desolating sacrilege and it's followed by cosmic signs and then by the coming of the son of man. In Luke, the pattern is retained. The Old Testament coloring of the language is more pronounced, thus stressing the note of fulfillment and the cosmic signs in the parousia follow as in Mark.

In both Gospels, the fall of Jerusalem is included among all the things that must take place. At the same time, the fall is part of the historical development which leads up to the parousia. But this is already the case in Mark, as has been demonstrated by E. Earl Ellis, who rightly claims that Luke is not here historicizing Mark.

Second, the Lukan stress on an interval before the parousia should not be exaggerated. We should not read too much into the phrase, but the end will not be at once, in Luke 21:9. It is Luke's equivalent for Mark's, but the end is not yet, Mark 13:7. And the change is simply stylistic. The reference to the enigmatic times of the Gentiles shows that an interval after the fall of Jerusalem is in mind.

Yet, in essence, Luke has not moved beyond Mark. Ellis has argued cogently that the generation in Mark 13:10 and Luke 21:32 is the last generation, a phrase that may cover several lifetimes. The point of the saying is to assure the hearers that they are part of the last generation and that, therefore, the eschatological events are already taking place.

Consequently, the period of expectation of the parousia is not delimited in Mark, for example, to a period of one generation, any more than it is in Luke. Mark says nothing about how near the end is. The accent is on its sudden, unexpected coming, Mark 13:36, a point that is still true for Mark's readers, Mark 13:37. In fact, Mark makes it clear that a number of events must take place before the final denouement.

The fact that there is an interval before the end, that the end is imminent rather than immediate, does not mean that the end has been deferred so far into the distant future as to lose its relevance for the disciples. Luke has preserved a considerable number of sayings in which blessings and woes associated with the end are significant for the contemporaries of Jesus. We may briefly refer to the beatitudes and woes in the Sermon on the Plain, Luke 6:20 through 26, the sayings about the future coming of the Son of Man, Luke 9:26, 12:8, and 9, and verse 40, Luke 18:8, the

warnings about future judgment, Luke 11:29 to 32, and the sayings about admission to and exclusion from the kingdom, Luke 13:25 and 30, 14:14, 15 to 24, 16:9, and 18, 24.

The end is thus relevant for the life of people now. They must not grow slack in waiting for its coming. Luke 18:8, an exhortation which is not to be explained as a late community formation occasioned by the delay of the parousia, but which is authentic teaching of Jesus who himself expected an interval before the end.

The disciples are to govern their behavior in the light of the hope of the coming of the Son of Man. Naturally, this does not mean that they will be motivated simply by the hope of heavenly blessing or the fear of future woe or that the imminence of the end is what basically animates their conduct. It is not the nearness of a crisis which animates New Testament ethics, but the character of God.

We may briefly draw together the results of this section. It has emerged that in the gospel of Luke, the teaching of Jesus regarding the presence and the future of the kingdom is faithfully reproduced. While Luke retains the hope of the future coming of the kingdom, he also stresses the presence of the kingdom as a reality in the ministry of Jesus.

Thus ends our lectures on the theology of the gospel of Mark. In our next lecture, we will begin talking about the theology of the Acts of the Apostles.

This is Dr. Robert A. Peterson and his teaching on the theology of Luke-Acts. This is session 10. I, Howard Marshall, The Promised Savior and The Kingdom of God.