

Luke/Acts and the End of History



**Kylie Crabbe
Keble College
University of Oxford**

Thesis and abstracts submitted in the
Faculty of Theology and Religion
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term 2016

Short abstract

Luke/Acts and the End of History

Kylie Crabbe

Keble College, University of Oxford

Submitted in the Faculty of Theology and Religion

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity term 2016

This thesis investigates how understandings of history in diverse texts of the Graeco-Roman period illuminate Lukan eschatology. Two strands of Lukan scholarship have contributed to an enduring tendency to underestimate the centrality of eschatology to Luke/Acts. Hans Conzelmann's thesis, that Luke focused on history rather than eschatology as a response to the parousia's delay, has dominated Lukan scholarship since the mid-twentieth century, with concomitant assumptions about Luke's politics and understanding of suffering. Recent Lukan scholarship has centred instead on genre and rhetoric, examining Luke/Acts predominantly in relation to ancient texts deemed the same genre while overlooking themes (including those of an eschatological character) that these texts do not share.

This thesis offers a fresh approach. It illuminates the inherent connections between Luke's understanding of history and its end, and demonstrates significant ways in which Luke's eschatological consciousness shapes key themes of his account. By extending comparisons to a wider range of texts, this study overcomes two clear methodological shortfalls in current research: limiting comparisons of key themes to texts of similar genre, and separating non-Jewish from Jewish texts. Having established the need for a new examination of Luke's eschatology in Chapter 1, in Chapter 2 I set out the study's method of comparing diverse texts on themes that cut across genres. Chapters 3 to 6 then consider each key text and Luke/Acts in relation to a different aspect of their writers' conceptions of history: the direction and shape of history; determinism and divine guidance; human culpability and freedom; and the present and the end of history. The analysis shows that in every aspect of history examined, Luke/Acts shares significant features of the texts with which, because they do not share its genre, it is not normally compared. Setting Luke/Acts in conversation with a broader range of texts highlights Luke's periodised, teleological view of history and provides a nuanced picture of Luke's understanding of divine and human agency, all of which is affected in fundamental ways by his portrayal of the present time already within the final period of history. As a result, this study not only clarifies Lukan eschatology, but reaffirms the importance of eschatology for Lukan politics and theodicy.

Long abstract

Luke/Acts and the End of History

Kylie Crabbe

Keble College, University of Oxford

Submitted in the Faculty of Theology and Religion

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity term 2016

This thesis investigates how understandings of history in diverse texts of the Graeco-Roman period illuminate Lukan eschatology. It makes a contribution both in its method and in the questions it asks. By placing Luke/Acts alongside a broad range of texts from Luke's wider cultural setting, this study overcomes two clear methodological shortfalls in current research: limiting comparisons of key themes to texts of similar genre, and separating non-Jewish from Jewish parallels. Further, by posing fresh questions designed to reveal writers' underlying conceptions of history—such as beliefs about the shape and end of history or divine and human agency in history—this discussion moves beyond the current rather narrow focus on *historiography* and illuminates Luke's underlying teleological conception of *history*. The resultant insight into history in Luke/Acts clarifies not only Lukan eschatology, but related concerns or *effects* of his eschatology: Luke's politics and approach to suffering.

Treatments of history in Luke/Acts have been dominated by Hans Conzelmann's (1954) thesis that Luke removed eschatological expectations from his account due to concern at the parousia's delay and focused instead on salvation history. This influential premise connected to other mid-twentieth-century scholarship which placed biblical writers within a presumed trajectory towards *Frühkatholizismus*. Drawing polemical contrasts between Paul and Luke, and accentuating Luke's differences from the Synoptics, these studies portrayed Luke as distinctively uneschatological within the NT. These views about Luke's separation of history from eschatology led to further assumptions: that Luke's politics advocate complicity with Rome and that he emphasises *theologia gloriae* at the expense of *theologia crucis*. The basic tenets of Conzelmann's view have been challenged from a number of angles, such as Robert Maddox's thorough redaction-critical reappraisal of Conzelmann's exegesis in Luke. However, the understanding that eschatology "is not a prominent topic in Acts" (Pervo 2009:25) remains surprisingly enduring.

Oscar Cullman, an interlocutor contemporaneous with Conzelmann, offers a quite different perspective. Cullmann claimed that New Testament texts present a linear schema of history in which human history exists in continuity with the events of the end, and that

the entire schema is characterised by God's decisive action in Jesus' death and resurrection at its midpoint. His critical engagement with Conzelmann led Cullmann to focus on Luke/Acts, yet his analysis was offered largely without reference to non-biblical texts. However, Cullmann is rarely cited in recent studies, which, while frequently presuming Conzelmann's premise, have moved away from these more theological or philosophical questions of the nature of history.

Much recent Lukan scholarship has centred instead on the genre(s) of Luke/Acts (or Luke and Acts separately). Numerous studies have focused on assessing the genre(s) of the Lukan writings, such as Richard Pervo (1987), Gregory Sterling (1991), Hubert Cancik (1997), Doo-Hee Lee (2013), and Sean Adams (2013). Building on the conclusions of such studies, further works address other interpretative questions through the lens of a particular ancient genre. Here scholars move from appreciating the importance of genre for correctly interpreting texts, to limiting discussion of other themes—including Luke's theology—to a set of texts *determined by genre*. For instance, theological themes are addressed in various ways through comparing Luke/Acts to Hellenistic historiographies in studies by John Squires (1993), Clare Rothschild (1997), and Scott Shauf (2015). These approaches have also resulted in a separation of non-Jewish from Jewish texts. Todd Penner's 2004 analysis of studies in Acts over the previous fifteen years observes that studies compared Acts to Jewish texts when addressing theological questions and non-Jewish texts for rhetorical matters. Although some more recent studies have incorporated Jewish historiographies, such as Samson Uytanlet (2014), the continued dominance of genre studies has generally confirmed the prominence of non-Jewish Graeco-Roman texts in Lukan studies. Moreover, particularly through the emphasis on rhetoric, Graeco-Roman texts have also become the focus of studies of theological themes within Luke/Acts.

However, although an awareness of the rhetorical features of its genre will be important for correctly interpreting any given text, this study suggests that ancient texts of all genres are shaped by their writers' underlying conceptions of history. A text does not need to be 'historiography' in order to be shaped by assumptions, for instance, about the purpose, direction, or end of history, nor to be influenced by beliefs about divine involvement in (or absence from) that process. This is true even where a writer harnesses particular rhetorical devices of a chosen genre *in order to communicate* these views. A writer who presents human history as a divinely orchestrated, linear progression to the final pinnacle of history identified with the current political regime reflects radically different politics to another, who envisages an unending pattern of rising and falling regimes, each replaced in turn by the next, or a third writer, who sees history in steep decline, approaching an imminent nadir at which God will finally intervene to make things right for all time. Likewise will they differ in their theologies and their explanations of present suffering. All of this variety is reflected in texts of the Graeco-Roman period, providing illuminating dialogue with biblical texts such as Luke/Acts.

Further, this thesis demonstrates that those texts with which Luke/Acts shares greatest *generic* similarity are not always those most closely aligned with Luke's conception of history. Tying the conversation to historiographies, or biographies, has limited discussion of some key features of Luke's text relevant to traditional debates in Lukan studies, such as the impact of Luke's eschatology on his presentation of human history. Interestingly, C. Kavin Rowe identifies Luke as "apocalyptic" (Rowe 2009:137), which could suggest some important further conversation partners for Luke/Acts, though Rowe makes this claim without reference to any apocalypses.

Therefore, this thesis seeks to illuminate Lukan eschatology by considering the conception of history in Luke/Acts alongside a wide range of texts of the Graeco-Roman period, including Greek and Latin historiography, Latin epic, Jewish Hellenistic historiography, and Jewish apocalypses. In doing so, it builds upon Cullmann's insights about the inherent connection between history and eschatology in teleological understandings of history, by expanding the focus to texts beyond the NT. And it responds to Penner's criticism, by incorporating both Jewish and non-Jewish texts. Despite the number of studies that have dealt with history and Luke/Acts previously, I am not aware of any that has offered a systematic treatment of these questions among a fuller spectrum of the texts from Luke's setting.

After setting out, in Chapter 1, previous treatments of history and eschatology in Luke/Acts and the relevant questions that have not yet been adequately addressed, in Chapter 2 I describe the current study's approach. Clarifying the importance and limits of genre, I illustrate that conceptions of history transcend genre. I argue that the possibility of shared views about topics like divine and human agency in history, or expectations about the end of history, in texts of different genres justifies—or, indeed, *necessitates*—the cross-genre comparisons in this study. I then describe key elements of the study's approach, namely (1) selecting texts based not on claims to literary dependence but on their contribution to mapping out the range of concepts writers employ in this period, (2) using these texts to build detailed case studies for comparison, and (3) incorporating an expanded set of relevant texts, including Greek, Latin, and Jewish texts, spanning from the second century BCE to the second century CE. I introduce each of the ten texts treated in detail throughout the thesis (five non-Jewish texts and five Jewish texts). These texts are: Polybius's *Histories*, Diodorus Siculus's *Library of History*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Valerius Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, Tacitus's *Histories*, 2 Maccabees, the Qumran War Scroll, Josephus's *Jewish War*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch.

Chapters 3 to 6 then consider each key text and Luke/Acts in relation to a different aspect of their writers' conceptions of history. Chapter 3 asks: how do the direction and shape of history in these texts illuminate the schema of history in Luke/Acts? I note that in the vast

majority of texts, the writers present history as periodised—that is, comprised of ages or epochs, and that Virgil’s *Aeneid* and the Jewish texts portray history as teleological—that is, history follows a linear shape that draws to some sort of culmination at its end. Concluding that these are the texts to which Luke’s periodised and teleological conception of history is most similar, I note that Luke/Acts differs strongly from most of the texts with which it shares generic features, and thus those with which it is most likely to be compared in current scholarship.

In Chapter 4, I analyse evidence of the writers’ beliefs about determinism and divine guidance of history. The texts treated reveal diverse views: determinism can confirm hope (the promised end to present suffering is assured, as also the events of the past took place as predicted), endorse existing authorities, or underscore the futility of human resistance. Moreover, in some texts divine personal or impersonal forces drive the course of history as part of a larger plan, in others they simply react in the moment. Again, Luke displays strikingly little use of the characteristic language or concepts employed by Graeco-Roman writers in how he portrays divine guidance of history (even in comparison to Josephus). Moreover, Luke’s understanding of divine guidance is shaped in significant ways by his claims about the end of history: for Luke, divine action is not merely a form of moral accountability or way of explaining unpredictable changes of fortune in human experience, but the basis for assurance about the end. Divine guidance over the whole course of history and its end remains central to the assurance Luke provides: the βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ can be opposed, but it cannot be stopped.

Chapter 5 considers how the writers portray interactions between divine and human agency, in order to illuminate the ways Luke/Acts apportions *human* responsibility—both for the events of the past and for action in the present and future. Through analysing treatments of ‘opponents,’ I demonstrate that temporal concerns draw out apparent inconsistencies—that is, in many of the comparison texts, explanations of the negative events of the past tend to centre on human culpability, while prospective reflections affirm divine sovereignty as assurance for the future. However, in contrast to the writers of apocalypses and texts governed by Deuteronomistic theology, Luke explains negative events in the past as the result of tragic opposition, maintaining a notable appreciation for human freedom in both past and present. In this respect, some non-Jewish writers may offer an interesting parallel, such as Diodorus Siculus’s understanding of human contributions to divine providence. When Luke looks to the future, an (urgent) universal invitation confirms the human freedom for all to respond positively in the present—though, as in Jewish texts such as 4 Ezra, repentance itself is also portrayed as a divine gift.

Finally, Chapter 6 examines characterisations of the present and the end of history, and the relationship between the two. Luke not only reflects similarities to the writers of contemporaneous Jewish texts in his understanding of the shape of history (as argued in

Chapter 3), but also in the way he draws on past events to provide assurance of God's faithful action in the future. However, for Luke, the key event of the past—namely Jesus' resurrection—constitutes a unique and decisive transition to the final period of history. Luke's understanding of the relationship between the end of history and the present thus shares features with Virgil's *Aeneid*. Nonetheless, whereas Virgil collapses the present and the end into a static continuity in which there is no hope for future change, for Luke the remaining events of the end, expected imminently, retain an important dynamic tension in the present. I argue that both the *placement of the end of history in relation to the present* and the *character of the present* crucially affect the ways in which the writers portray hope, suffering, and political structures, revealing important differences in the ways eschatology functions in each of *Aeneid* and Luke/Acts.

In Chapter 7, in addition to summarising the study's findings, I assess the methodology and consider further implications for understandings of history and eschatology in texts across the NT. I maintain that the cross-genre methodology has been effective in comparing aspects of the writers' understandings of history—that is, particular features of these texts that transcend genre. And I observe that in each aspect of history discussed, Luke/Acts shares significant features with the texts of different genres with which it is rarely compared. Luke's periodised, teleological understanding of history demonstrates important similarities with the late Second Temple Jewish texts, though his understanding of the position of the present as already within the final period of history also draws out significant differences. Likewise, Luke's portrayal of divine and human agency demonstrates important similarities and differences to the other texts of this study. In each of these areas, Luke's understanding of the end of history plays a key and shaping role, as he explains past experience, provides assurance for the future, and exhorts appropriate human response in the present.

I conclude that Luke's understanding of the end, far from being severed from his understanding of history, is integral to each of the other features of history examined in this thesis. In each of these areas, Luke's eschatological consciousness shapes his text in crucial ways: divine faithfulness in the past confirms that divine guidance governs all of history, including its end, even as the unstoppable divine βουλή adapts to the tragic consequences of opposition. Contrary to Conzelmann's reading, in which the end has become so distant as to be irrelevant, Luke's periodised, teleological view of history is able to hold history and eschatology together, balancing what Luke considers to be the cataclysmic change brought about by God's action in raising Jesus from the dead with a sense of continuity, rather than rupture, across the full sweep of history. Luke's attention to the end provides assurance of the culmination of faithful divine action and underscores the urgency of human response. To Luke, from his perspective within the final period of history, it is clear that divine action toward the culmination of history has already begun.

Thus the study makes a scholarly contribution through its method of comparing diverse texts and by its new insights about the significance of Lukan eschatology. From the diverse connections between Luke/Acts and the range of other texts discussed emerges a nuanced picture of history that underscores the eschatological consciousness of Luke/Acts, and reaffirms the importance of eschatology for Lukan politics and theodicy.

Table of Contents

<i>Short abstract</i>	i
<i>Long abstract</i>	iii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiv
<i>Translations</i>	xv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1. A note on nomenclature	3
2. Hans Conzelmann and post-war debates about uneschatological Luke	4
2.1 The reception of Conzelmann's work	7
2.2 Oscar Cullmann and a linear schema of history and its end	10
3. Genre, rhetoric, and Graeco-Roman comparisons	14
4. This study	18
Chapter 2: Genre, shared worlds, and the approach of this study	22
1. The importance and limits of genre	23
1.1 Ancient and contemporary genre theory and practice	24
1.2 Maintaining precision regarding genre	30
1.3 Shared 'worlds' across ancient texts of different genres	32
2. This study's approach to examining Luke's conception of history	34
2.1 Mapping understandings of history in Luke's context	35
2.2 Building a series of detailed case studies	36
2.3 Expanding the scope of texts relevant to Luke's cultural context	38
3. The case study texts	40
3.1 Texts chosen for analysis	41
3.2 Texts omitted from detailed discussion	53
3.3 General approach to Luke/Acts	56
4. The aspects of history discussed in the following chapters	58
Chapter 3: The direction and shape of history	60
1. Introduction: the importance of schemas of history	60
2. Texts without a sense of an endpoint to history	66

2.1 Hints of positive progress in history	67
2.2 Steady continuation of history	77
2.3 Decline in history	81
3. Periodised history with an end.....	87
3.1 Progress to the end of history	88
3.2 Steady continuation of history with an end.....	95
3.3 Decline in teleological history	111
4. Periodised and teleological history in Luke/Acts.....	119
4.1 Teleological history in Luke/Acts	121
4.2 Times and periods in Luke/Acts	124
4.3 The direction of history in Luke/Acts	133
5. Conclusion.....	134
Chapter 4: Determinism and divine guidance of history.....	137
1. Introduction	137
2. The forces in history	141
2.1 τύχη/ <i>fortuna</i>	142
2.2 πρόνοια/ <i>providentia</i>	150
2.3 εἰμαρμένη/ <i>fatum</i>	154
2.4 ἀνάγκη/ <i>necessitas</i>	160
2.5 δεῖ.....	164
2.6 Summary: personal and impersonal forces in history.....	173
3. Prophetic insights into the future	174
3.1 Prophetic insights according to Polybius, Diodorus, Valerius, and Tacitus	175
3.2 Prophecy in Virgil's <i>Aeneid</i>	180
3.3 Prophecy, determinism, and divine guidance in the study's Jewish texts.....	182
3.4 Summary: Prophetic signs and determinism.....	192
4 Prophetic insight and the divine plan in Luke/Acts	193
4.1 Prophecy in Luke/Acts: interpreting the past and assuring for the future	194
4.2 Assurance of the divine βουλή in Luke/Acts	201
5. Conclusion.....	210
Chapter 5: Human culpability and freedom	213
1. Introduction: interactions of divine and human agency	213
2. Divine and human responsibility in Jewish texts	222
2.1 Deuteronomistic approaches.....	222

2.2 Extensions of Deuteronomistic themes in late Second Temple texts.....	227
2.3 Other spiritual forces in late Second Temple texts	240
2.4 Θεομάχοι in Jewish texts.....	243
3. Divine and human responsibility in non-Jewish texts	247
3.1 Graeco-Roman treatments of human culpability and divine action	247
3.2 The divine <i>as</i> the opponent in Graeco-Roman texts	252
4. Summary: divine and human agency in the key texts	254
5. Interactions between divine and human agency in Luke/Acts	255
5.1 The role of culpability in explanations of the past.....	256
5.2 Θεομάχοι in Luke/Acts	259
5.3 Human response and reversal in Luke/Acts.....	265
6. Conclusion: Human response in Luke/Acts.....	276
Chapter 6: The present and the end of history.....	278
1. Introduction	278
2. The present and the future in non-teleological texts.....	284
3. The historical present is the <i>telos</i>: Virgil's <i>Aeneid</i>	289
3.1 Virgil's portrait of the end	290
3.2 The significance of the 'now' in <i>Aeneid</i>	292
3.3 The consequences of aligning the present with the end.....	297
4. The present and the end of history in late Second Temple texts	299
4.1 The relationship between the present and the end	300
4.2 Consequences of the dynamic relationship between the present and the end.....	317
5. The present and the end of history in Luke/Acts.....	324
5.1 The events of the end in Luke/Acts.....	326
5.2 The placement of the present in Luke's schema of history.....	328
5.3 The character of life in the present according to Luke	335
6. Conclusion: hope, politics, and invitation at the end of history	345
Chapter 7: Conclusion	354
Luke's eschatology and its effects	355
Assessment of method	360
Salvation history and post-war concerns.....	364
Bibliography	368

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the product of the support and care of a great number of people, to whom I owe much more than these notes of thanks can say.

To my doctoral supervisors, Christopher Rowland and Markus Bockmuehl, I owe a great debt of thanks. They have been ideal supervisors, excellent individually and formidable in combination. Chris is prone to sending detailed emails on something I'd assumed was peripheral but turns out to be exactly on point and, alongside Markus's insightful suggestions for further reading, Markus's eagle eye saved me from many an unfortunate slip. I continue to be grateful for the series of conversations through my first year with Chris, and then also with Markus, which shaped my thinking and research. They both have a deep familiarity with an extraordinary range of primary texts, from which I have benefited greatly, and conversations with them helped me to identify the scholarly patterns and assumptions that lay behind so much of what I was wanting to tackle and question about Luke/Acts. I'm likewise appreciative of Markus's work with me in the years following Chris's retirement, for his absolute commitment to supporting my professional development as well as my doctoral project, and for his kindness.

Given the breadth of my project, I have shamelessly enlisted the expertise of scholars from diverse areas, and I am very grateful for the good humour and excellent advice particularly of Barnaby Taylor, Tristan Franklino, and Tessa Rajak. Loren Stuckenbruck offered enthusiastic support of my project and a prepublication copy of his recent work on time in Second Temple Judaism and the New Testament, Michael Wolter provided detailed feedback on one of my papers related to material in Chapters 4 and 5, and John Barclay made available an advance copy of material on 4 Ezra in his *Paul and the Gift*. I'm also much obliged to the classicists who welcomed me into the Princeton-Oxford Classics conference and gave me helpful feedback, as well as to the communities of biblical scholars who gave me feedback on papers related to parts of this work, including the British New Testament Society Acts session, the Society of Biblical Literature Acts session, and the New Testament graduate and senior seminars at Oxford.

I'm grateful to my examiners, Loveday Alexander and Teresa Morgan, as well as to those who have given feedback on my developing doctoral project at the earlier internal stages of assessment: David Lincicum, Mary Marshall, and Christopher Tuckett. To my amazing team of proofreaders I credit an examiner's comment that the thesis was "a very clean manuscript," with thanks going to the marvellous Nicholas Moore (who read and commented on a considerable proportion of this manuscript), as well as Christine Joynes, Jenny Crane, Sarah Leeser, Roosmarijn de Geus, Sarah Apetrei, and Sam Kiss.

While working on my doctorate I have been the grateful recipient of generous financial support from the Clarendon Fund, the Sloane-Robinson Graduate Scholarship, the Keble Association, the Ivens-Franklin Travel Fund, Alan Stockbridge Award, Squire and Marriott Bursaries, Crewdson Trust, the Faculty of Theology and Religion Travel and Language Grants, and a bursary from Gladstone's library. Academic communities have supported me in manifold ways; I'm grateful for the friendship and support of the communities at Keble and Trinity Colleges, and the extraordinary hospitality of Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, who welcomed me into her research house in Wales for an intense week of writing.

Thanks are due to those who supported my academic work in earlier stages, particularly Brendan Byrne, who taught me to read Luke in new ways and supervised my Masters thesis, and Dorothy Lee, who taught me many things, not least the surprising reality that NT Greek reading could be a good class with which to ease back into study after a bereavement! And thanks to Sean Winter, who encouraged me to consider the outlandish possibility of undertaking doctoral work in the UK.

Finally, to the communities who have supported me through this time of doctoral work and the long road that led to it: thank you. For all those who have shared meals over the years, or sent and received tense messages over particularly frustrating chapters, discussed the frivolous and the divine, shared good cheer and profound grief, and politics and faith and theodicy—thank you, and may the conversation (and meals) continue! Whether in Oxford or in Melbourne I have been so fortunate to have extraordinary friends around me, and—conscious of the inadequacy of any list of names—I would like particularly to thank: Sam Kiss, Roosmarijn de Geus, Jenny Crane, Robbie Davies, David Bowkett, Ellie Healey, Liam Gannon, Alma Brodersen, Jennifer Strawbridge, Sarah Apetrei, Christine Joynes, Mary Marshall, Jonathan Downing, Donovan Schaefer, Megan Dent, Anik Laferriere, Sarah Leeser, Kirk Robson, Mavis Robson, Peter Robson, Nicole Batch, Joel Townsend, Annie Quail, Naomi Flanagan, Anita Major, Martin Wright, Sally Douglas, Andy Hamilton, Alistair Macrae, Clare Boyd-Macrae, and so many others I could name but “I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that would be written” if I were to do so. I will simply hope that you really do all know, whether named or not, what a very great deal you mean to me.

And it is with deep appreciation that I thank those to whom I dedicate this work: my parents, Merrilyn and Peter, and my sisters, Delia, Maree, and Narelle Crabbe. You have been there through thick and thin, and I'm so grateful.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used in this thesis are in keeping with *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. The following specifies abbreviations for items that this style guide does not include.

I use English titles for Classical texts, in keeping with the Loeb Classical Library.

Abbreviations for ancient sources:

Diodorus Siculus	<i>Library of History</i>	<i>Library</i>
Polybius	<i>The Histories</i>	<i>Polyb. Hist.</i>
Valerius Maximus	<i>Memorable Doings and Sayings</i>	<i>Doings</i>

Other abbreviations:

OED *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press.

Translations

Unless otherwise specified, the following translations have been used throughout the dissertation.

Loeb Classical Library editions have been used where relevant. This includes:

- Diodorus Siculus: Oldfather, C. H. 1933-1967. *Diodorus of Sicily: The Library of History*. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Josephus: Thackeray, H. St. J. 1926-1965. *Josephus*. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Polybius: Paton, W. R., F. A. Walbank, and Christian Habicht. 2010-2012. *Polybius: The Histories*. Revd ed. 6 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tacitus: Moore, Clifford H. and John Jackson. 1925-1937. *Tacitus: The Histories and The Annals*. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Valerius Maximus: Bailey, D. R. Shackleton. 2000. *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Virgil: Fairclough, H. R., and G. P. Goold. 1999-2000. *Virgil*. Revd ed. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

The New Revised Standard Version is used for biblical texts, including the key texts of the study:

2 Maccabees
4 Ezra
Luke/Acts

For the Dead Sea Scrolls:

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 1997. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

2 Baruch:

Klijn, A. F. j. 1983. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." Pages 615-652 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. vol 1. ABRL. New York: Doubleday.

Chapter 1: Introduction

“Everything began with history and eschatology.”¹ So François Bovon commences his authoritative summary of fifty-five years of Lukan studies. On the subsequent pages he evokes the tightly-wound series of problems through which interpreters have troubled over, and even reprimanded, Luke.² Bovon deftly captures a core issue: divergent views of Luke’s purpose and the major themes of his *Doppelwerk*, such as his portrayal of the plan of God, are bound up in assessments of Luke’s eschatological consciousness (or alleged lack thereof).³ In this thesis I argue that Luke’s eschatology—that is, his understanding of the end of history—is indeed central to this whole suite of issues, as Luke explains the past, offers assurance for the future, and exhorts appropriate human response in the present. Furthermore, by setting Luke/Acts⁴ alongside a broad range of ancient sources, I demonstrate that separating history from eschatology in Luke/Acts is a false distinction.

Two broad strands of Lukan scholarship have contributed to common misrepresentations of Lukan eschatology. Influential mid-twentieth-century scholarship placed Luke within a

¹ Bovon 2006:11. That these words appear under the heading “the Plan of God” is also pertinent.

² The title of Kümmel’s article, “Current Theological Accusations against Luke,” exemplifies this attitude towards Luke (Kümmel 1975a).

³ Bovon describes conflicting assessments, according to which Luke suggests humans are left to their own devices by an absent (ascended) Christ, or portrays people as “puppets” to an all-encompassing divine plan (Bovon 2006:12).

⁴ On my use of Luke/Acts, rather than Luke-Acts, see below p.57.

presumed trajectory of decreasing eschatological interest and increasing focus on the day-to-day matters of the church over the generations following the first disciples.⁵ Drawing on polemical contrasts between Paul and Luke and accentuating Synoptic differences, these studies portrayed Luke as distinctively uneschatological within the NT.⁶ More recent studies have particularly considered the *genre* of Luke/Acts instead, tending to emphasise certain similarities to Graeco-Roman texts, while overlooking themes (such as those of an eschatological character) that these texts do not share.⁷ In different ways, each of these two strands has influenced an enduring tendency to underestimate the centrality of eschatology for understanding Luke/Acts.

Expanding the range of ancient sources suitable for pertinent comparison, this thesis investigates how understandings of history in the Graeco-Roman period illuminate Lukan eschatology. The analysis underscores Luke's periodised and teleological schema of history, the important continuities and differences in Luke's portrayal of divine and human agency in history, and how all of these features are shaped by Luke's understanding of the relationship between the end of history and the present time. I argue that the resultant insight into history in Luke/Acts clarifies not only Lukan eschatology, but related concerns or *effects* of his eschatology: Luke's politics and approach to suffering.

⁵ Although avoiding the label *Frühkatholizismus*, Conzelmann even uses his assessment of Luke's position on this trajectory to date Luke/Acts (Conzelmann 1966:302-7).

⁶ See §1 below.

⁷ See §2 below.

1. A note on nomenclature

Throughout this thesis I use ‘history’ in its philosophical sense to denote understandings of the whole “course of human affairs,”⁸ also encompassing elements of a writer’s understanding of history that may extend beyond affairs in which humans are involved. A schema of history can include a conception not only of the beginning and the end of history, but also, for instance, events *beyond* the end of history. Additionally, throughout the thesis I reserve the term ‘historiography’ for a literary genre of texts that give an account of events.⁹ This definition does not challenge the legitimacy of the other dictionary meanings for ‘historiography’ (in addition to “written history” the *OED* includes “the writing of history” and “the study of history-writing”).¹⁰ Neither does my limited use of ‘history’ undermine other meanings of the term. I am simply attempting a measure of clarity in a thesis that will make considerable use of so many related terms by excluding these other meanings from the present discussion.

⁸ *OED* definition II 7b.

⁹ On definitions of literary genre, see Chapter 2.

¹⁰ *OED* definitions 1 and 2.

2. Hans Conzelmann and post-war debates about uneschatological Luke

Shortly following the Second World War, in which he himself was injured, Hans Conzelmann (1915-1989) completed a doctorate which would profoundly shape the conversation within, and assumptions of, Lukan studies.¹¹ On Conzelmann's account, Luke responded to a crisis caused by the parousia's delay by distancing his narrative from imminent eschatological expectation and focusing instead on the time of the early church as a new salvation-historical period. For Conzelmann, this separation of history from eschatology reflected the Evangelist's distortion of the primitive kerygma.¹² Concomitantly, he posited that the shift had steered Luke's politics and understanding of suffering.¹³

¹¹ *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. Conzelmann's doctorate was completed in 1951, first published in 1954 (English: *The Theology of St Luke*, 1960). See also Conzelmann 1952, which introduced key themes.

¹² Disdain for Luke's perceived compromise of the radical message of the early discipleship movement is shared by numerous contemporaneous scholars, including Vielhauer 1950-1951:15-16; Bultmann 1952-1955:2.116-18; Bultmann 1957:38-39; Käsemann 1954:136-38, 141; Käsemann 1957:20-21; Grässer 1979:125-27; Haenchen 1971:116; Klein 1964:214-15; and Drury 1976:12. Bultmann judges that Luke represents a developing "Christian-bourgeois piety" (Bultmann 1952-1955:2.114; cf. Drury 1976:10). Conzelmann notes the importance of comparison with the Pastoral epistles (Conzelmann 1966:303).

¹³ Conzelmann considers the role of salvation history in Luke's "political apologetic" towards Rome (Conzelmann 1960:137-49) and, although attributing the change to one of "unconscious modification rather than of conscious alteration (*unbewußte Erweichung als eine bewußte Gestaltung*)," he interprets, for instance, $\theta\lambda\iota\psi\iota\varsigma$ in Luke/Acts, as an uneschatological and extended experience of suffering for believers, rather than the sign of the end as in Matthew and Mark (pp.98-99; 3rd German edition p.89). Throughout, life in this extended period is explained by a divine plan to history—even the suffering which Conzelmann attributes to necessity through his interpretation of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\eta$ (p.98). Barrett notes precursors to the view that Luke does not feature *theologia crucis* (Barrett 1979:73-75), though concludes himself that Luke does not engage with such themes particularly theologically (p.84).

The claims put forward in *Die Mitte der Zeit* were not new in every respect.¹⁴ Scholars such as Albert Schweitzer¹⁵ and Conzelmann's *Doktorvater*, Rudolf Bultmann,¹⁶ had already advanced theories about the delayed parousia and its consequences for early Christian communities and NT texts. Likewise, as Conzelmann theorised about Luke's reasons for focusing on a historical account (especially in narrating the life of the early church in Acts), he cited Philipp Vielhauer's earlier argument.¹⁷ But Conzelmann was responsible for at least two significant developments. Giving prominence to his new redaction-critical method, he claimed to have demonstrated Luke's systematic tendency to remove expectation of the imminent parousia from his sources.¹⁸ And he developed a detailed

¹⁴ This study only considers Conzelmann and his reception in order to highlight the initial debate and the assumptions which endure in contemporary commentaries and studies. For detailed accounts of this period of scholarship, see Bovon 2006:11-85; Green and McKeever 1994:35-45, 71-78; Maddox 1982:100-102; Carroll 1988:1-30; Shauf 2005:4-84. Note, however, that each of these remains shaped by its own frameworks—for instance, even Bovon's magisterial annotated bibliography criticises studies that do not have a strong redaction-critical focus and maintains that Luke anticipated an extended delay of the parousia.

¹⁵ Schweitzer 1910:358; Schweitzer 1931:334-39.

¹⁶ Bultmann 1952-1955:2.111-18.

¹⁷ In an early footnote, Conzelmann cites Vielhauer appreciatively: "How uneschatological Luke's thinking is is proved not only by the contents, but by the very fact of the Acts of the Apostles" (Conzelmann 1960:14n.1; Vielhauer 1950-1951 ET:15). See also Käsemann 1957:20-21; Bultmann 1952-1955:2.117; Schulz 1967:293; Haenchen 1971:94. Comparisons of Luke and Paul go back to Baur (see discussion in Haenchen 1971:16-17) and are already embedded in these treatments, cf. Vielhauer 1950-1951:14-17; Wilckens 1966:67-69; Conzelmann 1966:307-9. They also feature in later work (Green 1995:126-27). Bultmann distinguishes between Luke and the other synoptic evangelists, whom he describes as "preachers and teachers" in their presentation of the good news, while Luke is a "historian" (Bultmann 1957:38).

¹⁸ Conzelmann reverses Bultmann's interest in peeling back the Evangelists' additions to reveal the historical Jesus, instead accenting *alterations* to highlight Luke's beliefs (Talbert 2007:325).

account of Luke's schema of salvation history, which he identified as Luke's 'solution' to this delay:¹⁹

If Luke has definitely abandoned belief in the early expectation, what does he offer on the positive side as an adequate solution of the problem? An outline of the successive stages in redemptive history (*der gegliederten Kontinuität der Heilsgeschichte*) according to God's plan.²⁰

Conzelmann rightly identified the importance of both periodisation and the divine plan to Luke's understanding of history. However, in light of his assumptions about Luke's situation and his negative assessment of what he perceived to be Luke's project, he overlooked continuities between Luke's understanding of history and other contemporaneous texts,²¹ with serious ramifications for his influential representation of Lukan eschatology and its effects. For instance, Conzelmann took periodisation to be a characteristically Lukan modification, whereas this feature is shared by texts from Jewish apocalypses to Diodorus's historiography.²² Moreover, historical apocalypses demonstrate that expectations of an imminent end are not mutually exclusive with a periodised schema

¹⁹ Conzelmann proposes a three-fold structure of history (the times of Israel, Jesus, and the church), arguing Luke has moved the time of Jesus from the end of history to "*die Mitte*." He further divides Jesus' life into three periods (Conzelmann 1960:17). This aspect of Conzelmann's theory has not endured (Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.183); it conflates Luke's narrative structure with salvation-historical periodisation.

²⁰ Conzelmann 1960:135 (3rd German edition, 1960:127).

²¹ Conzelmann also overlooked key sections of Luke/Acts. While centring his thesis on texts such as Lk 16.16, he excluded the infancy narratives from discussion, which later studies have emphasised as central to any interpretation of key themes in Luke/Acts (Minear 1966:118-25; Talbert 1976:385; Fitzmyer 1981-1985:184).

²² See Chapter 3.

of history overseen by a divine plan. When Luke's portrayal of history is placed within a broader context, I suggest, a quite different view of Lukan eschatology emerges.

2.1 The reception of Conzelmann's work

The significance of Conzelmann's contribution was immediately recognised, though his work was not received uncritically. Henry Cadbury referenced pre-publication summaries from Conzelmann in support of his delayed parousia hypothesis,²³ and C.H. Dodd purportedly commented that, "I suspect we shall have to give (the Lukan writings) over, so to speak, to Conzelmann."²⁴ Several studies built on Conzelmann's methodology and findings. For instance, Grässer extended the approach into a more detailed assessment of Acts as well as Mark and Matthew²⁵ and Klein applied Conzelmann's model to Luke's prefaces.²⁶ Käsemann embraced the salvation-historical framework with some venom at Luke's endeavour and employed labels that would become key criticisms: Luke was a representative of *Frühkatholizismus* and proponent of *theologia gloriae*.²⁷

²³ Cadbury 1956:320. Cadbury later revises his view to focus on the salvific nature of events already realised in Luke's narrative (see Maddox, who also shares this view of Lukan eschatology, Maddox 1982:145n.4; cf. pp.116-17).

²⁴ Talbert 1976:383-84. See also Sparks 1963:454.

²⁵ Grässer 1979:99-127.

²⁶ Klein 1964:183-216. See also Schulz 1967:275-6. Schulz adds that Luke's divine plan reflects Graeco-Roman understandings of εἰμαρμένη/*fatum*; few contemporaneous studies relate to this literature (Schulz 1963:108-9). See my Chapter 4 below.

²⁷ Käsemann 1954:143; Käsemann 1957:21.

Not all scholars who supported Conzelmann's conclusions, however, took as negative a view as the Bultmann school. Wilckens affirmed the framework of salvation history, relegation of imminent eschatological expectation, and the assessment that Luke was early catholic, without judging any of these features to be negative²⁸—a position with which many contemporary treatments of Lukan eschatology show considerable sympathy.²⁹

Numerous studies accepted the broad strokes of Conzelmann's historical schema, but suggested amendments to particular elements.³⁰ For writers like E. Earle Ellis, Luke's account reflects a balance between *both* the imminent and future aspects of eschatology, as Luke seeks to counter not the crisis of the parousia's delay, but the problem of disciples who were *too* focused on apocalyptic expectation. In notable contrast to Conzelmann, Ellis emphasises a two-age schema of history, though he divides this timing into two further stages for Jesus and his followers. For Ellis, Luke's concern is correcting ethical practice,

²⁸ Wilckens 1966:66-67; cf. Kümmel 1975a:131-45. Wilckens also offers incisive assessments of the theological and ideological influences in the Bultmann school and in the legacy of Karl Barth, which contribute to the negative attitudes towards 'history' (as diametrically opposed, in the latter, to 'revelation'; pp.69-77). The social and intellectual context profoundly directed these attitudes in post-war NT scholarship. See my Chapter 7.

²⁹ See Bovon's appreciation for Wilckens's positive approach, in keeping with his broad affirmation of other elements such as the role of the delayed parousia for Luke (Bovon 2006, 39); elsewhere Bovon emphasises a two-fold division between the periods of promise and fulfilment, while still further dividing the period of the church (Bovon 2002-2013:1.10-11). See also Bock 2011:389-405; Drury 1976:9.

³⁰ For instance, some debated the exact points of transition between historical periods (Robinson 1960:27; Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.185-87).

hence Luke emphasises the unknown timing but instantaneous nature of the parousia *whenever* it arrives.³¹

Some studies responded to similar concerns about history as those evident in Conzelmann's work, but attempted to defend Luke from the Bultmann school's criticisms by focusing on spatial rather than temporal considerations. Helmut Flender expresses a deep concern about "the false sacralisation of history," from which he distances Luke by emphasising the ascension, which in a sense he equates with the parousia.³² Keeping Jesus at one remove from the events of history, Flender points to a lordship that has already been inaugurated in the heavenly sphere and exists concurrently.³³ Conversely, writers like Talbert and Klein saw Luke's emphasis on grounding the story of Jesus in historical events and attending to the bodily realities of Jesus' resurrection as a response to Gnosticism.³⁴

³¹ Ellis 1972a:118; Ellis 1972c:146; Ellis 1974:49. See also Wilson 1970:336-47, and extended discussion of this double-edged perspective in Carroll 1988:13-16. Green likewise emphasises the ethical purpose to which Luke puts the extended present period (Green 1995:126-27). Tannehill emphasises expectations of suddenness, which may indicate suddenness at either the individual's death or the parousia (Tannehill 1986-1990:1.249).

³² Flender 1967:106, cf. 91-94, 139-40. Flender argues that Luke saw that he must keep history and eschatology separate, fighting a "danger of a confusion between salvation and history" (p.140).

³³ This is notwithstanding the deputising function Flender attributes to the Spirit during the time of the church (Flender 1967:145-46). See also Franklin 1970:191-200.

³⁴ For Talbert, Luke's point is to champion history over against myth, rather than history over eschatology (Talbert 1966:111-2). See also Barrett 1961:63-64; Kümmel 1975b:146-47, and the emphasis on salvation in Marshall 1970:20-24 (though Marshall argues against the view that Luke sought to counter Gnosticism, p.22).

Although interacting in different ways with the themes Conzelmann introduced, by and large these studies maintain the basic premise that Luke divorces history from eschatology.³⁵ However, some offered a different approach to salvation history, which kept history and eschatology together.

2.2 Oscar Cullmann and a linear schema of history and its end

Publishing prior to Conzelmann, Oscar Cullmann argued that like OT texts, NT texts present a linear schema of history (what he termed “the continuous redemptive line”),³⁶ in which human history exists in continuity with the events of the end.³⁷ The key difference, however, is that rather than anticipating God’s action at the end of history, the entire historical schema in NT texts is characterised by God’s decisive action in Jesus’ death and resurrection at its ‘mid-point.’ Stressing the significance of the *past* decisive event, Cullmann likened the relationship between Jesus’ resurrection and the parousia to that of D-Day and V-Day—that is, the decisive battle that determines the outcome of the war has already taken place and only the armistice documents remain to be signed.³⁸

³⁵ Kümmel offers a slightly more nuanced view, but retains this division (Kümmel 1975b:144).

³⁶ Cullmann 1962:35.

³⁷ Cullmann 1962:53-54, 79-80, 83; Cullmann 1967:122-27, 169.

³⁸ Cullmann 1962:xix, 84. The salience of imagery related to World War Two is of note; see discussion of the impact of the social context on these mid-twentieth-century interpreters in Chapter 7 below.

Cullmann's forceful critique of the Bultmann school,³⁹ particularly Conzelmann, in the introduction to his revised edition of *Christus und die Zeit* in 1962, led him to focus on Luke/Acts.⁴⁰ Though his analysis was offered largely without reference to non-biblical texts, Cullmann represents a valuable approach within post-war scholarship, which used comparisons with other biblical texts to challenge approaches to Luke/Acts that severed eschatology from history.⁴¹ Some other scholars also challenged uneschatological readings of Luke's history. Although simplifying 'apocalyptic' perspectives into a "two-aeon" framework, Mattill helpfully emphasises that Luke's understanding of the "Last Things" is in keeping with apocalypses including Daniel and Revelation,⁴² while Francis focuses on Acts 2.17 in arguing that Luke believed the last days had already begun, lending an eschatological character to all of history.⁴³

³⁹ He also responds to criticism from the Barthian school (Cullmann 1962:xxv).

⁴⁰ Conzelmann makes only passing reference to Cullmann, though suggesting his "discussion of 'consistent eschatology' also of course deserves our close attention" (Conzelmann 1960:95n.1; cf. Cullmann's critique of 'consistent eschatology' however, Cullmann 1962:85-86). For his part, Cullmann claims Conzelmann depends upon his own work, arguing even the title is derivative of his concept of the "mid-point in time" (Cullmann 1962:xxiii). (Though the two scholars understand this middle in relation to the end of history in very different ways!).

⁴¹ Schlaudraff concludes that the enduring contribution of Cullmann's work lies in this insight: "Kerygma und Geschichte sind nicht gegeneinander auszuspielen, sondern gehören im Blick auf die göttliche Offenbarung zusammen" (Schlaudraff 1988:253).

⁴² Mattill rightly asserts that Luke's understanding of history and its end is less original among NT writers than Conzelmann suggested. His diagrams on the structure of history are helpful (Mattill 1979:12), although his characterisation of apocalypses and identification of seven "miniapocalypses" in Luke is not wholly convincing (pp.6-8). Luke's Gospel does not need to be 'an apocalypse' in order to share elements of this view of history. It is perhaps surprising that Mattill makes no reference to Cullmann.

⁴³ Francis 1969:51-59. So also Panagopoulos, who sees history divided into two eras, the second of which is already inaugurated by the Spirit and centred on the presence of the risen Jesus in the church's midst (Panagopoulos 1972:149-59). The extent to which Panagopoulos retains a future temporal sense in his understanding of Luke's eschatology, rather than purely realised in the

In some important recent studies, interpreters have engaged in detailed examinations of themes related to the understanding of history in Second Temple Jewish texts, with a particular focus on illuminating Pauline literature. For instance, Loren Stuckenbruck's analysis of the structure of time and overlapping ages in Second Temple Judaism has offered a welcome challenge to some simplistic characterisations of 'apocalyptic' in NT studies.⁴⁴ Other studies, drawing on the work of John Barclay, have sought to clarify understandings of divine and human agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul.⁴⁵

These recent directions in Pauline scholarship highlight important areas for exploration in relation to other NT texts and, given the enduring questions on these themes in Lukan studies, particularly in relation to Luke/Acts. Despite the numerous strengths in Cullmann's approach to salvation history, his understanding, for instance, of decisive divine action in the past, obscured for him the significance of Luke's portrayal of divine and human agency in the *present*, especially as it relates to Luke's explanation of

present, is less clear. Smith's concept of salvation history explains previous delay in terms of the salvation-historical significance of the universal mission, while arguing that history and eschatology are inherently connected (Smith 1958:888-94, 901). Rasco likewise strongly criticises Conzelmann's hypothesis, attributing it partly to Conzelmann's Lutheran doctrine (Rasco 1976:318).

⁴⁴ Stuckenbruck 2014a:309-26; Stuckenbruck 2014b:240-56; Stuckenbruck 2016:142-52.

⁴⁵ See especially Barclay 2008:1-8; Barclay 2015:309-28; Maston 2010; Wells 2014; and my Chapter 5 below.

suffering.⁴⁶ Considering Luke/Acts within a broader range of texts helps to clarify these important features of Luke's text.

Despite these shortcomings, studies like that of Cullmann provide an important corrective for assumptions that lay at the heart of Conzelmann's hypothesis. However, Cullmann is rarely cited in recent studies.⁴⁷ The basic tenets of Conzelmann's view have been challenged from a number of angles, such as Robert Maddox's thorough redaction-critical reappraisal of Conzelmann's exegesis.⁴⁸ However, the understanding, for instance, that eschatology "is not a prominent topic in Acts" remains surprisingly enduring.⁴⁹ Recent studies may seek to project more moderate views about Luke's understanding of history, but the assumption that Luke has in some sense traded a reduced emphasis on eschatological expectation for a focus on the life of the church and the presence of the Spirit emerges frequently in contemporary commentaries on Luke and Acts.⁵⁰ For many

⁴⁶ Cullmann encountered difficulty in explaining how evil was constrained in the present, given the decisive event had already taken place (Cullmann 1962:198). He introduced a better appreciation for historical contingency in his later *Heil als Geschichte*, ascribed to insights from reading Gerhard von Rad (Cullmann 1967:122-27). Diminishing the role of human agency emerges also in some studies of 'apocalyptic' Paul (see Martyn 1997:111-13, 120-22, 143-47, and analysis in Campbell 2009:191-92), as was also the case in Mattill's more 'apocalyptic' treatment of Luke/Acts (Mattill 1979). See my Chapter 5 below.

⁴⁷ Bauspieß supplies a notable exception (Bauspieß 2012:137-45). Cullmann does not appear in the annotated bibliography by Green and McKeever 1994, and is listed only in a footnote among other theologies of history in Shauf 2005:325n.2.

⁴⁸ Maddox 1982:100-57.

⁴⁹ Pervo 2009:25; similarly, cf. Keener 2012-2015:518-19.

⁵⁰ Introductory texts consistently rely on these assumptions, see Shillington 2015:20-21; Bock 2011 (though Bock attempts to distinguish his view from Conzelmann regarding the parousia's delay [p. 399], his schematisation of Luke's history is strongly influenced by Conzelmann). See also Busse

interpreters, these assumptions endure predominantly because their areas of interest have largely moved away from these more theological or philosophical questions of the nature of history.

3. Genre, rhetoric, and Graeco-Roman comparisons

Much recent Lukan scholarship has centred instead on the genre of Luke/Acts (or on distinct genres of Luke and Acts). Luke's linguistic and rhetorical skills, often identified as superior among NT texts, have led to studying Luke/Acts⁵¹ in the context of Graeco-Roman literary conventions. Much recent work has focused on assessing the genre(s) of the Lukan writings and then considering Luke/Acts predominantly in relation to ancient texts of the same genre(s). Drawing on dominant views of Luke/Acts as historiography since Dibelius

2011:163-66, 171-75. Commentaries similarly follow key elements of Conzelmann's approach to salvation history (Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.182-87; 2.1115; cf. Jervell 1996:106 on Luke's emphasis on history over eschatology, though contrast Jervell 1984:25 on living in the last days though the end has not come). Some commentaries frequently imply a milder approach to Lukan eschatology in introductions, noting the earlier debate, but then make scarce further references to eschatology. For example see Gaventa 2003:67; Parsons 2008:7, 58, 123-4; Schweizer 1984:328 (Schweizer argues Luke does not have a schema of salvation history; pp.92, 326); cf. also Jeffrey 2012:243-51. No themes related to eschatology are included in the list of key themes in Johnson's introductions to his commentaries on either Luke or Acts (Johnson 1991:21-24; Johnson 1992:14-18). For Tannehill, the parousia's delay is tied to misunderstandings about the tragic necessity for Israel's rejection to play out (Tannehill 1986-1990:1.258-61).

⁵¹ Note, however, Alexander's important delineation between everyday language (evident in some other NT texts, such as Mark), higher literature, and Luke's language—which falls into neither category. Alexander emphasises that Luke's language is competent, but Luke/Acts does not display the stylistic and rhetorical features of literary texts (Alexander 1993:170-71).

and Cadbury,⁵² various recent interpreters identify Luke/Acts with a sub-type of historiography, such as “institutional”⁵³ or “apologetic” historiography (the latter making a clear link between genre and purpose).⁵⁴ Another significant perspective extends work by Talbert to argue that Luke wrote a form of biography. Beyond more general studies of the Gospels as biographies,⁵⁵ Talbert identified Luke/Acts as a two-volume form, encompassing the life of a movement’s leader followed by an account of the leader’s followers.⁵⁶ Other literary genres also feature in discussions, including the ancient novel⁵⁷ and epic,⁵⁸ while some argue Luke/Acts displays elements of multiple genres.⁵⁹

⁵² See the helpful overview in Rothschild 2004:32-59. See also Keener 2012-2015:90-115, and Marguerat 2002:1-34, though Marguerat assesses that Luke/Acts contains elements of other literary traditions while most closely reflecting historiography with an apologetic purpose.

⁵³ Cancik 1997, from a slightly different angle, offers a renewed version of the argument about Luke’s ‘catholicising’ tendencies (see, for example, his discussion of increasingly rigorous rules for membership and developing internal structures for the “Christian *ekklesia*” pp.678-79). The features Cancik notices in Acts relate to his parallels with non-Jewish historiographies; his portrait of Acts and its purpose makes no reference to eschatological expectations or the relevance of beliefs about divine guidance.

⁵⁴ Sterling 1991:349-69. Lee considers the relevance of “‘tragic’ history” for Luke/Acts, without specifying a new ‘genre’ (Lee 2013). See also Luther 2015:181-208; Palmer 1993:1-29. By contrast, Alexander’s detailed examination of the Lukan prefaces, which are frequently appealed to as evidence in support of the genre designation ‘historiography,’ found instead that they shared more with the prefaces of scientific and technical texts (Alexander 1993:147-48, 164-67, 187).

⁵⁵ Burridge 1992:185-212.

⁵⁶ Talbert 1974. For collected biography, see Adams 2013.

⁵⁷ Pervo 1987.

⁵⁸ Bonz 2000. MacDonald argues that Mark and Luke imitated Homeric models in their storytelling (MacDonald 2015:28-29), and in particular that Luke also imitated Virgil’s *Aeneid* not only in the broader structure of stories, but in Virgil’s reception of Homeric themes and even (unconvincingly) on topics crucial to Luke’s theology (MacDonald 2014:112-77).

⁵⁹ Parsons 2008:4; Phillips 2006; Peterson 2009:15. Alexander provides a list of texts treated in earlier texts as parallels for Luke’s literary style (Alexander 1993:10n.18).

Building on the conclusions of such studies, further research addresses other interpretative questions through the lens of a particular ancient genre. Here scholars move from appreciating the importance of genre for correctly interpreting texts, to limiting discussion of other themes—including Luke’s theology—to a set of texts *determined by genre*. For instance, John Squires considers Luke’s divine plan alongside providence, fate, and fortune in Hellenistic historiographies.⁶⁰ Scott Shauf’s portrait of “the divine in Acts” likewise is tied to historiography.⁶¹ Historiography and its generic features also occupy the focus for Daniel Marguerat,⁶² Clare Rothschild,⁶³ and Samson Uytanlet,⁶⁴ among many others. This focus on the genre(s) of Luke/Acts has also resulted in a separation of non-Jewish from Jewish texts. Todd Penner’s 2004 analysis of studies in Acts over the previous fifteen years observes that studies compared Acts to Jewish texts when addressing theological questions and non-Jewish texts for rhetorical matters.⁶⁵ Although some more recent studies have incorporated Jewish historiographies, the continued dominance of genre studies has generally confirmed the prominence of non-Jewish Graeco-Roman texts

⁶⁰ Squires 1993. Squires diminishes the importance of eschatology in relation to the divine plan (cf. pp.8-9, 187).

⁶¹ Shauf 2015.

⁶² Marguerat 2002. Marguerat also emphasises the influence of both Graeco-Roman and Jewish historiography (p.25).

⁶³ Rothschild 2004, though Rothschild also observes historiography’s connections to biography and epic in its development (pp.8-9), while focusing on historians’ rhetorical techniques.

⁶⁴ Uytanlet 2014. Cf. Moessner 2004. However, Molthagen emphasises differences between Luke/Acts and Herodotus, Thucydides, and Polybius (Molthagen 2009:181).

⁶⁵ Penner 2004:232.

in Lukan studies.⁶⁶ Moreover, particularly through the emphasis on rhetoric, Graeco-Roman texts have also become the focus of studies of theological themes within Luke/Acts.⁶⁷

However, although an awareness of the rhetorical features of its genre will be important for correctly interpreting any given text, many features of a writer's beliefs transcend genre. Indeed, ancient texts of all genres are shaped by their writers' underlying conceptions of, for instance, divine and human agency in history or the end of history.⁶⁸ Further, as this thesis demonstrates, those texts with which Luke/Acts shares greatest *generic* similarity are not always those most closely aligned with Luke's conception of history. Tying the conversation to historiographies, or biographies, has limited discussion of some key features of Luke's text relevant to longstanding debates in Lukan studies, such as the impact of Luke's eschatology on his presentation of human history. In an important recent contribution, C. Kavin Rowe identifies Luke as "apocalyptic."⁶⁹ This label should invite interpreters to consider the relevance of apocalypses as texts that might provide illuminating comparison with Luke/Acts.⁷⁰ But Rowe himself makes this claim without

⁶⁶ Reviews of studies like Squires 1993 have emphasised the need for engagement with Jewish ideas (e.g. Tannehill 1994). Some recent studies have incorporated Jewish comparison texts, although generally these have also continued to restrict the analysis to genre categories (e.g. Uytanlet 2014; cf. Rosner 1993:65-82; Dunn 2009:385-401).

⁶⁷ Shauf 2015; Rothschild 2004:185-212; Bonz 2000:56-57.

⁶⁸ See Chapter 2 for detailed discussion, including criticism of the idea of 'mere' rhetoric.

⁶⁹ Rowe 2009:137.

⁷⁰ The relationship between 'apocalyptic' and 'apocalypses' in scholarly definitions has been the subject of longstanding debate (cf. Collins 1979a:1-19; Reynolds 2013:36-57; Davies 1978a:15-28;

reference to any apocalypses (indeed, he makes minimal use of any Second Temple Jewish texts). In this thesis, I suggest that greater precision is required in the way in which generic categories are employed in the methodologies of Lukan studies. In order to address the kinds of themes upon which this study centres, the scope of texts with which Luke/Acts is compared must be expanded.

4. This study

This thesis seeks to illuminate Lukan eschatology by considering the conception of history in Luke/Acts alongside a wide range of texts of the Graeco-Roman period, including Greek and Latin historiography, Latin epic, Jewish Hellenistic historiography, and Jewish apocalypses. In doing so, it builds upon Cullmann's insights as noted above,⁷¹ by expanding the focus to texts beyond the NT, and responds to the criticism I highlighted from Penner, by incorporating both Jewish and non-Jewish texts.⁷² Despite the number of studies that have dealt with history and Luke/Acts previously, I am not aware of any that has offered a systematic treatment of these questions among a fuller spectrum of the texts of Luke's Hellenistic Jewish setting.

Stone 2011:59-89; Hanneken 2012:1-26). I take the view that apocalypses provide a key insight into any content interpreters might attribute to the adjective 'apocalyptic' (such as beliefs about revealed insights into the world as it really is, including its spatial structure and temporal plan of history), though a text of a different genre may also share such characteristically 'apocalyptic' views.

⁷¹ Cullmann 1962; Cullmann 1967.

⁷² Penner 2004:232.

In Chapter 2, I set out the study's methodology. Clarifying the importance and limits of genre, I illustrate that conceptions of history—such as beliefs about the end of history, or divine and human agency in history—transcend genre. I argue that the possibility of shared views about these topics in texts of different genres justifies—or, indeed, *necessitates*—the cross-genre comparisons in this study. I describe key elements of the study's approach and introduce the ten texts which will be Luke's conversation partners.

Chapters 3 to 6 then consider each key text and Luke/Acts in relation to a different aspect of their writers' conceptions of history. Chapter 3 asks: how do the direction and shape of history in these texts illuminate the schema of history in Luke/Acts? I note that in the vast majority of texts, the writers present history as periodised—that is, comprised of ages or epochs, and that Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Jewish texts portray history as teleological—that is, history follows a linear shape that draws to some sort of culmination at its end. Concluding that these are the texts to which Luke's periodised and teleological conception of history is most similar, I note that Luke/Acts differs from most of the texts with which it shares generic features, and thus those with which it is most likely to be compared in current scholarship.

In Chapter 4, I analyse evidence of the writers' attitudes to determinism and divine guidance of history. The texts treated reveal diverse views: determinism can confirm hope

for the future, endorse existing authorities, or underscore the futility of human resistance. Moreover, in some texts divine personal or impersonal forces drive the course of history as part of a larger plan, in others they simply react in the moment. Again, Luke displays strikingly little use of the characteristic language or concepts employed by Graeco-Roman writers in how he portrays divine guidance of history (even in comparison to Josephus). Nonetheless, divine guidance over the whole course of history and its end remains central to the assurance Luke provides: the βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ can be opposed, but it cannot be stopped.

Chapter 5 considers how the writers portray interactions between divine and human agency, in order to illuminate the ways Luke apportions *human* responsibility—both for the events of the past and for action in the present and future. Through analysing treatments of ‘opponents,’ I demonstrate that temporal concerns draw out apparent inconsistencies—that is, for many writers, explanations of the negative events of the past centre on human culpability or divine punishment, while prospective reflections affirm divine sovereignty as assurance for the future. Human agency is particularly important for Luke. He explains past negative events as the result of tragic opposition to the divine purpose, while an (urgent) universal invitation confirms the human freedom to respond positively in the present.

Finally, Chapter 6 examines characterisations of the present and the end of history, and the relationship between the two. Like contemporaneous Jewish writers, Luke draws on past events to provide assurance of God's faithful action in the future. However, for Luke, the key event of the past—namely Jesus' resurrection—constitutes a unique and decisive transition to the final period of history. Luke's understanding of the relationship between the end of history and the present thus shares features with Virgil's *Aeneid*. But I argue that both the *placement of the end of history in relation to the present* and the *character of the present* crucially affect the ways in which the writers portray hope, suffering, and political structures, revealing important differences in the ways eschatology functions in each of the *Aeneid* and Luke/Acts.

In Chapter 7, in addition to summarising the study's findings, I assess the methodology and consider further implications for understandings of history and eschatology in texts across the NT. I conclude that Luke's understanding of the end, far from being severed from his understanding of history, is integral to each of the other aspects of history examined in this thesis. And I maintain that in each aspect of history discussed, Luke/Acts shares significant features with the texts of different genres with which it is rarely compared. In each of these areas across Luke/Acts, Luke's understanding of the end of history plays a key and shaping role, as he explains past experience, provides assurance for the future, and exhorts appropriate human response in the present.

Chapter 2: Genre, shared worlds, and the approach of this study

As set out in Chapter 1, much recent scholarship of Luke/Acts has focused on genre, including studies which have tied their methodologies to genre-related decisions.¹ In describing the method I use in this study to illuminate Lukan eschatology, this chapter demonstrates that ancient texts of different genres can evoke the same world. That is, a text of one genre can be compared to a text of another genre with respect to elements such as their writers' portrayals of the shape and end of history and the divine forces and human agents who act in history. Consequently, a study comparing texts of diverse genres is not only possible, but *necessary*, when dealing with these kinds of questions.

After an overview of ancient and contemporary genre theory and practice, I highlight classical and biblical texts which confirm that the same beliefs about the world can be reflected in texts of different genres. I then set out this study's approach. Finally, I provide general information about each key text used in this study, as background for the analysis which follows.

¹ For instance, see Squires 1993; Uytanlet 2014; Shauf 2015.

1. The importance and limits of genre

Although this study is not *about* genre, it recognises that genre is important. This will become evident in a range of ways. But the prominent position genre occupies in the history of biblical scholarship, particularly in relation to theological interests in interpretation, warrants a brief note.² For instance, an appreciation for genre has played a key role in modern interpretations of mythological texts such as Gen 1-11, which scholars frequently contrast with literalist approaches.³ In earlier eras, theological interests similarly energised form-critical studies which analysed units of tradition for insights into the historical Jesus.⁴ Theological concerns were embedded in debates about the genre ‘historiography’ as it was conflated with claims about historicity, which has been significant for Acts scholarship especially.⁵ Therefore, as biblical scholars stress the importance of genre, they highlight a methodological issue which connects to significant theological convictions (and conflicts).

Attending to a text’s genre remains important in biblical research—as a tool which clarifies features of the text, but not a prescriptive means of determining the boundaries of

² See, for instance, genre divisions in Barton 2002. Conversely, Alter argues biblical narrative represents a unique category unlike genres represented elsewhere (Alter 2011:221-22).

³ See Van Seters 1992:8-23; Rad 1972:31-43; cf. Doty 1972:432.

⁴ Aune 2013:27-9.

⁵ See discussion of this tension in Acts scholarship in Alexander 1993:3; Sterling 1991:2; Penner 2004:224-5, 229, 234. Penner also distinguishes between the “historicity” (of particular events) and the historical world (historical plausibility of such events in context, e.g. trial scenes; pp.251-60).

discussion.⁶ Some treatments of genre have become unduly rigid,⁷ and even attributed the theological claims in a text to generic convention alone.⁸ Importantly, as Hernadi rightly asserts, texts share a range of things in common with one another, not all of which will relate to genre.⁹ Interpreters who exclude from their analysis all texts which have been designated a different genre inevitably exclude texts which would illuminate these other features. I suggest it is helpful to be more precise about how and why interpreters make genre distinctions, as part of clarifying how we might examine textual features that transcend genre.

1.1 Ancient and contemporary genre theory and practice

The tensions between the stipulations of ancient genre theory and the practices employed by ancient writers are well documented. Plato's distinction between different forms of poetry (*Republic* Book 3), which Aristotle consolidated into his renowned framework of

⁶ Sterling rightly argues genre is for "clarification not classification" (Sterling 1991:16).

⁷ Grethlein reflects a strong tradition in Classics when he notes the ways ancient writers recognise overlap between historiography and biography (Grethlein 2013:22-23); also recognised by Adams 2013; cf. Farrell 2003:383. Though helpfully clarifying, studies such as Talbert 1974, Burrige 1992, and Adams 2013 (biography), Pervo 1987 (ancient novel), and Sterling 1991 (apologetic historiography) and Cancik 1997 (institutional historiography) also run the risk of overlooking *sui generis* features of these NT texts (see especially Burrige 1992:255-56), and overstating the distinctions between sub-genres. Aune argues that biblical research has often overlooked insights from contemporary genre theory (Aune 2013:54).

⁸ See, for instance, Rothschild's explanation of some theological themes as rhetorical devices employed by historians (Rothschild 2004, and discussion at §1.2 below).

⁹ Hernadi 1972:7, 153.

tragedy, comedy, and epic (*Poetics* 1447a),¹⁰ did not map directly onto actual texts.¹¹ When writers such as Polybius set out methodological commitments related to generic convention (2.56.7-12), they can fail to realise them in their own writing—as in Polybius’s famed denunciation of tragic features in historiography and his own apparent use of dramatic and tragic features.¹² Moreover, in some cases texts appear to draw on features from other genres in order to “enrich”¹³ or undermine formal generic claims or expectations in the text. Although some Graeco-Roman writers’ renowned generic playfulness may seem to devalue generic conventions, in fact the opposite is true: this playfulness relies on readers’ awareness of distinctions between genres.¹⁴

¹⁰ Dubrow 1982:46-9. Najman stresses that Jewish texts supply no equivalent explication of their use of genres (Najman 2012:311).

¹¹ Farrell 2003:395-6. Najman demonstrates that some traditions rely on awareness of generic rules, such as theatres which required that tragedies submitted for performance meet certain criteria (Najman 2012:309-10). Hellenistic period texts provide few examples of formal genre theory (Harrison 2011:3), though they can still indicate “implicit theory” in how they apply conventions (Farrell 2003:386-7, 403). Lucian’s satirical account of contemporaneous historiographical practice in *How to Write History* also indicates formal generic understanding. Contemporary scholars variously characterise tensions in defining genres through contrasts between the emic and etic (Rosmarin 1985:7, 50-51; cf. Najman 2012:309), theory and history (White 2003:597-615), or prescriptive and descriptive (Rosmarin 1985:7, 50-51; cf. Edwards 2006:52) approaches.

¹² Walbank 1960:216, 234; Walbank 1957:15; Sacks 1981:144-70.

¹³ Harrison’s term (Harrison 2011:14). Harrison’s helpful description of “genre enrichment” highlights how a primary (“host”) genre may exhibit features of a secondary (“guest”) genre, through which a reader’s expectations may be challenged or extended (“enriched”).

¹⁴ A text’s form and content can act in creative tension, as Farrell illustrates with Horace using the wrong meter to undermine his own content (Farrell 2003:394).

Defining genre is notoriously difficult. My purpose here is not to become embroiled in what Daniel Chandler describes as the “theoretical minefield” of genre theory,¹⁵ but to set out some key points that will help to clarify textual features that *transcend* genre. A literary genre can be defined as “a type of text recognised by particular conventions of form and content which are shared by other texts of that type.”¹⁶ As “competent” readers¹⁷ recognise them, these conventions shape the readers’ expectations and interpretations. Five elements of this understanding of literary genre warrant further comment.

(1) Genres are by definition about groups of texts, not individual texts, given the focus on shared features.¹⁸ Where claims are made that a text is *sui generis*, this reflects an assessment that any sharing of formal features between that text and others is so weak that it cannot be interpreted in light of expectations raised by shared features.¹⁹ (2) Genres

¹⁵ Chandler 1997:2. Dubrow likewise notes that, “though the effects of genre are manifest and manifold,” defining genre is difficult (Dubrow 1982:4).

¹⁶ Chandler and Munday 2011:173.

¹⁷ This is a concept Harrison draws from Culler (Harrison 2011:14; cf. Culler 1975:140-41).

¹⁸ Cohen 2003:vi.

¹⁹ Edwards cites Xenophon’s *Reminiscences of Socrates*, as the only example of its genre, to demonstrate the possibility of *sui generis* texts, and therefore this possibility for the Gospels (Edwards 2006:53-54). However, this conceptualises genre from the wrong direction. Other texts with shared features may simply have been lost. All that can be claimed is that, on the basis of extant texts, such unique works would not appear to raise expectations in competent contemporaneous readers. Also contra Burridge, who argues that texts *must* have genres (Burridge 1992:53, 255-56).

are about real texts, not imagined texts that might be designed as members of a generic category.²⁰

(3) Genres are based on shared features related to the texts' form. Such features may be described as a "generic repertoire," where this includes external (e.g. meter, literary structure) and internal (subject, tone) features.²¹ Texts may share many different kinds of things: a given group may all be written by British authors or Roman citizens, printed in Times New Roman or written on Papyrus, or published in 1983 or under the reign of Tiberius. One could rightly argue that such attributes might be more common in texts of one genre or another. However, they are not directly indicative of genre. The importance of these perhaps obvious kinds of distinctions will become clear below. Internal features such as subject must be weighted appropriately with other external features.²² Certainly some thematic considerations are significant: biographies narrate the life of a particular individual,²³ and apocalypses reveal information through a vision or otherworldly journey, often mediated by the explanations of an angelic guide.²⁴ However, if an emphasis on

²⁰ Aune suggests genres reflect a "core of prototypical members" and "fuzzy boundaries" (Aune 2013:54; also Chandler 1997:3). Najman uses a "constellation" image to describe "classes" of texts (though she avoids equating this with classical understandings of the term 'genre' [Najman 2012:316]). Though valuably observing that texts may share diverse features (p.312), Najman does not take her discussion further to consider how other shared features may cut across generic or other 'type' divisions.

²¹ Fowler 1982:55-56. See also Harrison 2011:11.

²² Aune 2013:30-31.

²³ Burridge 1992:61-63.

²⁴ Cf. Collins 1979a:9.

theme is taken to an extreme and at the expense of external features, any genre differentiation becomes meaningless²⁵—on some readings, all biblical texts, whether prose or poetry, that describe divine faithfulness would converge to the same ‘genre.’

(4) In the words of Hanks, genre creates “orientating frameworks” and “sets of expectations,”²⁶ thus performing a function in communication. In order for generic features to raise such expectations, therefore, readers must have reasonable levels of what Harrison, following Culler, calls “literary competence” or Aune describes as “literary socialisation.”²⁷

Naturally, this immediately raises difficulties inherent in literary interpretation: the impasse between writer, text, and reader.²⁸ Following Harrison, I suggest it is most helpful to approach the text from the perspective of an ideal, contemporaneous, “competent” reader.²⁹ Harrison is cognisant of the dangers intrinsic to such a conceptualisation, but compellingly argues for this approach, “believing as I do that it is an easier task to attempt the reconstruction of the cultural horizons of the collective model readership of a classical

²⁵ Cf. Chandler 1997:1.

²⁶ Hanks 1987:670. See also Seitel 2003:277.

²⁷ Harrison 2011:14; Aune 2013:33. Todorov recognises that readers may be affected by generic features unconsciously (Todorov 1990:19).

²⁸ Rosmarin critiques the “explanatory power” of the increasingly detailed theory addressing the tension between text and reader as ultimately “self-exhausting” (Rosmarin 1985:3).

²⁹ ‘Reader’ here need not be taken literally; an audience in any form will require competence for generic conventions.

text than of the mental processes of its single historical author.”³⁰ This approach remains vulnerable to the possibility that writers may have articulated what they mean in such a way that their intended audiences could not understand—like teachers who fail to pitch their lectures to their student audiences and whose lecture notes would not illuminate the recipients’ experience. However, coupled with further knowledge about the historical setting, on balance the model reflects the best approach to an insoluble tension, avoiding the greater pitfall of suggesting that texts have intentions severed from their writers and readers.

(5) Finally, genres can evolve over time.³¹ As soon as Virgil’s *Aeneid* evoked the expectations of epic for his readers, but then adapted these conventions, the genre ‘epic’ had shifted.³² Over time, genres may be stretched or divided³³ and new genres may emerge.³⁴

Thus, the ways that shared features set frameworks for expectation and shape interpretation for competent readers in their socio-historical context justify—and

³⁰ Harrison 2011:14.

³¹ Fowler 1982:23, 45-48.

³² Farrell 2003:395, 400.

³³ Farrell 2003:400.

³⁴ Fowler 1982:23; Fowler 2003:187.

exhaust—the purpose of identifying a particular text’s genre.³⁵ Genre is not “an end in itself.”³⁶

1.2 Maintaining precision regarding genre

The above discussion about genre is important because it attempts to set out which textual features rightly belong to genre and which reflect something else, to avoid attributing *all* features of a text to a loose notion of its ‘genre’ or suggesting that all beliefs a writer conveys through a text will fit within parameters inherent to its genre. Indeed, I suggest quite the opposite is true: numerous elements of a text transcend genre.³⁷ A particular theme, such as belief in divine guidance, may be present in an apocalypse and a historiography, although not present in all historiographies.³⁸

Conflating content claims with genre can create the problematic assumption that content reflects generic convention alone. For instance, Clare Rothschild contends that Luke makes use of the rhetorical techniques of recurrence, prediction, divine guidance,³⁹ and

³⁵ Fowler 1982:22; cf. Seitel 2003:292.

³⁶ Hernadi 1972:7. Cf. Edwards 2006:61; Sterling 1999:1; Chandler 1997:10.

³⁷ Clarke observes the methodological difficulties posed by blurred genres and different scholarly traditions regarding local historiographies and calendar documents, though both kinds of texts reflect interests in the “structures of time” (Clarke 2008:51).

³⁸ Distinctions between genre and implied world may also illuminate other contentious discussions of genre in biblical studies, such as those related to apocalypse/apocalyptic/apocalypticism (see, for instance, Ashton 2013; Reynolds 2013; Stuckenbruck 2014b). See also p.185n.149 below.

³⁹ Rothschild 2004:95. For instance, Rothschild argues that in passages where it is clear that something of divine action is at work in Luke’s narrative, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ is “conspicuous by its absence” (Rothschild 2004:212). See my Chapter 4 below.

eyewitnesses as common methods for establishing a historian's authority and credibility, and that, even where these techniques explicitly bear on theological issues, Luke does so without affirming the theological implications.⁴⁰ I understand 'rhetoric' as, "the art of using language effectively so as to persuade or influence others."⁴¹ While some *OED* meanings refer to negative uses indicating an over-blown style, none suggest an expression might contradict its intended meaning. By contrast, Rothschild's approach to rhetoric as "any means available"⁴² leads her to divorce the rhetoric from substance. The texts discussed in this thesis challenge the notion of 'mere' rhetoric. The writers employ rhetorical devices in support of, not counter to, their conceptions of history and, in the case of late Second Temple Jewish texts, to maintain a characterisation of the divine in keeping with Jewish antecedents.⁴³

As part of his critique of recent methodological "madness" in Acts scholarship, Penner observes that theological themes often reduced to rhetoric, such as "retribution and providence," are not limited to historiography, and thus require a "cross-generic comparison."⁴⁴ The presence of these themes in epic texts, to which the evidence of the

⁴⁰ Rothschild 2004:7.

⁴¹ *OED* meaning 1A.

⁴² Rothschild 2004:95.

⁴³ Chapter 4 demonstrates this point, for instance, in relation to Josephus's adaptation of τύχη. Similarly, Walbank asserts Polybius uses rhetoric to highlight elements he believes are "objectively present in the fabric of events" (Walbank 1957:15). Likewise, Luke does not use terms such as δεῖ independently of his theological claims—like embroidery detached from fabric—but rather to reinforce them. Similarly, on rhetoric in apocalypses, see Newsom 2014:202-3.

⁴⁴ Penner 2004:240.

current study could add apocalypses, confirms that these ideas cannot be dismissed as rhetoric tied to generic convention, even if presented in characteristic ways in particular kinds of texts. Rather these themes evoke features of what might be considered the ‘world’ implied by the text.⁴⁵

1.3 Shared ‘worlds’ across ancient texts of different genres

A writer does not have to produce historiography to have a view about the nature of history and its end, or divine and human agency over the events of history. Such views show through in diverse texts—from apocalypses like 2 Baruch, to the historiography of Diodorus Siculus or Virgil’s epic. Importantly, various features of the world implied by a text may be shared by texts of different genres without being shared by other texts of the same genre—as this study demonstrates is true of Luke/Acts and the other (non-Jewish) Greek and Latin historiographies in almost every aspect of history discussed.

Ancient texts of different genres written by the same author illustrate that conceptions of history transcend genre. Seneca produced a generically broad corpus, from manuals and epigrams to letters and tragedies.⁴⁶ But his Stoic commitments are in evidence to one

⁴⁵ In *Beyond Genre*, Hernadi refers to a text’s “evoked world” (Hernadi 1972:7), but does not clearly develop it. At points he seems to equate “evoked world” with attributes of genre (as also do Farrell 2003 and Seitel 2003 when drawing on similar ideas), but elsewhere Hernadi discusses a feature of the world evoked as a kind of “principle of reality” (p.182). This, I suggest, is a feature that transcends genre.

⁴⁶ See Ker 2006:19-41.

degree or another across his collection. For instance, Rosenmeyer stresses continuity in the portrayal of the nature of the gods, determinism, and a Stoic emphasis on the control of nature even in Seneca's tragedies.⁴⁷ Similarly, Ovid's *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* are considered to share some key perspectives about the world, despite their different genres.⁴⁸ Such examples of ancient authors who work in multiple genres, but communicate the same underlying beliefs, demonstrate that it is possible for texts of different genres to evoke the same 'world.'

Biblical texts also provide explicit evidence of a shared 'world' across diverse genres. For instance, the poetry of Psalm 1 sets out the theology of divine reward and punishment within the events of history for the righteous and wicked.⁴⁹ These beliefs also appear in historiographical texts such as the explanation of the fall of the northern kingdom in 2 Kings: "This occurred because the people of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God" (2 Kgs 17.7a, cf. vv.7-23).⁵⁰ Both texts imply features of the same world in relation to divine involvement in history, specifically God's use of the events of history as a punishment for

⁴⁷ Seneca's tragedies have traditionally been regarded differently, but contemporary studies affirm continuity in these underlying views (cf. Rosenmeyer 1989:63-90).

⁴⁸ Virgil represents another good example of generic diversity by the same writer (see Farrell 2003:392-3), though the perspectives reflected in *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* famously differ (see Chapter 3 on the golden age). Demonstrating that comparing features between the texts remains possible, critics identify a development in Virgil's perspective itself, extending to intertextuality between the works (Theodorakopoulos 1997:157).

⁴⁹ The focus in Psalm 1 remains on the blessing of the way of the righteous during earthly life and its opposite for the wicked (Kraus 1988:115-22).

⁵⁰ See Chapter 5 on Deuteronomistic theology.

sin. Not all biblical writers present exactly the same views, for instance, when identifying causes of suffering in the past, but the particular views they do present are not determined by the genre of their texts.

Therefore, whichever *particular* beliefs about the world are present, it is nonetheless possible to compare these features across different texts. It remains important to take due account of a text's genre as it provides readers with a framework of expectations that will shape interpretation. However, undue concentration on genre has bred unhelpfully narrow methodology in some biblical research. These methodologies have featured particularly in studies of Luke/Acts, excluding from the field of vision key elements that transcend genre.

2. This study's approach to examining Luke's conception of history

In order to investigate how the understandings of history in diverse texts of the Graeco-Roman period illuminate Lukan eschatology, this study examines key texts to build up a picture of the variety of views that are evident in Luke's context. I argue that approaching each text as a detailed case study provides the best data for assembling this picture, and that Greek and Latin non-Jewish texts and diverse late Second Temple Jewish texts are all

relevant as part of Luke's first-century Jewish setting. Each of these claims requires some justification.

2.1 Mapping understandings of history in Luke's context

The usefulness of the comparisons undertaken in this study does not lie in any claim to Luke's literary dependence upon these texts. Other studies have explored Graeco-Roman historiographies in order to determine Luke's use of rhetoric without claiming direct dependence. Likewise, there is widespread agreement that cultural influences have mediated the effect of, for instance, formal Stoic or Epicurean philosophies upon diverse texts. Evidence of these philosophical frameworks can be found in Paul's letters, Josephus's works, or Acts, even where the writers display limited evidence of any direct engagement with philosophical texts.⁵¹ Similarly, I suggest that mapping the conceptions of history underlying a range of texts of the Graeco-Roman period illuminates Luke/Acts without requiring Luke's familiarity with those particular texts.

This method draws on concepts developed in cultural history, particularly among the proponents of the history of *mentalité*. Introduced by mid-twentieth-century historians Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch,⁵² this approach considers the ideas and ways of thinking—what Febvre termed the “*outillage mental*” (“mental tools”)—in evidence in a given cultural

⁵¹ Sanders 2007:90; Pervo 2009:431; Keener 2012-2015:2614-17.

⁵² Cf. Febvre 1982. For further discussion of this movement, see Green 2007:29-34; Chartier 1988:21-37.

setting.⁵³ From this developed the idea of mapping the diversity of ways of thinking, or the set of “mental tools” available, in a given context.⁵⁴ This approach has been applied helpfully to the ways ancient writers employed terms and concepts in their cultural setting.⁵⁵ In this study, I work with diverse texts to consider the ways of thinking about history that were in evidence in a Luke’s broader context,⁵⁶ so that comparisons might illuminate Luke’s particular emphases and assumptions.

2.2 Building a series of detailed case studies

I deal with comparison texts as a series of detailed case studies that together build up the picture of the ways of thinking about history that were present in Luke’s wider setting. Not only Luke/Acts, but each text must be read as far as possible in light of its own set of complex relationships with other literary and cultural traditions.⁵⁷ For instance, it is not enough to observe the number of texts in a given period that use a term like τύχη, (‘chance’ or ‘Fortune’), if the interpreter does not also attend to whether or not, say, writers like

⁵³ Febvre 1982:355-79, esp. pp.355-63. Febvre’s objective was to assess the plausibility of particular views in his chosen setting, given the “mental tools” available. He has been criticised for prescribing what is possible, rather than describing the diversity evident in a given setting (see critiques in Chartier 1988:24-35; Green 2007:33-34; Burke 1999:442-56).

⁵⁴ Chartier also uses the phrase “modes of thought” (Chartier 1988:25).

⁵⁵ See, for instance, Morgan 2015:10-11, 24-27.

⁵⁶ In doing so I seek to reflect the diversity evident in the context, rather than the all-encompassing kind of implications inherent in claims about the ‘worldview’ of a particular group or time.

⁵⁷ This naturally creates an elusive conundrum between reading the part in light of the whole, and the whole in light of its parts (see Hernadi 1972:2-3).

Polybius and Josephus, seem to mean the same thing when they use it.⁵⁸ Making this assessment will include considering how the concept functions in each text as a whole, relates to the writers' rhetorical purposes, and might be shaped by the cultural expectations, for instance, of a Jewish or non-Jewish audience.

Set out in this form these claims may be obvious to students of ancient texts. However, various practical constraints inevitably press interpreters into choosing between areas of compromise.⁵⁹ Historians of *mentalité* seek to collate vast data banks of information in which patterns across a given period may then be discerned. Notwithstanding its particular strengths, this approach encounters practical problems of analysing large volumes of texts at sufficient depth for accurate interpretation.⁶⁰ Whereas some kinds of texts may be well suited to this type of analysis,⁶¹ other texts in which ideas about the nature of the world are embedded in long narratives of causation will be better suited to a more detailed, case study approach. Case studies allow for appreciating the particularity of a given text as its various features interact, while also facilitating a richer comparison between texts.

⁵⁸ Polybius and Josephus do use τύχη differently. See Chapter 4.

⁵⁹ See, for instance, Vovelle's discussion of serial and case study approaches to the history of *mentalité* (Vovelle 1990:232-45).

⁶⁰ Green 2007:56-8; see also discussion of this difficulty in Morgan 2015:38-39.

⁶¹ Proverbs or sayings that are readily separable from their immediate context and frequently used in this way even within the ancient sources provide ideal material for this approach. Morgan demonstrates the usefulness of large databases of proverbs, fables, gnomai, and exempla, for building up a picture of popular morality (Morgan 2007). See also discussion of the value of large samples of data in Morgan 2015:38-39.

Inevitably, case studies are limited. The ideal would be to incorporate very large numbers of detailed case studies, to map the elements of understandings of history evident in the setting as completely as possible. Nonetheless, recognising inevitable practical constraints, the key texts discussed throughout this study encompass appropriate diversity and have been carefully chosen. They are not eccentric and in most cases can be seen to be somewhat exemplary, reflecting the interests of some other texts within this diverse setting. But, having identified each for its value in filling out the range of perspectives in this setting, I then treat each in detail as an individual example, not a representative of a wider class.

2.3 Expanding the scope of texts relevant to Luke's cultural context

Finally, given this approach to mapping the understandings of history evident in Luke's setting, the scope of texts to be included must be considered to contribute to the same, broad cultural context. Teresa Morgan convincingly demonstrates the interpenetration between Greek and Latin worlds during this time, evident not only in the geographical spread of inscriptions in each language and cultural parallels, but even Latinisms in the Greek NT (cf. *δηνάριον* Mk 6.37; *πραιτώριον* Mk 15.16).⁶² Roman linguistic and cultural influences were present across the Roman empire, and the NT as well as related

⁶² Morgan 2015:26-7, 36-8.

archaeological evidence demonstrates that members of the messianic movement following Jesus, whether in Rome, Jerusalem, or the communities of Paul's mission like Corinth, were in contact with ideas present in Latin texts. My approach therefore does not rely upon, for instance, assumptions about a common location for the intended audience of each of the texts discussed.⁶³

Diverse late Second Temple Jewish⁶⁴ texts necessarily also fit within the scope of the cultural world within which the NT emerged. Jewish texts remain relevant conversation partners for Luke/Acts because of both the strong connections to themes and traditions from Jewish texts in Luke's narrative⁶⁵ and the well-documented influence of Hellenism on Second Temple Judaism.⁶⁶ Writers like Luke, as well as Josephus or Philo, make use of themes, terms, and styles from the Graeco-Roman setting because this is also naturally their own context.⁶⁷

⁶³ Unlike studies that presume that Latinisms in Mark's Gospel suggest a Roman provenance or intended audience, the cultural and linguistic cross-fertilisation across the region in this period precludes drawing such conclusions from only this evidence.

⁶⁴ I use 'late Second Temple Judaism' given the broad timespan covered by 'Second Temple Judaism.' This study's key texts fall in the latter part of that period (or, technically, just beyond the time of the temple in the case of Josephus's *Jewish War*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch).

⁶⁵ Sterling 1999:199-225; Sterling 1991:358-59; Moessner 2008a:223-38; Moessner 1996:218-50.

⁶⁶ Significant studies that reshaped understandings of Second Temple Judaism, its diversity, and its relationship to Hellenism, include: Hengel 1974; Sanders 1977; Hengel and Marksches 1989; Boccaccini 1991; Barclay 1996. It is clear that Judaism exhibited extensive interaction with Hellenism before the messianic sect that would become Christianity emerged—Hellenisation was already part of its late Second Temple Jewish context.

⁶⁷ Sterling 1991:327.

Thus, this study's cross-genre method seeks to map aspects of the understandings of history present in Luke's cultural context, using case studies for detailed treatment of key texts and a wide scope of texts. It recognises that Greek, Latin, and late Second Temple Jewish texts can all contribute to the understandings of history that are relevant to Luke/Acts. In addition to offering conclusions about the ways diverse understandings of history illuminate Lukan eschatology, I return to assess the usefulness of this cross-genre methodology at the conclusion of the thesis.

3. The case study texts

The key texts selected all date within an approximate range of the second century BCE to the early second century CE. In order to build up the understandings of history present in Luke's cultural context, and given diachronic changes, for instance in the way Graeco-Roman texts portray divine involvement in human history, these parameters are appropriate. At the earliest boundary, the period I consider includes the Hellenistic historiographical perspective of Polybius, with his focus on the rise of Rome, and the reflections on the Seleucid empire provided by 2 Maccabees. At the later end, Tacitus's perspective on earlier Roman politics from his early second-century vantage point is included, as well as various responses to the fall of Jerusalem, but material beyond the Bar Kokhba revolt is excluded.

Notably, while the texts for discussion have been chosen carefully, any feasible selection will be limited. Inevitably readers will notice texts omitted, including perhaps texts they should like to have seen included—no doubt for good reasons. Moreover, as set out in Chapter 1, I have deliberately steered away from including other NT texts as case studies in the analysis, particularly given that earlier work like that of Oscar Cullmann has already taken this as a key focus⁶⁸ and my intention is to expand the breadth of texts considered alongside Luke/Acts—though I recognise that there may be scope for revising such earlier studies and I do at points note connections to the treatment of other NT texts.

3.1 Texts chosen for analysis

The five non-Jewish key texts are introduced below in chronological order, followed by the five Jewish texts. Some (historiographical) texts have frequently featured in studies of Luke/Acts.⁶⁹ The others extend comparisons into texts such as popular exempla, Latin epic, and apocalypses.

Polybius's *Histories*—Written in the second century BCE, Polybius's historiography of 40-volumes, of which about a third remain extant, traces events initially from 220-167, though he later extends his account until the mid-140s BCE. Polybius was well connected

⁶⁸ Cullmann 1962; Cullmann 1967.

⁶⁹ Though also historiography, 2 Maccabees has not been studied alongside Luke/Acts as frequently as historiographies by Josephus, Polybius, or Diodorus Siculus (though, as an exception, see Schwartz 2009:119-29).

as the tutor for a leading family in Rome.⁷⁰ His social and political situation seems to influence his account, as well as providing his privileged access to events.⁷¹ The Greek-language historiography focuses on Rome's rise as a unique military and political feat. Polybius's focus on historical causes, the rise of Rome and 'universal' history, and important (if varied) references to the role of τύχη, as well as scholars' frequent use of his historiography as a conversation partner for Luke (and Josephus),⁷² makes this text an illuminating contributor.

Diodorus Siculus's *Library of History*—Diodorus advocates extending historiography both temporally and geographically. His 40-volume Greek language *Library* (of which Books 1-5 and 11-20 remain, with some further fragments from most of the books extant)⁷³ includes primeval myths and stories from both eastern and western sources, tracing “the accounts which each people records of its earliest times” (1.4.5) up until the mid- to late-50s BCE.⁷⁴ Originally from Sicily (Agyrium), Diodorus then lived in Egypt (c. 60-56 BCE) and

⁷⁰ Dreyer 2007:495.

⁷¹ As discussed in later chapters, Polybius may incorporate some subtle resistance to Rome (see Gruen 2011:153).

⁷² Cf. Molthagen 2009; Cohen 1982; Ben Zeev 1996; Moessner 2008b; Gruen 2011.

⁷³ Sacks 1990:3. The fragmentary sections of the work create some difficulties. For instance, Book 7 derives almost exclusively from Eusebius, whose understandings of history might significantly interfere (see Clarke 2008:127). On the various sources Diodorus has used for his text, and a traditional argument about Diodorus's (lack of) skill and independence, see Stylianou 1998:8-10.

⁷⁴ Meister 2007:444. Diodorus gives his own structure in 1.4.6-1.5.1, though he is thought to have adjusted the finishing point, perhaps for political reasons as the content approached his own time (Sacks 1990:160-1), or due to age (Oldfather 1933-1967:xix).

Rome (at least 56-30).⁷⁵ He claims to have worked on his *Library* for over 30 years, and to have gone to great pains to provide this compilation (1.4.1) for those who hadn't time to read all the sources individually (1.3.5-8). Though often dismissed as a compiler of earlier sources,⁷⁶ several recent studies have asserted Diodorus's role in shaping his text, particularly highlighting his creativity in his prefaces.⁷⁷ As an 'outsider,' his portrayal of Rome is not always positive. Diodorus's focus on morality is evident throughout, including in his understanding of the historian's purpose, which he also relates to divine πρόνοια. Together with his approach to 'universal' historiography, these themes in his *Library* reveal important features of Diodorus's conception of history, which, in addition to its frequent use as a comparison to Luke/Acts elsewhere,⁷⁸ make Diodorus's *Library* a helpful inclusion in this study.

Virgil's *Aeneid*—Virgil worked on his epic poem of Roman origins from the battle of Actium in 30-31 BCE until his death in 19 BCE.⁷⁹ The 12-volume Latin epic plays on inherited themes, particularly as found in Homer.⁸⁰ Virgil presents Rome as the *telos* of

⁷⁵ Meister 2007:444.

⁷⁶ Stylianou maintains Diodorus is not only a compiler but that he *mishandles* earlier sources (Stylianou 1998:1-3, 15-17, 21; cf. Stylianou 1991:388). By contrast, Sacks 1990:3-4; Hau 2009:172.

⁷⁷ This is the central argument of Sacks 1990:5-6.

⁷⁸ Cf. Squires 1993; Moessner 2004; Moessner 2008b; Rothschild 2004.

⁷⁹ Fantham 2007:xvii. Disagreement exists over whether some inconsistencies in the finished text indicate sections Virgil intended to alter but left incomplete when he died; the subtly at work elsewhere suggests that these types of explanations are not necessary (O'Hara 2007:77-78).

⁸⁰ Williams 1990:194-96; Knauer 1990; Quint 1989:9; on effects of other intertextual links, see O'Hara 2007:90-91.

history achieved in the reign of Augustus—although this presentation also displays elements of ambiguity.⁸¹ The plot covers mythic events following exile from Troy and a search to found a new city, and concludes with the figurative founding of Rome as Aeneas kills Turnus.⁸² *Aeneid*'s portrayal of deterministic prophecy and the nature of the end of history, which the reader is invited to see as realised in the historical present, ensures that this text makes an important contribution, often overlooked in NT studies,⁸³ to the understandings of history in Luke's broader context.⁸⁴

Valerius Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings*—Valerius's Latin compilation of exempla provides significant insights into popular views of history. The nine books of anecdotes,⁸⁵ produced in approximately 30 CE during Tiberius's reign,⁸⁶ are collected under thematic headings to assist the ancient rhetorician in need of an illustration.⁸⁷ Not much is known about Valerius himself, and his text has often been dismissed as merely derivative

⁸¹ See Galinsky 1996; Hardie 1986; Feeney 1986.

⁸² Lyne 1990:338.

⁸³ Previous discussions of *Aeneid* in Lukan studies have generally focused on genre and a minority view that Luke/Acts is an epic and/or on Luke's imitation of Virgilian literary structures (Bonz 2000; MacDonald 2014:112-77). This is not my intention here; as argued above, the world evoked by a text can share features with that evoked by another text, without the text exhibiting the same generic conventions.

⁸⁴ Although I will at times refer to *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, the focus will remain on *Aeneid*.

⁸⁵ Wardle argues that the original end is likely lost (Wardle 1998:6; cf. Carter 1975:29).

⁸⁶ Bailey 2000:2-3. In his preface to Book 1, Valerius provides a glowing dedication to the Caesars. The text is frequently taken to indicate a popular attitude towards the principate (Mueller 2002:178).

⁸⁷ See discussion of the development of collections of exempla for declamation in Bloomer 1992:8.

of its sources and popular in register.⁸⁸ However, its “middlebrow,” popular nature indicates one of Valerius’s great contributions to study of the first century.⁸⁹ Moreover, he leaves his mark by redacting particular anecdotes and through the selections themselves.⁹⁰ Significantly, rather than the irony and scepticism of some first-century literary works,⁹¹ Valerius affirms the assumptions of Roman religion and the place of the *princeps* in it, alongside everyday anecdotal reflections on virtue and fortune. This renders his text a valuable addition to these case studies.

Tacitus’s *Histories*—Like Diodorus Siculus, Tacitus focuses on moral order and moral explanations for historical events. This fits with his political preference for governance by an elite, asserting that without such controls the people will descend into licentiousness.⁹² Tacitus was a senator during the Flavian period (70-96).⁹³ *The Histories*, a Latin historiography believed to have comprised either 12 or 14 books (of which Books 1-4 and sections of Book 5 remain), dates to 105-109 CE.⁹⁴ It describes the period of Flavian rule and the events that immediately preceded it, beginning from 1 January 69 CE and recounting

⁸⁸ Bloomer 1992 and Skidmore 1996 reignited interest in the text in the 1990s. See also Wardle 1998:v. Conversely, see Carter on Valerius’s “supreme mediocrity of talent” (Carter 1975:30; cf. p.51).

⁸⁹ Mueller 2002:3. Mueller asserts, “Valerius Maximus was no theologian, even less a philosopher, and his work, no *De natura deorum*, is consequently most useful” (p.3).

⁹⁰ See discussion in Mueller 2002:118-21; Wardle 1998:16-17.

⁹¹ Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, for instance, is contemporaneous and sceptical. For Ovid’s relevance to the period, with reference to Valerius, see Millar 1993:2-4.

⁹² Syme 1958:1.169.

⁹³ Franke and Flaig 2009:105; cf. Syme 1958:1.63-70.

⁹⁴ Franke and Flaig 2009:106.

the tumultuous year of the four emperors, with the extant sections concluding in the summer of 70 CE.⁹⁵ Given the period with which it deals, I have chosen *Histories* as the case study text, but the *Annals* will occasionally feature as it helps to interpret Tacitus's conception of history in *Histories*. Through his focus on morality and scepticism about the involvement of divine forces in history, Tacitus contributes helpfully to this study.

2 Maccabees—Written in Greek,⁹⁶ 2 Maccabees offers a valuable perspective within Second Temple Judaism, reflecting support of the revolutionary activities of Judas Maccabeus.⁹⁷ The text comprises two letters (1.1-2.18), a historiographical narrative recounting the events related to Judas with a preface (2.19-32; chps 3-15)⁹⁸ and an epilogue (15.37-9). It records an anonymous epitomiser's claim to have condensed the historiographical sections from a (no longer extant) five-volume account by Jason of Cyrene (2.23). While recounting the situation in Judea under the Seleucid empire, 2 Maccabees indicates a more positive attitude towards Rome, which most scholars suggest indicates a dating in the late second century BCE, after initial Roman victories over the

⁹⁵ Griffin 2009:183.

⁹⁶ The Greek is original, not translated from Hebrew or Aramaic as other LXX texts (Schwartz 2009:199; Harrington 1988:103).

⁹⁷ On the relationships between the Maccabean literature and historical considerations, see Harrington 1988, and on theological and ideological differences between 1 and 2 Maccabees see Schwartz 2009, Doran 1999, and Berthelot 2007.

⁹⁸ See Doran on possible relationships between the historiographical summary and the letters (Doran 2012:14-15). The letters appear to reflect the diaspora situation and traditions of sending letters with other texts. The first letter is commonly considered authentic; the second is not. Dates provided in letters are also used in dating the narrative; see below.

Seleucids but before the Roman general Pompey's action against the Hasmoneans in 63 BCE.⁹⁹ Its presentation of the role of humans in enacting divine will, as well as the understanding of reward and punishment within history, make 2 Maccabees a worthy contribution to the range of views within which to situate Luke/Acts.

Qumran War Scroll—Written in Hebrew, the War Scroll sets out the events of an eschatological battle to take place between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, in highly choreographed, even liturgical, terms. It incorporates thanksgiving hymns, prophetic claims about the outcomes of seven phases of battle, and the final victory. Although not a manual the community intended to implement in real life battles,¹⁰⁰ details about battle formation and weapons indicate Roman military strategies¹⁰¹ and suggest conflict with Roman forces as the setting that gave rise to the text. This would indicate the text should be dated to the mid-first century BCE.¹⁰² 1QM provides the most detailed text. There is disagreement about which other fragments are to be attributed to the War Scroll, though certainly texts from Cave 4 confirm the presence of different recensions of the text

⁹⁹ Second Maccabees is generally placed between 124/5 and 63 BCE (Doran 1999; Attridge 1986:318-20). Schwartz provides an earlier date, based on a different reading of dates provided in the letters in manuscripts (Schwartz 2008:14-15).

¹⁰⁰ Mattila 1994:530-31; contra Alexander 2003:28.

¹⁰¹ Vermes 1997:163.

¹⁰² Schultz argues the events of 63 BCE catalysed the later editions of the War Scroll and their further criticism of Rome and the Kittim (Schultz 2009). Davies dates to late first century BCE/early first century CE, though he has been criticised for such a late dating (Davies 2000b; cf. van der Woude 1998:12).

(cf. 4Q491-96).¹⁰³ This study will focus particularly on 1QM as a single detailed manuscript,¹⁰⁴ with occasional references to other fragments—although apparent seams exist even within 1QM, between the overview of column 1, and then significant repetition in columns 2-14 and 15-19 suggesting two strands of tradition.¹⁰⁵

The Dead Sea Scrolls contribute important information about Second Temple Judaism. The particular circumstances of their preservation and discovery do not of themselves indicate an eccentric perspective uncharacteristic within the diversity of Judaism. Recent research into the Qumran site's archaeology, as well as the observation that many of the scrolls appear to predate the settlement and therefore to originate elsewhere,¹⁰⁶ suggest a community at Qumran may not have been as isolated as some scholarship has presumed.¹⁰⁷ The texts included in the Dead Sea Scrolls collection are diverse. Although I draw occasionally on other texts (particularly 1QpHab and 1QSa), the focus will remain on the War Scroll. The War Scroll's longer treatment, explicit references to history from the

¹⁰³ Numerous studies debate which of the texts should be included as versions of the same text. See Alexander 2003:19-20, 29-30; Schultz 2009; Vermes 1997:162, 184-6.

¹⁰⁴ Davies argues that, given the unclear relationships with the seven other texts sometimes attributed to the War Scroll, the designation should be reserved for 1QM (Davies 2000b:365).

¹⁰⁵ Vermes 1997:162, 184-86. See Schultz 2009. While some have maintained that the final form of the text is original (Alexander 2003:28), others have presented various hypotheses as to the history of the text's redaction. See Collins 1995 for source-critical solutions to these problems. Davies' doctoral dissertation provides a detailed hypothesis about stages of its development, though see criticism in van der Woude 1998:12. For the history of scholarship on this and other points in relation to the War Scroll, see van der Woude 1998.

¹⁰⁶ See discussion in Meyers 2010:22-23.

¹⁰⁷ Meyers 2010:32. This is also supported by the Cairo Geniza manuscript of the Damascus document.

distant past to the future, and focus on divine and human activity portrayed as part of the events of the end, provide a valuable case study to fill out the picture of understandings of history.

Josephus's *Jewish War*—Josephus witnesses to the adaption of Hellenistic literary convention for communicating Jewish theological ideas, thereby offering a helpful reminder of the immersion of first-century Judaism in Hellenism. Josephus wrote his seven-volume¹⁰⁸ Greek historiography in the late 70s CE, tracing the events from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple and Titus's victory. Some elements indicate a non-Jewish intended audience, such as descriptions of Jewish practices.¹⁰⁹ But Josephus's explanations of the recent disasters as punishment for the Jewish people's sin and his emphasis on their need to repent to God and Rome, demonstrates an interest in persuading a Jewish audience as well. Josephus's apology in *Jewish War* thus operates in both directions and indicates a dual focus for his audience.

Josephus presents his own religious and military experience as evidence of his authority in the text—an authority which extends to his account of his own defection, leading to later

¹⁰⁸ Some suggest the seventh book, or some sections of it, may have been written later (Schwartz 2011:344). Josephus's works were preserved by Christian groups.

¹⁰⁹ See Sterling 1991:241, 302.

service to Vespasian.¹¹⁰ He writes under Roman benefaction, and the positive portrayal of Rome linked to some subtle hints of resistance is perhaps reminiscent of Polybius.¹¹¹ I have selected *Jewish War* as the case study text because of the rhetorical and pastoral focus of Josephus's explanation of the war, his account of prophecy, determinism, and human responsibility, and the central role he attributes to his own character. However, I will make some reference to his other works, especially *Jewish Antiquities*, as helpful in illuminating *Jewish War*. Similarities between Josephus's and Luke's projects are frequently noted.¹¹² As borne out by the following chapters, Josephus's combination of (Deuteronomistic) explanations for the past, hope for the (perhaps distant) future, and encouragement of certain attitudes in the present make him an important conversation partner for Luke.

4 Ezra—Like 2 Baruch (below), 4 Ezra is an apocalypse which offers theological reflection on the destruction of Jerusalem. The writers of both texts spell out their conceptions of history explicitly in *vaticinia ex eventu* historical reviews. Although set in a literary present of the period following the first destruction of the temple in 586 BCE, the historical setting for both texts is patently the period following the destruction of Jerusalem and the second

¹¹⁰ See Gray 1993:37.

¹¹¹ Gruen 2011:153.

¹¹² Cf. Crabbe 2015; Sterling 1991; Squires 1993.

temple in 70 CE. There is a general consensus that the texts come before the Bar Kokhba uprising;¹¹³ 4 Ezra is normally dated approximately 100CE¹¹⁴ and 2 Baruch shortly after.¹¹⁵

4 Ezra was most likely first written in Hebrew, though it is extant only in secondary and tertiary translations.¹¹⁶ It comprises seven episodes. Although a Jewish text, it has been preserved through Christian traditions, most obviously affecting the text through explicitly Christian additions at the beginning and end (5 and 6 Ezra respectively).¹¹⁷ The first three episodes are dialogues between the pseudonymous legal scribe, Ezra, and an angelic interpreter, Uriel, and the remaining four are visions, all but the last of which are also interpreted by Uriel. The final episode describes an encounter with a voice from a bush, and Ezra's instruction direct from the Lord. The history of interpretation of 4 Ezra is divided over the relationship between the voices of Ezra, Uriel, and the view affirmed by the writer, as well as the relationship between the perspectives described in each episode.¹¹⁸ I take the view that Ezra's grief is transformed as he comes to see the present

¹¹³ Henze 2008:206.

¹¹⁴ Metzger 1983:520.

¹¹⁵ Klijn 1983:617.

¹¹⁶ Stone 1990:10. Occasionally I draw on one of these languages where it will illuminate discussion.

¹¹⁷ Exercising caution about other possible Christian interpolations is necessary; for instance, see questionable references to the messianic figure as "my son" (4 Ezra 13.32, 37). On the impact of Christian transmission of 4 Ezra, see Bergren 1996:102-13.

¹¹⁸ Since Brandenburger 1981 and Harnisch 1969, interpreters have questioned where the author's voice is found in 4 Ezra. Possibilities considered include Ezra, Uriel, or some merging of the two, whether as two sides of an individual's concerns (Gunkel 1990), dialectical tensions resolved through differences of temporal perspective (Barclay 2015:280-308), or airing the theological questions of a community (Hogan 2008:4). Hogan argues that the views represent dialogue with sages from the wisdom traditions, specifically that expounded in 4QInstruction (p.36). In addition,

from the view of the future,¹¹⁹ but his lament across the episodes contributes in important ways to the perspective affirmed by the writer. Although overlooked in treatments of Luke/Acts due to genre differences, 4 Ezra provides a crucial conversation partner, given the writer's teleological view of history and sustained engagement with questions of divine and human agency in explaining the events of the past and portrayal of hope for the future.

2 Baruch—A relationship between 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch clearly exists, whether direct dependence or mediated via a shared source.¹²⁰ Second Baruch offers a more conservative interpretation of Jerusalem's destruction, in which Deuteronomistic understandings of the disaster as just divine punishment for sin, within a deterministic eschatological framework, both justify God's action and affirm restoration in an eschatological future for a privileged elect.¹²¹ The most likely explanation is that 2 Baruch was written to counter 4 Ezra or the type of views presented in 4 Ezra.¹²² Second Baruch also describes a pseudonymous scribe, here Jeremiah's scribe Baruch, experiencing visions which are interpreted variously by the Lord or by an angel, Ramael. The fully extant Syriac manuscript claims to be a translation

interpreters frequently note a turning point in Ezra's perspective as the episodes progress, normally associated with the fourth episode (Najman 2014:136).

¹¹⁹ See also Barclay 2015:302-3, though for Barclay this transition involves recognising that the justice of God requires that, in that future, mercy for the unrighteous (opponents) is no longer possible (pp.307-8).

¹²⁰ Note, for instance, cross-references in standard editions of 2 Baruch, such as Klijn 1983 or Stone and Henze 2013. Sparks also notes similarities in Ps-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, which he suggests supports the possibility of another source or theological approach upon which they both draw (Sparks 1984:838).

¹²¹ Henze 2008:201-15.

¹²² Klijn argues the differences suggest a common source is more likely (Klijn 1983:620).

from a Greek text; a Greek fragment found at Oxyrhynchus supports this claim.¹²³ Second Baruch comprises chapters recounting Jerusalem's destruction, Baruch's lament, and a series of apocalyptic visions Baruch experiences and their interpretations (chps 1-77), with an attached letter to the "nine and a half tribes of the dispersion" (78-87). Second Baruch makes an important contribution to this study through its portrayal of the shape of history, shared explicitly with 4 Ezra, coupled with its contrasting approach to divine and human agency as it draws differently on earlier traditions.

3.2 Texts omitted from detailed discussion

By necessity, many texts are not included in this study. Some earlier texts fall outside the scope of texts for detailed treatment but will still be addressed at times due to their influence on the later texts under discussion. Such texts fall into three categories. First, work by earlier Greek writers such as Thucydides, Homer, and Hesiod will occasionally be relevant given later writers deliberately evoke these texts.¹²⁴ Secondly, OT texts provide important background, given their crucial theological contributions to later texts that emerge from Jewish traditions. And similarly, earlier (canonical and non-canonical) apocalypses with historical reviews, namely Daniel and 1 Enoch's *Apocalypse of Weeks* and

¹²³ Klijn 1983:616. See also *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 3 (1903) §403:3-7. A fully extant Arabic manuscript also depends on the Syriac (Klijn 1983:616).

¹²⁴ Although illuminating background, it is important to view these earlier texts separately, particularly given significant shifts away from portraying the gods' involvement in history in later texts. These changes render the synchronic treatment of studies such as Uytanlet 2014 less effective.

Animal Apocalypse will be discussed at times; the reception and reinterpretation of these apocalypses is important not only in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, but also for writers like Josephus.

Some other texts would also fill out the variety of conceptions of history evidenced in texts of the chosen period, but unfortunately there is not space in this study for their inclusion.

I initially sampled a much larger collection of texts before selecting the key texts above.

A number of Graeco-Roman texts would have provided further insights into conceptions of history in this period, including Strabo's *Geography* and Pliny's *Natural History*, both wide-ranging texts reflecting Stoic interests,¹²⁵ the former with an explicit interest in writing for an "educated," non-specialist audience.¹²⁶ The more sceptical views of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* or Lucan's *Civil War* would have provided additional insights, as also would Lucian's satirical treatment *How to Write History*, although much of the latter criticises historians' approaches to the writing of historiography itself and thus generic concerns. Other historiographies, such as those by Livy or Dionysius of Halicarnassus frequently feature as comparisons in Lukan studies. However, in selecting non-Jewish texts frequently compared to Luke/Acts, I have chosen Diodorus over other, in some ways similar, texts like Dionysius, as well as Polybius (Greek) and Tacitus's (Latin) *Histories*. For a more popular perspective, I have chosen Valerius Maximus for the reasons described

¹²⁵ Elvers 2008:865; Sallmann 2007:387.

¹²⁶ Elvers 2008:866.

above over a writer like Strabo. And I have chosen Virgil's *Aeneid* as an example of epic, because of the important insights Virgil's teleological view of history provides alongside teleological Jewish texts. I have also deliberately excluded formal philosophical texts due to a preference for texts which indicate their conceptions of history in less systematic ways in the course of other narratives or purposes.

Likewise within the variety of Judaism in this period, a number of further valuable contributions could have been included to good effect. Philo of Alexandria represents a rather unique voice within Jewish writers of the period and his philosophical approach to biblical interpretation and political aspects of his life experience would illuminate contemporaneous understandings of history. Similarly, canonical and non-canonical wisdom texts would provide further insights, as would the fragmentary Jewish Hellenistic historians such as Demetrius and Eupolemus. However, within the constraints of this study, I have prioritised Josephus's contribution to Jewish Hellenistic traditions over both Philo and the fragmentary historians, because of important similarities and differences to Luke in his conception of history, frequent engagement with his work in Lukan studies, and assertion that he represents the peak of this tradition of Jewish Hellenistic historiography.¹²⁷ For some balance with a different historiographical perspective, I have chosen 2 Maccabees. For the reasons stated above I have chosen the War Scroll as the case study from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and prioritised 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch because their

¹²⁷ Rajak 1986:124-45.

historical reviews provide important and contrasting insights into conceptions of history for Luke's setting.

Thus, the texts that have been chosen for detailed discussion represent a range of views of history from among the broader collection of texts initially sampled. They include texts frequently cited in connection to Luke/Acts and some unusual in NT studies. And, as they fill out the range of understandings of history in Luke's broader context, they each contribute in different ways to illuminating eschatology in Luke/Acts.

3.3 General approach to Luke/Acts

Finally, a few further comments about my approach to Luke/Acts are warranted. Throughout this study I deal with Luke/Acts as a literary unity. Despite recent challenges prompted by the absence of material unity of Luke and Acts in manuscript evidence,¹²⁸ I consider the continuity in narrative, prefaces, parallel themes, and so on, too great to indicate a different author.¹²⁹ Reading Luke and Acts together will illuminate both.¹³⁰ I do however use the designation Luke/Acts (rather than Cadbury's emphatic Luke-Acts)¹³¹ in

¹²⁸ Rowe 2007:449-57; Gregory and Rowe 2010:43-49.

¹²⁹ Johnson 2010:66-69.

¹³⁰ Bockmuehl suggests an illuminating dialectic emerges from attending to both the place of Luke and Acts in their reception(s) in the church, and their literary relationships to each other (Bockmuehl 2010:72).

¹³¹ Cadbury 1958:10-11.

recognition that, at least on the basis of extant manuscripts, the earliest readers do not appear to have received the text as a contiguous whole.¹³²

In terms of synoptic relationships, I presume Markan priority, and take care with material shared by Matthew and Luke over Mark—though I do not rely heavily on conclusions arising from claims to redaction from either a Q-source or Luke’s editing of Matthew. Indeed, Conzelmann’s focus on redaction criticism was one of the difficulties with his analysis, as he problematically presumed that redaction indicated material about which Luke felt more strongly.¹³³ This fallacy overlooks the core material shared between the Synoptics, and downplays continuity between them. I therefore focus on reading Luke as a narrative, with due attention to synoptic parallels, but without allowing these parallels to overshadow the way passages function in Luke’s account.

I date Luke in the decades after 70 CE and Acts shortly following, both before the turn of the century,¹³⁴ and I treat both parts of the work as historiography, though aware of some difficulties with this designation.¹³⁵ In general I use the Nestle-Aland 28 composite text,

¹³² Rowe 2007:450; cf. Gregory 2007:459-72.

¹³³ See discussion in Ellis 1972a:106; Maddox 1982:100-157; cf. Conzelmann 1960; and criticism in Minear 1966:121.

¹³⁴ Contra those who support a second-century date for Acts (cf. Pervo 2006).

¹³⁵ There is not space here to rehearse the debates on the genre of Luke/Acts. I am persuaded that the two-part work exhibits the features of historiography (for a summary, see Keener 2012-2015:90-115) and would raise expectations associated with historiography in first-century readers, though this is more pronounced in the second volume with the extended focus on speeches. In the Gospel, Luke

though I recognise certain criticisms of this text, particularly given the different manuscript traditions of Acts, and occasionally refer, for instance, to the text from Codex Bezae where this is illuminating.¹³⁶ Finally, I refer to the authorial voice 'Luke' without making particular claims about the historical author (as I do also in relation to the authors of the other texts treated). Rather, I use the name to indicate the author implied by the text, seeking to read from the perspective of an ideal, 'competent,' first-century reader, as discussed above.

4. The aspects of history discussed in the following chapters

Therefore, I argue that texts share a range of features in common, not all of which should be attributed to genre. In particular, features such as portrayals of the shape and end of history, and divine and human agency in history, transcend genre. Texts of different genres can imply the same 'world,' while texts of the same genre may not, making the cross-genre approach of this study not only possible but necessary, given the themes with which it is concerned.

Chapters 3 to 6 address different elements of the understanding of history portrayed in the case study texts and Luke/Acts, namely: (3) The direction and shape of history; (4)

clearly responds to the sources shared with the Synoptics, which affects the episodic nature of the narrative.

¹³⁶ See Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger 2004-2009. Also discussion in Penner 2004:242-3.

Determinism and divine guidance of history; (5) Human culpability and freedom; and (6) The present and the end of history. The diverse interactions between these varied themes across the texts illuminate Luke's explanation of the events of the past, hope for the future, and call for response in the present—clarifying Lukan eschatology and its effects.

Chapter 3: The direction and shape of history

It is impossible to get from writers who deal with particular episodes a general view of the whole process of history. For how by the bare reading of events in Sicily or in Spain can we hope to learn and understand either the magnitude of the occurrences or the thing of greatest moment...

—Polybius, *The Histories*, 8.2.2-3

1. Introduction: the importance of schemas of history

This chapter begins the investigation into how understandings of history in diverse texts of the Graeco-Roman period illuminate Lukan eschatology. It asks how the *direction* and *shape* of history in the study's key texts clarify the schema of history in Luke/Acts.¹ By considering the relationship between history and eschatology in writers' schemas of history, the chapter addresses a crucial controversy in Lukan studies. As set out in detail in Chapter 1, Hans Conzelmann influentially argued that Luke's concern at the parousia's delay led him to focus on salvation history *instead of* eschatology.² In a move that would shape Lukan studies and reflect conflict in other areas of NT interpretation,³ he claimed that texts could not deal with both history and eschatology but rather a focus on one precluded the other.⁴

¹ On the definitions of 'history' and 'historiography' used throughout this thesis, see Chapter 1.

² Conzelmann 1960:14,131-2; Conzelmann 1987:xliv.

³ On studies that set 'apocalyptic' Paul against an understanding of salvation history, see below.

⁴ By the time of writing his commentary on Acts, in which he argues the "view of history" from the Gospel is "presupposed," Conzelmann also identifies this shift as one of ecclesiology: "the polity of the earliest Christian community cannot be retained" (Conzelmann 1987:xliv).

The following treatment of key texts demonstrates that this is a false dichotomy. The writers of several of the texts under discussion hold history and eschatology together in a *teleological* schema of history, that is, a view that history follows a linear shape and draws to some sort of conclusion at its end.⁵ These writers are interested in *both* the nature of history and its periods over time *and* the events of the end, and portray these as related in essential ways. In particular, many ground their claims about the events to take place at the end of history in their assertions about divine guidance over time since creation.⁶ For example, the writers of *Urzeit zu Endzeit* apocalypses such as 2 Bar 53-76 display an almost scientific interest⁷ in the periods of history since creation, while simultaneously asserting that the divine determinism that has structured the course of history in the past guarantees the promised culmination of history and vindication of the righteous which is imminently anticipated.

⁵ This chapter discusses the end or *telos* of history in the sense of an *endpoint* to history, and teleological in terms of a *linear trajectory that leads to an end*. However, even texts which are non-teleological in this sense can display a sense of *purpose* to history. The *OED* defines “telos” in English as “the end, purpose, ultimate object or aim.” A similar range of meanings emerges from the use of τέλος in Greek texts (see the extensive study of meanings and etymology by Waanders 1983:232-239, especially the diagram on p.239). The semantic field of the Greek term, which includes the temporal point “marking the end of a duration,” last stage of a process (conclusion), or goal or outcome to which a process is pointed (BDAG:998), raises potentially significant implications for instance in 2 Macc 6.15, where the writer could mean the fullness of sin, the end of a person’s lifetime, or the end of history (see below). Furthermore, in some Greek texts τέλος may indicate the end of a historiographical work, or of history itself, or the fulfilment of some purpose. See below for discussion on this point in Polybius.

⁶ Attributions of divine and human agency in history are explored in Chapters 4 and 5.

⁷ Cf. also 4 Ezra 7.78-101. This interest is particularly pronounced in 1 Enoch’s historical apocalypses (*Apocalypse of Weeks* and *Animal Apocalypse*).

Most importantly, in contrast to Conzelmann's hypothesis, the presence of periodisation in these schemas of history does not reflect any lack of interest in the end or diminished expectation of its imminence.⁸ This study's writers also envisage history itself as not simply a continuous uniformity but divided into periods. Writers attach varying degrees of significance to this periodisation, from simply practical divisions between different eras or political administrations to cataclysmic transitions in history. In this way, the writers balance concerns about *rupture* and *continuity* in history.⁹ Arguably, it is this feature that has animated the dichotomy between history and eschatology in NT studies. For instance, studies of Pauline literature have often caricatured apocalypses with a 'two-age' model, overlooking any interest in earlier periods of history in Jewish apocalypses and importing an 'apocalyptic eschatology' based entirely on rupture into their interpretation of Paul.¹⁰ Conzelmann brought the opposite emphasis to Lukan studies, stressing continuity across Luke's history and identifying periodisation as a method of

⁸ Chapter 6 discusses the timing of the end in these texts.

⁹ Mermelstein offers a compelling analysis of remedies for the sense of rupture in history employed by post-exilic texts. He particularly highlights an emphasis on tracing Israel's history from creation rather than from Sinai, so as to stress continuity in divine faithfulness and address the fear that exile might mark the end of the covenant (Mermelstein 2014:11-13).

¹⁰ These themes run throughout key strands of Pauline scholarship. See, for instance, discussion in Käsemann 1971, Martyn 1997, Wright 2013:1034-96. Gaventa 2013 represents a collation of recent views. Important responses to these themes may be found in Stuckenbruck 2014a; Stuckenbruck 2016. Stuckenbruck 2014b particularly critiques the simplification of the schema of history in apocalypses into a 'two-age' model.

extending history, while the disruption of the end is postponed to an irrelevant future.¹¹

In this study, I seek to overcome problems with the simplistic elements of both of these approaches in my analysis of Luke/Acts.¹²

Importantly, any treatment of these questions requires attention to the particular ways in which features such as periodisation, patterns of rising and falling empires, and/or a teleological shape of history interact in any given text. This is evident in the criticism above of caricatures of ‘apocalyptic eschatology’ that misrepresent the central concerns of apocalypses. Moreover, considerable controversy has also arisen as a result of past scholarship in which labels such as ‘cyclical’ and ‘linear’ were associated with implicit judgements about primitive or sophisticated views of history. Not only Cullmann¹³ but also writers such as Taubes, Löwith, and Eliade¹⁴ frequently made a blanket division between Graeco-Roman conceptions of time as circular and Jewish and Christian as linear.¹⁵ That later scholars have received such treatments as simplistic readings of the Graeco-Roman texts is evident, among other works, in the summary of eschatologies

¹¹ Conzelmann 1960:97 and *passim*. This is partly also the concern behind Wolter’s recent claim that Conzelmann’s error was periodisation itself, as Luke envisages history as “one single overall history,” not three, or even two, parts (Wolter 2011:98).

¹² In many ways I echo Cullmann’s interpretation of a linear view of history (Cullmann 1962:57-8). See Chapter 1.

¹³ Cullmann 1962: 57-8.

¹⁴ Taubes 2009: 20-3; Löwith 1949:188-9; Eliade 2005:104.

¹⁵ See discussion in Edelstein 1967:xxi; Clarke 2008:14-17. Criticising the simplistic dichotomy, Momigliano calls attention to cyclical elements in Judeo-Christian festivals (Momigliano 1977b:184), and Barr similarly highlights Qohelet and some other Hebrew texts (Barr 1969:143-58).

provided by Cancik in the *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*.¹⁶ He attributes the earlier reductive views to post-war reactions,¹⁷ and examines a range of non-Jewish texts that he claims provide a teleological sense of “the end of the world, of history, and of the individual.”¹⁸

Indeed, the current chapter confirms that circular and linear features can interact in important ways in *both* Jewish and non-Jewish texts. For instance, the Dead Sea Scrolls have sharpened awareness of the importance of cyclical patterns in accounts of both past divine saving acts and practices of piety in the present, which are still portrayed within a linear progression to a final *telos*.¹⁹ Likewise the discussion of Virgil’s *Aeneid* below demonstrates circular patterns of recurrence within Virgil’s ultimately teleological view of historical progress. An appreciation for all of these features serves to clarify the implications of writers’ schemas of history and the traditions to which they relate,²⁰ without merely reducing texts to simplistic categories.

¹⁶ Cancik 1998:89-90.

¹⁷ Cancik 1998:90.

¹⁸ Cancik 1998:84.

¹⁹ Particular attention has been devoted to Peshar Habakkuk on these temporal questions, see for instance, Stuckenbruck 2007:124-49. On the end of days in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Collins 1997:80. Schwartz argues that 2 Maccabees offers a circular view of history (Schwartz 2009:119-20), but I suggest below that, despite the strong sense of continuity and return to divine favour at the end of 2 Maccabees, the writer does hint at an eventual end to history. See below.

²⁰ For instance, see the reference to traditions of decline in Roman historiography below.

Finally, schemas of history may be characterised not only by periodisation and the inclusion of an endpoint to history, but by assumptions about the *direction* of history. For some writers, for instance, history progresses—that is, things improve over time—as the needs humans encounter prompt the development of new skills or people learn from mistakes of the past.²¹ For others, nostalgia²² or suffering²³ signal history's decline, or, alternatively, beliefs about the universality of human traits and situations suggest that, though history continues, things remain essentially the same.²⁴ These elements affect the texts in fundamental ways. For instance, writers that portray improvement in history elicit particular assumptions about the people of the past and hope for the future, while descriptions of history in decline can approach nihilism,²⁵ or—where such decline fits within a schema of history in which an endpoint is anticipated—the decline itself can constitute the precursor to divine action that will bring about a final *telos*.²⁶

Therefore this chapter explores the schema of history reflected in each of the key texts of the dissertation, first considering texts which do not indicate an endpoint to history

²¹ See discussion of Polybius and Diodorus Siculus (§2.1).

²² Nostalgia is evident in Tacitus's understanding of decline (see §2.3), though it can also be present in different ways—see Josephus (§3.2) and Virgil (§3.1).

²³ This features in Second Temple texts such as apocalypses (§3.3).

²⁴ See discussion of Valerius Maximus (§2.2).

²⁵ Ovid's cynical presentation of the continued decline of history, in which ironically only the writer endures (*Metam.* 15.871-9), offers an interesting parallel to the decline in teleological texts such as Jewish apocalypses—as it does also as a response to Virgil's account of progress (Hejduk 2009:52; Kenney 2009:144).

²⁶ See §3.3.

before turning to those which do. For each category, I consider texts which suggest history is generally progressing positively, remaining constant, or declining. The diverse perspectives enable a comparison to Luke/Acts, to which I turn in the final section of the chapter. The comparison highlights that, as in the vast majority of texts, history in Luke/Acts is *periodised*—that is, comprised of ages or epochs. Further, in keeping with a subset of both Jewish and non-Jewish Hellenistic texts, it is also *teleological*—that is, it follows a linear shape that draws to some sort of conclusion at its end. Thus the chapter demonstrates the essential connection between history and eschatology for writers who draw on teleological understandings of history, including Luke. Finally, this chapter also confirms that those texts with which Luke/Acts shares greatest generic similarity, and hence with which it is most likely to be compared in contemporary studies, are not those with which Luke’s schema of history is most closely aligned.²⁷

2. Texts without a sense of an endpoint to history

Several of this study’s key texts indicate expectations that history will continue without an end. However, the significance attributed to particular periods is shaped in turn by further features of their schemas of history, from the scope of history imagined by a writer, to beliefs about progress or moral decline, or the continuity of human conditions

²⁷ Even those texts frequently compared to Luke/Acts are not generally used to address these questions. Josephus’s *Jewish War* represents a key example, which is often used as a comparison of rhetorical or generic features (Vogel 2009; Sterling 1991; Rothschild 2004; Uytanlet 2014), but not of his understanding of history and its end. See §3.2.

in all times and places. The following addresses texts in relation to each of these features in turn.

2.1 Hints of positive progress in history

Polybius and Diodorus Siculus provide historiographies frequently considered in relation to Luke/Acts, normally with a focus on rhetorical or generic features. For both, though for different reasons, history progresses over time,²⁸ even though empires rise and fall.²⁹ However, whereas Polybius stresses the significance of Rome's moment, Diodorus maintains a broader scope and moral interest in the factors that govern the course of history.

Polybius's Histories

Written in the second century BCE,³⁰ Polybius's *Histories* focus on the rise of Rome. Clarke notes that Polybius structures time in periods according to Olympiads (beginning in the 129th Olympiad) and the reigns of particular rulers (1.5.1; cf. 11.1.1; 39.8.6).³¹ Polybius

²⁸ For general discussion of historical progress in classical texts, particularly in accounts of scientific advance, contrasted with traditional portrayals of decline, see Edelstein 1967:xxxiii and *passim*; Dodds 1973:1-25.

²⁹ Momigliano outlines ancient writers, such as Seneca and Florus, who illustrate the stages of an empire's reign with the human life cycle, underscoring the natural process of rise, fall, and transition to the next regime (Momigliano 1983:136). Diodorus suggests Pythagoreans used the stages of human life as an analogy for seasons, but not history (10.9.5; cf. Clarke 2008:16).

³⁰ See Chapter 2 for further background information on each text.

³¹ Clarke 2008:114-15. Polybius follows Timaeus in periodising by Olympiad (p.109-121).

begins by outlining the movement between earlier empires (1.2.1-6), which he notes have been the focus of other historians' efforts, so as to demonstrate the superiority of the Romans, who he says have "subjected to their rule not portions, but nearly the whole of the world, and possess an empire which is not only immeasurably greater than any which preceded it, but need not fear rivalry in the future" (1.2.1, 7-8).³²

For Polybius, with the rise of Rome under the guidance of τύχη (a notoriously varied force in Polybius, as discussed in Chapter 4), history itself has been unified as a single body:

Previously the doings of the world had been, so to say, dispersed, as they were held together by no unity of initiative, results, or locality; but ever since this date (ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων τῶν καιρῶν)³³ history (ἱστορία) has been an organic whole (σωματοειδῆ), and the affairs (πραξις) of Italy and Africa have been interlinked with those of Greece and Asia, all leading up to one end (τέλος). (1.3.3-4)

On Polybius's account, Rome's comprehensive dominance has made universal or "general" historiography not only possible, but necessary (8.2.2-3). This also relates to Polybius's understanding of the historian's role and his own project.³⁴ He writes "for the sake of the improvement of the readers of this history" (1.35.6), with a particular focus on political and military strategies and their outcomes.³⁵ He affirms that insights provided by

³² This is as reconstructed by Paton, Walbank, and Habicht 1923.

³³ On "these times" or the idea of the "now," see Chapter 6.

³⁴ Dodds 1973:18.

³⁵ Walbank 2007:350-1.

comprehensive accounts of the past are widely generalizable (1.35.6-10), and require that material be set “under one synoptical view,” in order for readers to understand the significance of the events of Rome’s period (1.4.3). For Polybius, history’s progress is manifest not only in the unprecedented achievements of Rome’s rise, but in the historian’s work of facilitating readers learning from the past and avoiding future error.³⁶

However, even for Polybius, Rome takes its place in the succession of empires.³⁷ This is evident in his recognition of earlier periods prior to Rome (1.2.1-6, noted above). And he recalls an earlier prophecy by Demetrius of Phalerum, providing a none too subtle clue that, even at the height of an empire when it seems most unlikely, one may still be assured that this empire too will fall:

Do you think that fifty years ago either the Persians and the Persian king or the Macedonians and the king of Macedon, if some god (τις θεῶν) had foretold the future (προύλεγε τὸ μέλλον) to them, would ever have believed that at the time when we live (τοῦτον τὸν καιρόν), the very name of the Persians would have perished utterly—the Persians who were masters of almost the whole world—and that the Macedonians, whose name was formerly most unknown, would now be the lords of it all? (29.21.4)³⁸

³⁶ Marincola 2007:123; Dodds 1973:1-25.

³⁷ Momigliano 1983:139-41.

³⁸ This material from Polybius is reproduced by Diodorus at 31.10.

Thus Polybius also hints that the current empire will likewise come to an end.³⁹

Polybius's account of Scipio's sombre observation at the fall of Carthage, as preserved in fragments given in Book 38, likewise alludes to future transitions:⁴⁰

Turning round to me at once and grasping my hand Scipio said, 'A glorious moment (καλὸν μὲν), Polybius; but I have a dread foreboding (ἐγὼ δέδια καὶ προορῶμαι) that some day the same doom will be pronounced upon my own country (περὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πατρίδος).' (38.21.1-2; cf. 38.22.2)⁴¹

Polybius's understanding of both the uniqueness of Rome and the ongoing succession of empires highlights the importance of the scale of history envisioned by a writer. As in the quotation with which this chapter began, Polybius criticises historians who limit attention to particular episodes or places (8.2.2-3; cf. 1.4.6-10). But his own account focuses on one empire (however grand), whereas, for instance, the "universal" scope of Diodorus Siculus's historiography or the *Urzeit zu Endzeit* overview of 2 Baruch 53-76, expand well beyond Polybius's limits.⁴² Nonetheless, even within these limits, Polybius retains the sense that history itself continues.⁴³ The events he relates may lead up to

³⁹ Gruen argues that this is part of a subtle resistance from Polybius, who began by admiring the feats of Rome until his homeland fell (Gruen 2011:153). He makes parallel observations of Polybius and Josephus in this respect, as recipients of Rome's benefaction who at the same time wrote histories with subtle hints of an end to Rome's dominance (pp.160-161).

⁴⁰ Gruen 2011:159.

⁴¹ The second account, preserved in Appian's *Punica* 132, also explicitly refers to the succession of four empires between Assyria, Media, Persia, and Macedonia (Polyb. *Hist.* 38.22.2). On comparisons between the different extant versions of this story and manuscript conditions, see Walbank 1957:3.722-5.

⁴² On the development of universal historiographies from Ephorus of Cyme, see Clarke 2008:96-109, 130. Hernadi includes the "scope" or horizon of the writer's imagination in his account of the "world evoked" by the text (Hernadi 1972:171-2).

⁴³ See Grethlein 2013:227.

“one end (τέλος)” (1.3.4), but this is the conclusion of the significant events he has claimed need to be included in his account (cf. 1.4.2-3; 1.14.1), not the terminus of history itself. Polybius is clear that he continues the work of other historians, as he may expect others to carry on after him.⁴⁴

Thus, Polybius shares the common expectation that different regimes will rise and fall while offering no indication that such a pattern is itself expected to reach a *telos*. Through the work of τύχη and the historian, history progresses, epitomised by the present time’s achievement of unity under Rome. But, though this period constitutes the focus of Polybius’s own work, and even if a rival to Rome is not yet imminent (1.2.8) and the grand achievement of Rome is unparalleled to date (1.4.1-5), Rome itself is not the end of history.⁴⁵ As exemplified by Scipio’s comment and the account of Demetrius’s prophecy, Polybius anticipates a continuation of the pattern of new dominant regimes, each replaced in turn by the next.

⁴⁴ Walbank 1957:1.43.

⁴⁵ Grethlein argues the endpoint to Polybius’s story dominates his account. This kind of ‘teleology’ is a retrospective narrative technique, which ensures that readers interpret all of the events recounted in light of the end to which they will lead. But Grethlein does not suggest that Polybius is ‘teleological’ in the sense that he believes Rome is the end of history (Grethlein 2013:225).

Diodorus Siculus's Library of History

Although likewise presenting a schema in which history progresses positively but does not anticipate an endpoint, Diodorus Siculus means something quite different by “universal” historiography. As Anne Burton observes, Diodorus would dismiss Polybius’s claims that historiography generally limited to one empire could meet the definition.⁴⁶ By contrast, written during the Late Republican period, Diodorus’s *Library* extends from mythological narratives until the mid- to late 50s BCE,⁴⁷ claiming to incorporate “all events that have taken place in the known parts of the inhabited world (οἰκουμένης)” (1.6.2; cf. 19.1.10).

For Diodorus, as for other writers of this study’s key texts, history is periodised. He marks time in terms of Olympiads and periods of rule by named magistrates,⁴⁸ and uses *καιρός* and *χρόνος* to designate eras. For instance, his introductory overview divides his account into periods from before Troy, then Troy until Alexander’s death, and then the events of the expansion of Rome into Britain (1.4.6-7),⁴⁹ which he also calculates in terms of Olympiads and years for the periods following the Trojan War (1.5.1; cf. 13.1.2-3).⁵⁰ Diodorus notes, however, that one cannot “fix with any strictness” the boundaries of the

⁴⁶ Burton 1972:38.

⁴⁷ Diodorus gives his own structure to the history in 1.4.6-1.5.1. See Chapter 2 above.

⁴⁸ Clarke 2008:130-31; cf. pp.109-21.

⁴⁹ Cf. also 1.3.3-6.

⁵⁰ On counting time from Troy, see Clarke 2008:124-25.

periods before the Trojan War, due to lack of a “trustworthy chronological table” (1.4.5).⁵¹

Diodorus shapes his narrative particularly through his interest in the moral utility of historiography. On this basis he claims for historians the role of “ministers of divine providence (προνοίας)” (1.1.3).⁵² Likewise, they are tasked with explaining “the changes in τύχη” (18.59.6).⁵³ As divine providence has set and guided the universe and human nature, so historians bring together events into one narrative of the past, and thereby facilitate human progress. Here progress is made not, as for Polybius, through anecdotes to improve military strategy, but through the benefit of moral guidance from the past. According to Diodorus, the greatest benefit is thus derived from exemplars (both those to emulate and to avoid, cf. 37.4)⁵⁴ from the broadest range of times and geographical settings, for:

a knowledge of history is of the greatest utility for every conceivable circumstance of life. For it endows the young with the wisdom of the aged, while for the old it multiplies the experience which they already possess (1.1.4-5).

⁵¹ Diodorus explicitly recognises the different demands for dealing with mythological material (1.5.1; 1.6.1).

⁵² See also Chapter 4.

⁵³ Sacks 1990:41.

⁵⁴ Sacks 1990:24-5. See Sacks 1990 for discussion of the different views in antiquity on including negative as well as positive examples (pp.28-29).

As for Polybius, for Diodorus universal historiography enables readers to see as a whole rather than unnaturally divided parts.⁵⁵

According to Diodorus, questions of moral utility also account for the transitions within history.⁵⁶ Thus, the cause of regime change lies in consistent human failings; an empire's downfall reliably ensues when, having become accustomed to power, its rulers become complacent and treat their subjects harshly (cf. 19.1.1-8; 37.29.5-37.30.2).⁵⁷ As he follows Polybius as his source in Books 28-32,⁵⁸ Diodorus adds escalating Roman "greed" (31.26.2; cf. *Polyb. Hist.* 31.22). In the fragmentary later sections, Diodorus traces the tendency to immoderation through Persian, Macedonian, and Roman dominance (37.1.1-6). Having identified the pattern of rise and fall, Diodorus simply observes new phases of Roman tyranny (37.2-8; 37.3.1-4). He explains:

In days of old the Romans, by adhering to the best laws and customs, little by little became so powerful that they acquired the greatest and most splendid empire known to history. But in more recent times, when most nations had already been subjugated in war and there was a long period of peace, the ancient practices gave way at Rome to pernicious tendencies. (37.3.1)

⁵⁵ Diodorus's example of seeing the full living creature rather than unrelated parts (1.3.8), is similar to Polybius's example at 1.4.6-10, though their historiographies reflect different scales for determining the 'whole.'

⁵⁶ Sacks 1990:54. Τύχη also plays a complementary role in regime change (see Chapter 4).

⁵⁷ Sacks argues Diodorus applies this to myth, Egyptian, Median transitions, and "in nearly two dozen other circumstances spread throughout the *Bibliothēke*" (Sacks 1990:43).

⁵⁸ Sacks 1990:8.

Diodorus then leaves the reader to consider whether Rome seems inevitably likely to suffer the same fate.⁵⁹

For Diodorus, human history also progresses⁶⁰ through necessity (ὠφέλεια, 1.8.1-9),⁶¹ where skills (for example, speech) are developed as the need arises (in this case, humans working together in groups as defence against wild animals; 1.8.1-4).⁶² This accounts for human developments since a more primitive origin. When he describes the world's origins, Diodorus notes two alternate theoretical approaches: some believe the world had a point of origin and will lead to decay, and others that it is constant with no beginning or end (1.6.3).⁶³ But he endorses neither view explicitly and especially avoids any claim that the universe is moving toward decay.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Sacks suggests Diodorus was “ambivalent” about “imperial power” but believed Rome had “reached the point of terrorising its subjects” (Sacks 1990:52). Though it likely does not counteract this approach, it is worth bearing in mind that the portion of the *Library* that covers the latter part of the Republic is fragmentary (cf. Sacks 1990:47).

⁶⁰ Clarke suggests Diodorus sees history in decline, but she only cites passages about the loss of Roman virtue or decline of the Senate since the second century BCE (Book 8; 37.3-8; Clarke 2008:132-33), overlooking the broader picture. Conversely, Burton rightly emphasises the importance of progress for Diodorus, despite the rise and fall of empires (Burton 1972:48-49, 55-82).

⁶¹ Sacks argues that: “Three important forces or historical patterns help to shape Diodorus’s narrative: benefit, chance, and the decline of empires” (Sacks 1990:23). Stylianou claims that Diodorus’s emphasis on “chance and utility” is derived from his sources, though recognising that Diodorus nonetheless supports the view (Stylianou 1998:3-5).

⁶² Sacks 1990:57-8; Burton 1972:48-9.

⁶³ Dodds 1973:10-11; Edelstein 1967:140.

⁶⁴ The philosophical background on Diodorus’s cosmogony is unclear (Burton 1972:44-46). Oldfather labels Diodorus’s philosophy “eclectic” (Oldfather 1933-1967:28-29n.2).

Sacks observes that this cosmogony and anthropology puts Diodorus at odds with contemporaneous writers who present narratives of a golden age and the decay of empires. He argues that Diodorus deliberately avoids such views: “though the *Bibliothēke* is the greatest repository of utopian literature from antiquity, none of it is set in a Golden Age of the past.”⁶⁵ Rather, in Diodorus’s *Library* ‘utopias’ are simply located elsewhere during the same period, such as on an island, and actually remain imperfect (5.41.4, 42.4, 45.3, 46.1), or he hints that utopias are fictitious (2.55.1; 3.53.4-5).⁶⁶ Crucially, Sacks rightly claims that Diodorus “refuses to equate the material destiny of Rome in any way with the future well-being of civilisation.”⁶⁷

Thus, while for Diodorus history progresses, neither Rome nor any other moment realised or anticipated represents its end. Rather, divine providence (πρόνοια) “continually directs their [stars and humans’] courses through all eternity (ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα)” (1.1.3), with no further change anticipated. The *Library* leaves the reader with an impression of continuous progress in history, alongside exhortation to further moral improvement. Indeed, Diodorus argues history itself offers the motivation for upright life; heroic acts are exhorted on the basis of the fame accorded by history and public honour after death (“immortality of glory” [τῷ διὰ τῆς δόξης ἀθανατισμῶ], 1.1.5), in

⁶⁵ Sacks 1990:69.

⁶⁶ Sacks 1990:69n.69.

⁶⁷ Sacks 1990:82.

contrast to those who are immediately forgotten upon perishing (1.2.3), while making no claims about post-mortem rewards of any other kind.⁶⁸

Though Diodorus's schema of history is characterised by an overarching pattern of progress, it contains repeated elements in the constant rise and fall of political regimes. History is periodised. It progresses through necessity, and the historian plays a key role in supplying exemplars for moral improvement. But, while moral progress and more sophisticated responses to human need give history purpose, this process does not lead to any endpoint.⁶⁹

2.2 Steady continuation of history

Valerius Maximus's Memorable Doings and Sayings

Valerius Maximus simply implies that history continues in a constant fashion, without decline, progress, or anticipated end. Whereas traditions such as the *saeculum* festival presume a sense of continuity, even where history is clearly delineated into periods,⁷⁰ for

⁶⁸ See also, for instance, 2 Macc 6.44, which demonstrates a similar emphasis on good name and memory to exhort courage.

⁶⁹ Sacks asserts: "Rome is only 'the factual endpoint' of his history" (Sacks 1990:157).

⁷⁰ In the popular views underlying the Saeculum festival, history is comprised of successive periods or *saeculae* based on the natural lifespan of a city (on these periods, see Braund 1997:208-9; Galinsky 1996:101). It was believed that by careful ritual observance at the right moment, the city's lifespan could be extended (Cancik 1998:99-101). This is not a teleology as such, but a means by which the rotation through regimes can be maintained in the current position for a further period. The festival's necessity indicates an implicit threat: failure to celebrate properly will surely result, not in decline in history or its end, but in transition to the next empire in line.

Valerius, continuity in history stems from his implicit claim that people function in characteristic ways in all settings.⁷¹ Produced during Tiberius's reign, Valerius Maximus's compilation of *exempla* affirms: examples of human valour or failings, institutional errors, or vulnerability to fortune are relevant in any setting. Unlike that of Polybius or Diodorus Siculus, Valerius's treatment of the past is not an explanatory narrative of historical causes but a popular collection of Roman and non-Roman anecdotes arranged first by category, and then chronology. He makes no attempt to delineate broad movements of history.⁷² As Bloomer rightly notes, Valerius's purpose and form themselves reflect his static view of history.⁷³

Valerius's anecdotes deal with the past, both as commemoration⁷⁴ and moral lesson for the present (1.1.11; 3.7.praef, 3.8.6; 3.4.praef). His stories go back to earlier times, tracing for instance the actions of Romulus and Remus (1.4.praef; 3.2.praef, 3). But within his anecdotes he provides no sense of a development or decline in society, or in human behaviour. Unlike writers like Diodorus, Valerius chooses to keep his focus narrow,

⁷¹ In her work on popular morality, Morgan observes that ethical material deals with individuals without expanding to a view with corporate implications or sense of change over time (Morgan 2007:242).

⁷² In describing the ways Valerius expands upon his sources, Mueller identifies a tendency to focus on "personal conduct" with the result that the reader "views neither the sweep of history nor the character of the individual. Rather, one views the building blocks of human character." (Mueller 2002:176-7).

⁷³ Bloomer argues that Valerius's own narrative intrusions confirm this view of history, thus reflecting not simply his chosen form but also his view (Bloomer 1992:25).

⁷⁴ Bloomer 1992:146.

dismissing those who seek (impossibly) to encompass all of history (1.praef). In limited ways, some of Valerius's anecdotes incorporate a description over time, such as his treatment of social institutions in Book 2.⁷⁵ However, this does not contribute to any larger view of history and, though he recognises that particular changes take place, such as the loss of elections or battles (7.5), there is no pattern to this beyond human character.

Indeed, Valerius's approach to exempla in itself *relies* upon a certain stability of human experience in any context. He applies diverse stories as exempla, creating what Mueller describes as "a realm of universally and eternally valid paradigms."⁷⁶ As Bloomer observes:

Some continuity of past with present is essential for a historical exemplum to remain a valid means of argument: the reader or audience must have enough in common with the example so that the precedent still offers a basis for behaviour, for thought, or for action. Valerius' seamless vision of Roman history ensures the connection of past with present as his chapters' chronologically ordered series of exempla sweep the reader from distant times to the present while his rhetorical techniques, such as apostrophe, involve the audience, anachronistically, in the actions of the past.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ For instance, Valerius on the development of the secular games in 2.4.6, or material on trends in the senate in 2.2.6.

⁷⁶ Mueller 2002:176. See also Morgan 2007:244.

⁷⁷ Bloomer 1992:205.

Intensifying the timeless applicability of his anecdotes, Valerius generally removes any further detail which provided the context for his exempla in his sources. Naturally, he is aware of ideas of periodisation. Sometimes he refers to duration of time, such as “for many centuries (*saecula*)” (2.5.2; cf. 2.2.1a), people of “that epoch (*saeculi*)” (9.1.3), or events which take place in a particular “period (*temporis*)” (3.2.11). But his purpose obscures any clear affirmation of a periodised view of history. Occasionally, he frames his stories in a specific historical setting, such as “when Rome was captured by the Gauls” (1.1.10) or “in the Second Punic War” (1.4.3). But, as Mueller notes, frequently he removes additional detail that ties a story to its historical particularity, in the apparent interest of increasing its generalizability.⁷⁸

Valerius’s approach excludes any endpoint to history. Despite his glowing dedication to the Caesars (1.praef), Valerius’s understanding of history excludes any teleological view of the Roman empire⁷⁹—in fact he treats stories from the time of the Republic and imperial Rome uniformly, to the consternation of some interpreters.⁸⁰ Rather, having removed the context and generalised the details, he forces his anecdotes into a static view of human history. Indeed, Bloomer asserts that Valerius’s portrayal of “seamless” history is “similarly manipulative” to the representation of progress found in the statues

⁷⁸ Mueller 2002:176.

⁷⁹ Bloomer 1992:185.

⁸⁰ Cf. Bloomer 1992:206.

of Augustus's forum.⁸¹ He argues that Valerius's omission of a sense of causation or general movement of history must be deliberate, given the "historical self-consciousness" of Rome in this period, as evident in Valerius's sources such as Livy.⁸² Rather, excising his anecdotes from the narratives of his sources, Valerius presents a picture of continuous human triumph and strife.

2.3 Decline in history

Tacitus's Histories

By contrast, as Tacitus reflects back with several decades' hindsight, he suggests that the civil strife of 69 CE and the reigns of the Flavian emperors demonstrate the decline of the Roman empire since the Republic. This is at base a moral failure, manifest in the corruption, violence, and lack of liberty facilitated by the principate system, which may have been a necessary compromise to bring an end to civil war⁸³ but is far from the republican ideals about which Tacitus expresses nostalgia as a Roman elite.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Bloomer 1992:258.

⁸² Bloomer 1992:258. Lucian's satirical critique of the fashion of writing historiography in *How to Write History* confirms this historical consciousness. Not only Valerius's choice of form, but his selection of material, confirms his focus (Bloomer 1992:146).

⁸³ Syme 1958:1.206.

⁸⁴ See discussion in Sailor 2008:208, 213.

Like Polybius, Tacitus offers a deeply political historiography with an evident Roman focus, though for Polybius this consists in focusing on Rome's rise to dominance over other empires, whereas in Tacitus the Roman focus reflects a preoccupation with the events and individual characters *within* the empire, even where foreign wars are discussed.⁸⁵ Like Diodorus, Tacitus emphasises virtue. But, rather than Diodorus's attribution of transitions between empires to moral failure, Tacitus's picture of decline maintains a specifically Roman scope. Then again, unlike Virgil's *Aeneid*, which is discussed below, Tacitus's concentration on Rome does not evoke triumphalist *imperium sine fine*. Rather, his pessimistic assessment of human nature and the apparent decline of virtue, suggests a continuing pattern of Roman regimes under the tyranny of various *principes*, without anticipating an endpoint or goal.⁸⁶

Tacitus points to an underlying view of history as periodised, delineating epochs within Roman history such as the transition from the Republic to the principate.⁸⁷ And he affirms the general assumptions about periodisation in statements such as: "Italy was distressed by disasters unknown (*novis cladibus*) before or returning after the lapse of ages (*saeculorum seriem*)" (1.2.2).

⁸⁵ Tacitus also draws out characters' psychological motivations and the levers of power (Syme 1958:1.157).

⁸⁶ Quint considers Tacitus's (plainly negative) attitude to Augustus and his "blood-stained peace" (*Ann.* 1.10) in the reflections on Augustus's funeral, as a comparison to the seemingly more positive, even if sometimes ambiguous, view put forward in Virgil's *Aeneid* (Quint 1989:51-53).

⁸⁷ Sailor 2008:123.

This periodised pattern fits within an overarching trajectory of decline, which emerges from the beginning of *Histories*. Tacitus introduces the years recounted as “rich in disasters, terrible with battles, torn by civil struggles, horrible even in peace (*etiam pace saevum*)” (1.2.1). The reader is then thrown into an account whose focus on the key characters exemplifies the decay.⁸⁸ While Galba strives for noble service (1.13.2), his age and weakness (1.12, 16) complement attention to virtues that are out-dated (though valued by Tacitus) and certain to be unsuccessful in the new climate (1.18). Otho in turn is drawn in continuity with Nero, the “monstrous character (*immanitas*)” (1.16.2).⁸⁹ Tacitus parallels Otho and Nero in licentiousness (1.13, 22) and lack of discipline in the military (cf. 1.83-4).⁹⁰

While the corruption of the *princeps* and military exemplifies the decline, Tacitus also blames the people.⁹¹ He has Galba advise Piso, “Nero will always be missed by the worst citizens” (1.16.3). This, as in many of Tacitus’s narrative asides (cf. 4.1), supplies a general, pessimistic assessment of human nature.⁹² The narrative continues as it has begun.⁹³

⁸⁸ Tacitus attempts to establish his independence, despite his senior position within Flavian regimes, claiming to transcend all of the regimes which he will treat in turn (1.1).

⁸⁹ The description is taken from Galba’s speech to Piso, but Tacitus appears to support Galba’s assessment.

⁹⁰ Further examples in Syme 1958:1.169.

⁹¹ On Tacitus’s understanding of historians’ role in this decline see Sailor 2008:123; cf. Williams 1978:49, 283.

⁹² See Chapter 5 on the role of human freedom and culpability in explaining the events of history.

⁹³ Indeed, for Tacitus the principate system is itself corrupt (Syme 1958:1.208; Sailor 2008:191).

The first three books describe decline as they report the events of 69 CE,⁹⁴ and even Vitellius's death is described as "rather the end of war than the beginning of peace" (4.1.1; cf. 4.1.3). At the beginning of Vespasian's rule, Tacitus becomes more positive, though indications are that the consecutive Flavians bring about further decline.⁹⁵

In the *Annals* (Tacitus's last work, in which he treats the earlier period from 14 to 68 CE), Tacitus places the beginning of historical decline even earlier.⁹⁶ Drawing on imagery of a primordial golden age, he offers a striking account of decay in an excursus on the development of legislation (*Ann.* 3.26-28). In primeval times (*vetustissimi mortalium*), Tacitus claims, people were without wrongdoing and so laws were unnecessary. The ensuing decline of morality brought the need for legislation:

when equality began to be outworn, and ambition and violence gained ground in place of modesty and self-effacement, there came a crop of despotisms, which with many nations has remained perennial." (*Ann.* 3.26)

The laws follow moral decay, as "when the state was more corrupt, laws were most abundant" (3.27). Indeed, under Pompey's third consulate his "remedies" were "more

⁹⁴ Scott 1968:52-3.

⁹⁵ Syme reconstructs missing portions of *Histories* to suggest, on the basis of a parallel in earlier sections, decline continues under Domitian (Syme 1958:1.209-10). Without relying on reconstructions, others find hints of continuing decline elsewhere, such as *Ann.* 4.32-33 (Scott 1968:50n.16), or by reading the treatment of the past as commentary on the present (Sailor 2008:225; Williams 1978:294-95).

⁹⁶ Griffin 2009:173. Scott notes the different starting points to this decline suggested by different sections of Tacitus's work, from the beginning of the principate (*Hist.* 1.1), the *Punic* wars (*Hist.* 2), and the introduction of legal codes (*Ann.* 3, see below; Scott 1968:48-9). In *Agricola*, historiography itself declines from Actium (Sailor 2008:153).

disastrous than the abuses” (3.28); the laws themselves were no longer kept, resulting in an unjust reversal in which “villainy was immune, decency not rarely a sentence of death” (3.28). Finally, however, the “peace” instituted by Caesar Augustus is more chilling, as the civil war is drawn to a close by trading liberty for a hyper-vigilant state, such that under Tiberius “a reign of terror was threatened (*terror omnibus intentabatur*)” (3.28).

Tacitus exploits a well-worn trope in his narrative of decline, including a primordial golden age,⁹⁷ but he also uses the themes to serve both his narrative purpose and historical schema.⁹⁸ His is a character study of the faults of leaders who are given autocratic rule, and the consequences for the liberty of the elite and Roman institutions.⁹⁹ Symbols of decline suit his pessimism.

As in the above comparison of Polybius and Diodorus, Tacitus’s schema of history is also affected in important ways by its scale: Tacitus limits his scope of interest to Rome.¹⁰⁰

Neither *Histories* nor *Annals* indicate that Tacitus anticipated an endpoint to history,

⁹⁷ Similar decline is found in Livy and Sallust, an important model for Tacitus (Scott 1968:51; Griffin 2009:172-3).

⁹⁸ Griffin’s suggestion that Tacitus uses whatever tools will support his mood, though she refers here to his approach to divine guidance of history, is also pertinent here. She notes that for Tacitus “mood prevails over analysis” (Griffin 2009:172), and that he normally seeks a “gloomy” mood (p.171).

⁹⁹ Sailor 2008:188.

¹⁰⁰ In *Hist.* 1.1 Tacitus goes back to Rome’s founding, though he immediately disregards further events until 69 CE, claiming the intervening 820 years have been recorded appropriately already. Whereas Sailor argues Tacitus seeks the broadest scope, as befits Rome’s grandeur (Sailor 2008:123), again comparison to Diodorus or 2 Baruch illustrates Tacitus’s limits.

which is all the more notable given this might be expected in a schema of decline.¹⁰¹ As Syme observes, Tacitus avoids the term *aeternitas*.¹⁰² Despite his negative assessments, Tacitus does not suggest that a regime will come to supersede Rome.¹⁰³ His vision simply does not extend beyond Roman limits. The empire might be in crisis, but it is a crisis about how to live as Rome, not about the end of Rome itself.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, although acknowledging prophetic claims that associate the end of the empire with the burning of the Capitol, he refutes these as “empty superstition” (4.54.2).¹⁰⁵ And yet, unlike Virgil’s *Aeneid*, his *Histories* does not attribute to Rome any grand position as the end or goal of history. Neither does he suggest a return to an earlier golden age. As Tacitus presents it, Rome continues, imperfectly, injured by the corruption that can only be expected of the principate system. Within the general decline, some *principes* may be better or worse than others, and Roman regimes will come and go. But the process is not expected to reach an end.

¹⁰¹ Although conclusions about themes that are absent from *Histories* are inevitably provisional, given the text from the middle of Book 5 is no longer extant, a non-teleological view of history is entirely consistent with the extant material.

¹⁰² Syme argues that, compared to other writers and the cultural emphasis on *aeternitas*, Tacitus clearly does not like the term and avoids it. It appears only once in *Agricola* and once in reported speech in *Ann.* 9.71 (Syme 1958:1.208.n.1).

¹⁰³ See Sailor for extensive discussion of the Capitoline fire (cf. 3.71-2; Sailor 2008:209).

¹⁰⁴ Sailor 2008:231.

¹⁰⁵ Sailor 2008:231. See Chapter 4.

3. Periodised history with an end

In some texts the schema of history does incorporate an end. The above discussion demonstrates the significance of portrayals of the periods, scope, and direction of history. Teleology introduces new consequences of such claims. For several writers, the periods of history still represent a succession of empires, but the end constitutes the definitive transition to a final, unending empire.¹⁰⁶ The ‘end’ itself might also be envisaged differently.¹⁰⁷ Late Second Temple writers frequently describe expectations about a pattern of end-time events, inherently connected to a final culmination. This is generally also understood as marking the beginning of idyllic *ongoing* life. In *Aeneid*, also, Virgil portrays the end as ongoing. In each case, however, the end of history is understood as a qualitative change which, regardless of important continuities with the history that has gone before, will not return to features of the past, whether war, perishability, or the presence of evil.

¹⁰⁶ Wright argues that Jewish thought at the time of the NT did not incorporate beliefs about the end of history (“this makes no sense either of the basic Jewish worldview or of the texts in which the Jewish hope is expressed,” Wright 1992:299), but frequently used metaphors to refer to significant changes (particularly in relation to political transitions) *within* history. Wright’s interest in part lies in defending against claims that Jesus’ prophecy has not been fulfilled (cf. Mk 13); in the process he overlooks key elements of both NT and other Jewish texts. See the compelling critique in Adams 2007:5-16.

¹⁰⁷ Rajak considers whether Hellenistic Jewish Millenarian expectations describe: “the beginning of the End? Or the end of the beginning?” (Rajak 2002a:165). She rightly recognises the diverse understandings of end-time events as they unfold, which also interact with understandings of a human role in prompting the end through revolution. The end can involve joyful “weeks without number” (cf. *Apocalypse of Weeks* 1 Enoch 93.17; cf. 2 Bar 74.2-4). Collins paints this as a “series of ‘ends’” (Collins 1997:79). The claim that writers envisaged idyllic life continuing afterward is not mutually exclusive with the concept of the end of history in terms of a definitive transition brought about by a final defeat of evil (see Rowland 2002:188-89).

3.1 Progress to the end of history

Virgil's Aeneid

In *Aeneid*, Virgil's epic poem of Roman origins written in the Augustan period,¹⁰⁸ Virgil offers a complex picture of history. He plays with time, creating patterns within history through themes of recurrence. These circular elements in Virgil's portrayal of time interact in significant ways with key themes, such as delay, and create a sense of ambiguity which is important for the political questions *Aeneid* raises for the reader. But Virgil also addresses these questions by clarifying that these cyclical patterns of events ultimately fit within a linear progression, which advances to its goal and end in Rome.¹⁰⁹

Virgil's patterns of recurrence are formed both by linking events back to earlier events within the plot¹¹⁰ and by alluding to literary forerunners, especially Homer.¹¹¹ In doing so, not only does he circle back between earlier and later events in the world of the text, but he invites readers to compare events of the mythic past and their own present. Here as,

¹⁰⁸ Fantham 2007:xvii.

¹⁰⁹ The end in *Aeneid* is also depicted as ongoing existence (of Rome, not of individuals), which Virgil depicts as a static continuation of the present. See Chapter 6 below.

¹¹⁰ Quint 1989:50.

¹¹¹ Williams 1990:194-96; Knauer 1990. Note that intertextual (and intratextual) links create not only recurrence, but inversion, cf. *Aen.* 6 and *Od.* 11 (Williams 1990:207). Quint notes that the two halves of the epic, as they link to the first the *Odyssey* and then the *Iliad*, also create two different types of repetition, repeating the difficulties of the past but eventually emerging victorious (Quint 1989:9-10).

for instance, Troy and Carthage become literary types that precede the founding of Rome,¹¹² Virgil evokes a contrast, which at once suggests both cyclical and linear trajectories of history: Rome in some ways is the completion of the search to replace Troy following exile, after failed earlier attempts to recreate it in other cities, and at the same time represents something entirely new.

As he sets out his portrayal of history, Virgil makes frequent use of language denoting periodisation. He refers to time in terms of *saecula*. Jupiter promises in Book 1, “wars will cease and savage ages soften” (1.291) and in the final book, Juno asks Jupiter to “let Alban kings endure through the ages” (12.826; cf. 1.445,606; 6.235). *Saecula* are also directly connected to golden ages—both the golden ages of the past and the golden ages under Jupiter. Virgil evokes the nostalgia of the earlier golden age.¹¹³ In Book 8, King Evander takes Aeneas and his son through woods, describing to them an unruly (if innocent) population that once reigned there, before Saturn arrived and provided laws. The king goes on, “under his reign were the golden ages men tell of” (8.324-5). From this “perfect peace,” however, things fall apart. The golden ages of Jupiter promised by the historical review the reader has already encountered two books earlier (6.793) constitute something different. Rather than the idyllic scenario of agricultural harmony Virgil

¹¹² Quint 1989:10.

¹¹³ Although the idea of the golden age retained currency, not all writers subscribe to it. For some writers the idea of a golden age is problematic (e.g. Diodorus, see above), and even those who use it, use it differently. See Chapter 6.

presented as having been inaugurated in his earlier 4 *Eclogue*,¹¹⁴ in *Aeneid* Jupiter's *aurea saecula* are no longer part of nostalgic longing for effortless life in Troy,¹¹⁵ but reflect hard-won progress as the culmination of Aeneas's journey, fulfilled in Rome.¹¹⁶ Rather than the symbol's traditional position in a narrative of decline,¹¹⁷ here Virgil employs the concept of a regained (and, indeed, *revised*) golden age, as an image of resurgence and renewal.

Thus, while Virgil's play with time creates some sense of cyclical history, in three exemplary passages of historical review, in Books 1, 6, and 8 (1.262-304; 6.752-892; 8.624-728), he clarifies that the underlying schema is a linear progression.

The historical review in Book 6 depicts heroes parading before Aeneas in the underworld, with commentary by his father Anchises. This is the scene in which the prophecy of the golden ages is disclosed. Unlike a similar scene by Lucretius,¹¹⁸ the passage assumes a *vaticinium ex eventu* structure: that is, in Virgil's version the heroes belong to the *literary*

¹¹⁴ Cf. 4 *Ecl.* 4-10. Albeit, in Virgil's account, this age is embodied in a child whose identity has been much debated. See Braund 1997:209; Slater 1912; Fairclough and Goold 1999:1.2.

¹¹⁵ Here need and suffering, which is Jupiter's gift and not punishment (unlike in Hesiod's *Works and Days*), creates the environment for progress through motivation to strive for improvement, which Galinsky identifies as central in Augustan culture, and already present in *Georgics* 1.121-28 (Galinsky 1996:93-7, 121-5).

¹¹⁶ Galinsky 1996:123-4.

¹¹⁷ As in Hesiod *Works* 106-201, Ovid *Metam.* 1.89-150, and Tacitus *Ann.* 3.26-28.

¹¹⁸ Hardie 1986. Homeric associations shape the meaning of this passage (Williams 1990; O'Hara 2007:91-95).

future, though the reader's *historical past*. Virgil further plays with time by interrupting the chronology of the parade, unexpectedly jumping forward to Octavian,¹¹⁹ with a hint of the glory ahead that constitutes the *telos* of this process, and thereby relativising other characters.¹²⁰

A similar historical review is provided in the *ekphrasis*, or graphic description, of Aeneas's shield in Book 8.¹²¹ The scenes depicted on the shield represent much earlier events and then jump forward to those contemporaneous to the reader, bypassing significant moments of Roman history.¹²² Again, Octavian is at the centre. The description functions like an excursus that also gives shape to the surrounding story.¹²³ Indeed, Hardie argues the *ekphrasis* of the shield is the pinnacle of *Aeneid*, in which both the "universalist themes" of Achilles's shield in Homer's *Iliad* and Virgil's broader "nationalist concerns" are held together to encapsulate Virgil's joint thrust of "*cosmos and imperium*."¹²⁴ The shield provides a picture of Octavian and his historical moment at the centre of a *cosmic* picture of history. But Aeneas remains unaware of the deeper meaning of the scenes set

¹¹⁹ Austin 1977:242.

¹²⁰ The metaphysical assumptions behind this passage, namely the cyclic experience of individuals returning to earthly life from the underworld, are less Virgil's emphasis than the opportunity they supply for a prospective encounter with these heroes and emphasis on both explaining the "tragic past" and patriotic hope for the future (Williams 1990:194). Note that these individual cycles are not the same as a cyclic view of history, despite the reference to "when the circle of time is complete" (6.745).

¹²¹ This alludes to Achilles's shield in *The Odyssey* (Hardie 1986:337).

¹²² For instance, particularly excluding the Punic Wars (Hardie 1986:350-1).

¹²³ Barchiesi 1997:278.

¹²⁴ Hardie 1986:339, 362.

out on his new shield (8.730);¹²⁵ the book ends with Aeneas simply shouldering it, awestruck by the artwork of the gift (8.730-1),¹²⁶ as he travels on. But the reader has again received a prospective review of the periods of history that will culminate in triumph in Rome.

All of this takes place in light of the review in Book 1, which establishes Virgil's teleological sense of history in *Aeneid*. Here the reader is privy to a conversation between Venus and Jupiter, in which Venus (Aeneas's mother) reproaches Jupiter for the Trojans' suffering (1.229-53). Jupiter responds with an account of future events, which is to some extent performative, "further unrolling," as he says, "the scroll of fate [he] will disclose its secrets" (1.262).¹²⁷

Venus, and thereby also the reader, is told about the events through which Aeneas will provide both city walls and civilization (*mores*; 1. 263-4), and thus the space in which Romulus will eventually found a city (1.276). Jupiter declares of the thus-named Romans:

For these I set not bounds in space or time (*tempora*);
But have given empire without end (*imperium sine fine*). (1.278-9)

¹²⁵ In the unfolding story, the scene makes sense as a divine gift to assure Aeneas of his certain military victory, contra those who claim, against Homer's parallel scene, that Virgil's passage incorporates the shield without fitting it into any narrative purpose (see discussion in West 1990:295-6).

¹²⁶ West 1990:304.

¹²⁷ Here making a self-conscious play on the etymology of *fatum* (cf. 1.258, 261-2), indicating inevitability. See Chapter 4.

Furthermore, an age will dawn in which Aeneas's line (renamed "Iulus" [1.277-8, 288]) will produce "Caesar, a Trojan...Julius" (1.286, 8).¹²⁸ His boundless reign will encompass oceans and the stars. Ultimately he will be elevated to the heavens to become a focus of prayer himself (1.289-90). Jupiter's promise governs the whole of the story. Unknown to Aeneas at this stage, who of course fails to understand even after he receives the shield in Book 8 (8.730), the *telos* of his story is determined.

There are, however, delays in the prophecy's fulfilment. Some recent studies have problematized the prophecy; O'Hara even claims that Jupiter is shown to be deceiving Venus.¹²⁹ And certainly, as the epic proceeds, from the Odyssean wandering of the first half to the Iliadic struggle of the second,¹³⁰ it is clear that the *telos* is achieved at a cost. But the delays serve to heighten the reader's experience.¹³¹ Contrary to some recent explorations of subtle, anti-imperial tendencies in Virgil,¹³² the numerous delays do not undermine Virgil's teleology, though the struggle may suggest some ambivalence on

¹²⁸ The identification is assiduously vague, but most interpreters see Virgil referring here to Octavian, though simultaneously exploiting his connections to Julius Caesar (Galinsky 1996:251).

¹²⁹ O'Hara 2007:78-81; O'Hara 1990. See further discussion Chapters 4 and 6 below.

¹³⁰ Quint 1989:9.

¹³¹ Horsfall notes characteristic terminology for delay in the Trojans reaching their goal, for instance at 3.131, 205, 278; 6.2 (Horsfall 2013:2.66). It is notable even here that the powers of Juno, *Aeneid's* goddess of Carthage and force for delay, are noted but Jupiter promises she will come to benefit Rome (1.279-82), as also Dido, patron of Carthage, is kept ignorant of the future in the service of its fulfilment (1.299-300).

¹³² Galinsky's introduction supplies an insightful discussion of the impact of pre- and post-World War Two contexts in interpretation of Virgil (Galinsky 1996: 3-9; Harrison 1990:1-20). See further discussion of the political implications of Virgil's teleological view of history in Chapter 6.

Virgil's behalf about this inevitable trajectory.¹³³ *Aeneid's* version of history confirms the end has already been achieved, even where it is clear that there are problematic issues in the historical events to which the *vaticinia ex eventu* refer.¹³⁴ From the chronological vantage point of reader and writer, Octavian can be highlighted by appearing in the wrong place chronologically in the parade of Book 6 and the centre of the shield in Book 8. The narrative itself takes place in the space between the exile from Troy and the establishment of Rome and its unending dominion. But this is all in the past for the reader. While delay adds to the drama, readers' vantage point of life under Augustus, alongside the dramatic irony of their access to Jupiter's speech to Venus, underscores the certainty of success¹³⁵ and even that the end itself has been achieved.¹³⁶

Thus, in *Aeneid*, Virgil not only presents a teleological view of history but, as I will further argue in Chapter 6, identifies the end of history with Rome itself.¹³⁷ The delay, strife, and effort described as part of Aeneas's journey, involving failed attempts to re-create Troy

¹³³ Theodorakopoulos 1997:157. O'Hara notes "doubt" and "regret," and considers how they relate to the Augustan teleological elements, which he nonetheless recognises in the text (O'Hara 2007:102). Quint argues Virgil portrays the glorious Augustan ideal he hopes for, tinged with a darker fear, but that ultimately Virgil still affirms the former. By contrast, Quint argues a "worst case" interpretation of the teleology to Rome is portrayed, not in *Aeneid*, but in Ovid's reception of *Aeneid*, in which these themes turn to despair (Quint 1989:53-54).

¹³⁴ See Feeney 1986:5, 7; Ahl 2007:376. See also Chapter 6 below.

¹³⁵ See Chapter 4 on assurance of this end in relation to the role of fate and the gods.

¹³⁶ See Chapter 6.

¹³⁷ As in texts like 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch (§3.3), which invite readers to identify their own present by placing contemporary events in a prophetic account of the past, the effect of Virgil's play with time is a focus on the historical present.

elsewhere and traversing even the underworld, is all chronologically prior to the foretold events contemporary to the reader: the culmination of history in the *imperium sine fine* of the Roman empire.

3.2 Steady continuation of history with an end

For some writers, while the end of history marks a significant transition, it is less clear that the time leading to this end is characterised by either any significant improvement over time or decline. For the writer of 2 Maccabees, great difficulties take place in the course of history, but God oversees a return to justice also within history, with a promise of post-mortem reward for those who suffer for their faith in the interim and a hint of a final end. The War Scroll and Josephus's *Jewish War* each describe patterns of divine faithfulness in the past and expectations about an unending divine reign at the end of history, drawing particularly on imagery from the Book of Daniel—though these two texts differ in how positively or negatively they view history before the end.

2 Maccabees

Although 2 Maccabees contains an appreciation for the events of the end of history as well as post-mortem reward, the focus primarily remains on justice *within* history. As rightly noted by Daniel Schwartz, the second-century BCE narrative begins and ends in a stable situation, in which Jewish groups are free to practise their faith without

interference from political rulers. Schwartz argues this is characteristic of diaspora historiography (exemplified by Esther),¹³⁸ in which a crisis emerges but is resolved within the course of the narrative, with the sense that things return to ‘normal’ at the end. However, although rightly stressing the importance of divine action in 2 Maccabees, which ensures history proceeds steadily,¹³⁹ Schwartz downplays the significance of the threat represented by opponents such as Antiochus IV¹⁴⁰ and the hints of a teleological schema which extends beyond the narrative’s events.¹⁴¹

The letters with which 2 Maccabees begins set out history in terms of years and the period of reign under Demetrius (1.7). Throughout, the writer also uses temporal language to denote the “former times (χρόνοις, 14.38),” “time of separation (χρόνοις, 14.3),” “in times of evil (ἐν καιρῷ πονηρῷ, 1.5),” and looking back to the “times of Joshua (χρόνου, 12.15),” which to an extent provide a ‘type’ for the time of Judas Maccabeus.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ Schwartz also points to 3 Maccabees and Philo’s *In Flaccum* (Schwartz 2009:124).

¹³⁹ See Chapter 4.

¹⁴⁰ According to Schwartz, in these historiographies, secular rulers are essentially positive: a crisis emerges through a misunderstanding, is ultimately resolved, and things return to normal (Schwartz 2009). His perspective, not only of 2 Maccabees, but also of Acts, emphasises a quietism that, I suggest, is not present in the text. Antiochus IV is not portrayed as a well-meaning political ruler who persecutes as a consequence of misinterpreting a Jewish custom, but an archetypal θεομάχος, who is justly punished in the narrative. See Chapter 5.

¹⁴¹ Schwartz uses the language of “circular” or “teleological” history in his discussion of 1 and 2 Maccabees and Acts in a different sense to this dissertation. Without considering the relevance of the end of history in these three texts, Schwartz focuses only on the trajectory of the narrative itself, equating teleology for instance with 1 Macc’s transition to Hasmonean leadership and the narrative trajectory he identifies in Acts from the kingdom of Israel (1.6) to the kingdom of God (28.31, and from Israel to Rome; Schwartz 2009:128-9).

¹⁴² Χρόνος and καιρός also have domestic or colloquial meanings (2 Macc 1.22; 3.5; 4.23; 5.1; 9.1; 10.3), including denoting opportunity (4.32; 9.25; 14.5). See discussion at §4.2.

But any sense of these particular “times” does not lead to a structured account of history or appreciation for the transitions between these periods. Furthermore, many of the events other Hellenistic Jewish writers anticipate as part of the end also do not feature. Second Maccabees contains no sense of messianism,¹⁴³ no details about woes anticipated among the events of the end, nor details about an earthly final judgement or heavenly or earthly Jerusalem.

The writer does provide some hints of an end to history. The martyrdom stories in 2 Macc 6-7 function as a “key turning point” in the narrative,¹⁴⁴ interpreting the suffering as just divine punishment (6.12-17) and underscoring the punishment that will also rightly come the way of Antiochus (7.19; cf. 4.17; 8.11).¹⁴⁵ The narrative aside with which the martyrdom accounts begin explains the benevolence of “immediate” punishment in terms of divine action to punish before the people’s sins have reached completion (“πρὸς τέλος”; 6.15; cf. 7.38; Ps 93.12-13 LXX; Isa 54.7-8; Wis 16.11),¹⁴⁶ unlike the other nations who are allowed to continue accruing sins until a later punishment (6.13-15).¹⁴⁷ The later

¹⁴³ Collins 1987. See further discussion in my Chapter 6.

¹⁴⁴ Nickelsburg 2003:522.

¹⁴⁵ Nicklas notes elements of irony in how characters like Antiochus and Nicanor are treated, despite the serious subject matter (Nicklas 2007:111).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. 1 Thess 2.16, which describes the gentiles εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας πάντοτε, while divine wrath reaches them εἰς τέλος. Fee suggests the 1 Thess passage is “more distantly echoed” in 2 Macc 6.14-15 (Fee 2009:100-1n.47). Fee takes this to mean “at the end,” rather than fullness/to the uttermost, as suggested by Bruce (Bruce 1982:48).

¹⁴⁷ Doran 2012:150.

chapters go on to narrate the promised punishment of opponents and victory under Judas's military leadership, once God's wrath had turned to mercy.

The responses of the seven sons facing torture in 2 Macc 7 outline eschatological expectations, with further elements filled out as each son faces death.¹⁴⁸ Resurrection to “ever-flowing life” (ἀενάου ζωῆς; v. 36) is presented as the promise for those who die for keeping the law (vv.23, 29).¹⁴⁹ Throughout, the hopes are described through a contrast between Antiochus and God. The second son's emphatic use of pronouns initially establishes the comparison,¹⁵⁰ as he addresses the earthly king: “you accursed wretch” who may “dismiss us from this present life,” juxtaposing “the King of the universe [who] will raise us up to an everlasting renewal of life” (v.9).¹⁵¹ The fourth son informs Antiochus that “there will be no resurrection to life” for the king (v.14). The seventh son offers the longest speech as he draws all of the elements identified by each brother together, not only affirming belief in the resurrection but repeating the narrator's sentiment about benevolent, immediate punishment (cf. 6.12-16).

¹⁴⁸ Although these passages describe the martyrdoms dramatically, Doran rightly cautions against labelling the narrative “tragic history” (Doran 1979:114).

¹⁴⁹ Notably, belief in resurrection does not feature in 1 Maccabees (Harrington 1988:47).

¹⁵⁰ Doran 2012:157.

¹⁵¹ Doran suggests the grammar is reminiscent of Dan 12.1, rather than offering a direct quotation (Doran 2012:158).

A sense of the end also emerges from the account of Judas's collection for a sin offering, to atone for soldiers whose deaths during battle are attributed to their sinful recourse to amulets (12.43). Here the narrator praises the offering, as it demonstrates Judas's confidence in the resurrection and in supplication that would allow these people also to participate "in the splendid reward that is laid up for those who fall asleep in godliness" (v.45).¹⁵²

Thus 2 Maccabees provides some hints of a broader schema of history: a promised resurrection of the righteous and a somewhat vague sense of final judgement. Its writer also incorporates some sense of periodisation. Nonetheless the writer focuses on divine vindication through the events of history—in the punishment of *θεομαχοί*, the military victory of the faithful, and the purification of the temple (10.1-8).¹⁵³ As history proceeds however, the possibility for further crisis and restoration remains. The words of Judas and his followers confirm that victory is provisional, in the sense that divine wrath may again become necessary to discipline God's people (10.4; cf. 6.16; 7.33), and even the epitomiser's somewhat apologetic commentary on his decision about where to draw the narrative to a conclusion (15.37-39)¹⁵⁴ hints that he is aware that already the peace described has started to fracture. But 2 Maccabees asserts: divine guidance ensures that,

¹⁵² See Chapter 5 for discussion of the different ways that 2 Maccabees portrays opponent and protagonist characters whose deaths are attributed to divine punishment, and also *θεομαχοί*.

¹⁵³ Harrington 1988:49-50.

¹⁵⁴ On the difficulties of dating Judas's death in relation to the writing of each of Jason of Cyrene and the epitomiser, see Harrington 1988:37.

as often as it is necessary, once their punishment has been served, God's people will be restored, until the final end and restoration.

The Qumran War Scroll

The War Scroll¹⁵⁵ focuses on the period from the beginning of the eschatological war until the completion of history. The events narrated depict the phases of the war to be waged between the sons of darkness and the sons of light (1QM 1.1-2), which will lead to the complete and eternal destruction of the sons of darkness (1.5; 9.5-6; 15.2, 12; 18.1)¹⁵⁶ on a divinely-appointed day (1.10; 13.14, 18; 14.13; 17.5-6; 18.10), and eternal rejoicing for the sons of light (1.8-9; 15.1; 18.11-12).

The War Scroll's author shows great attention to questions of time, in keeping with preoccupations evident in other texts found at Qumran. The writer presumes time is divided into periods or seasons, with appointed moments for particular acts. So the war and its effects constitute "a time (עת) of salvation for the nation of God and a period (קִיץ) of rule¹⁵⁷ for all the men of his lot" (1QM 1.5). Indeed, following the defeat of the Kittim:

[the sons of jus]tice shall shine to all the edges of the earth, they shall go on shining, up to the end of all the periods (מוֹעֲדֵי) of darkness; and in the time

¹⁵⁵ See Chapter 2 for discussion of the various manuscripts associated with Qumran's War Scroll and my approach to the textual issues in this dissertation.

¹⁵⁶ Mattila notes a conflict between complete destruction of the enemy here and the traditional imagery of enemies being made subject to Israel at 19.2b-8 (Mattila 1994:534).

¹⁵⁷ Vermes: an "age of dominion" (Vermes 1997:163).

(ובמועד) of God, his exalted greatness will shine for all the et[ernal] times. (1QM 1.8)

Thus, the writer presents time both in the sense of an appointed moment and durations of time, which in turn can denote a succession of periods or seasons. In some cases the same term is used for both ideas. This is found also in Daniel,¹⁵⁸ where the term מועד, translated by Martínez and Tigchelaar in 1QM 1.8 as “period”¹⁵⁹ and Vermes as “season,”¹⁶⁰ is also used to indicate an appointed moment (as in Dan 11.27, 29, 35) as well as periods of time.¹⁶¹ For instance, in Dan 12:7 the same term clearly takes the meaning of units of duration in the terms translated “a time, times, and half a time”:

למועד מועדים וחצי.¹⁶²

The writer’s understanding of history as periodised also emerges from several passages of historical review in the War Scroll, normally presented in the context of speeches or hymns of praise. Such historical reflections do not take the form of the detailed, frequently numbered, periodisation found in historical reviews in apocalypses (see

¹⁵⁸ The eschatological war itself is reminiscent of 1 Enoch’s *Apocalypse of Weeks* and *Animal Apocalypse*, as well as Daniel. See Chapter 6 below.

¹⁵⁹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997. So also Delling on עת in 1QM 1.8, in the TDNT entry for χρόνος (9.588).

¹⁶⁰ Vermes 1997:163.

¹⁶¹ In later use the term maintains aspects of cyclical time as festival seasons, as in the use of Moed as “set feasts” in the Second Division of the Mishnah.

¹⁶² The Aramaic of Dan 7.25, where the English translation is identical, uses עדין. The LXX renders the terms in both Dan 7.25 and 12.7 as καιρός (cf. also Rev 12.14), which fits with some uses of καιρός as a period of time in Luke/Acts. See Barr 1969:37 and further discussion below.

discussion below). However, these passages praise God as having established the covenant and as Creator in terms that presume both a succession of ages and seasons of pious practices and festivals. Thus, the Priest's speech prior to the battle begins in 1QM 10.3 by encouraging the soldiers with words from Deut 20.2-5 and Num 10.9, before turning to address God directly—first by remembering the covenant and then acts of creation, which includes attention, among elements of Israel's story,¹⁶³ to divine establishment “of the sacred seasons (מועדֵי), of the cycle of the years (ותקופות שנים) and the ages of eternity (וקצי עד)...” (10.15).

Similarly, the ongoing cycle of ages is evident in the words to be spoken by all those on the side of the light following their victory. Having washed themselves from their bloody battle and returned to sing from their positions in battle formation (14.2-4), they are to assert that God has established the covenant made with their fathers, throughout the eternal ages (למועד[ד]י עולמים, 1QM 13.7-8, cf. 14.8-9), and to identify themselves as the surviving remnant of that covenant (14.8).¹⁶⁴ The hymnic praise that follows fits within an account of God's faithful acts that are grounded in both covenant and creation, building to the affirmation:

for your mighty deeds we will extol [your] spl[endor, at every] moment and at the times indicated by your eternal edicts (*literally: in all ages and ordained times/seasons of eternity*, בכול עתים ומועדי תעודות עולמים), at the on[set] of

¹⁶³ Including references to Babel, the division of nations, and inheritance of the land (10.14-5).

¹⁶⁴ In the latter passage the covenant is established with the fathers, which endures rather through generations (דורותינו).

day and at night at the fall of evening and at dawn. For great is the p[lan of] your [glo]ry and your marvellous mysteries in [your] heights.... (14.13-14)

These periods characterise the War Scroll's picture of the past and present, and also the writer's expectations of life at the end of history. Following the eschatological war, the righteous will enjoy "peace, blessing, glory and joy, and length of days" (1.9).¹⁶⁵ This end-time portrait however does not include any explicit references to resurrection.¹⁶⁶ They shall offer praise, and Zion is instructed to rejoice (19.5). Pious life at the end of history is expected to unfold in continuity with the practices of the faithful prior to eschatological victory,¹⁶⁷ as also the periods and seasons of piety continue.

Rather than leading to a purely cyclical conception of time, however, other elements of the War Scroll incorporate a linear dimension. The definitive defeat of evil for all time is

¹⁶⁵ Here, the righteous are depicted enjoying *long* life, rather than eternal life (1.9). Much in 1QM supports a view of *communal* continuity through all the ages of eternity, but the writer's view on *individual* immortality is at best unclear (in contrast, for instance, to the focus on post-mortem reward in 2 Maccabees, as discussed above). See also references to "eternal redemption" (1.12), and the claim that "all the sons of his truth will have enjoyment in everlasting knowledge" (17.8), though here it seems the knowledge of truth is everlasting, not any individual's celebration of it.

¹⁶⁶ Although there are several references to "raising up" they relate almost always to God rising up in judgement. In 14.14 the reference to raising people from the dust and bringing others down could be a more obtuse allusion to resurrection, but more likely a reference to reversal, perhaps alluding to soldiers standing up after falling. On the longstanding debate about resurrection in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Davies 2000a:189-232; Puech 1994:235-56; Hobbins 2001:395-420; Nickelsburg 2006; Wright 2003:238-42 (though note that Wright's earlier pages under the heading "Resurrection at Qumran" deal instead with information about the Essenes from sources such as *Antiquities*).

¹⁶⁷ Davies highlights differences between the eschatological views in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Davies 1985:39). See further discussion in Chapter 6 of the ways in which present practices mimic expectations of the end.

unlike anything experienced in the past and will not be repeated (1.5; 9.5-6; 15.2, 12; 18.1); it shall arrive suddenly and conclude with eternal redemption (1.13). Here the writer balances continuity and rupture in asserting the consistent patterns of history alongside a definitive and unique change. The defeat is expressed in terms of a reversal of fortunes: God has acted “to open the mouth of the dumb to sing [God’s] marv[els], and to train feeble [hands] in warfare... You raised the fallen with your strength, but those high in stature, you cut down” (14.6, 10-11, cf. 5-12).¹⁶⁸ This comes with a time of special insight for those who understand what God is doing (17.7), a unique period of afflictions just prior to the victory,¹⁶⁹ and the newfound peace, joy, and long life¹⁷⁰ following (1.9; 17.9).

Thus, for the War Scroll’s writer time comes divided into periods,¹⁷¹ marked by repeated patterns of piety but also anticipating events that signal a definitive transition into a new epoch of history. The text provides no clear indication as to whether its author considered this linear aspect of history’s movement to be one of decline, progress, or continuity until the point of the war. The appeals to God’s faithfulness in the past and absolute control over the movement of history assert that the action foretold for the

¹⁶⁸ This forms part of the victory hymn. Cf. similarities to 1 Sam 2.1-10; Lk 1.46-55; though differences from 1QS^a 2.7-8.

¹⁶⁹ Rather than unnatural cosmic events (cf. 4 Ezra 6.21-24), these afflictions indicate the military combat itself, though heightened by the supernatural elements of the enemy.

¹⁷⁰ See p.103n.165-166 above.

¹⁷¹ Stuckenbruck notes the *Damascus Document* also refers to “divisions of times in their Jubilees and in their weeks” (CD 16.3-4; Stuckenbruck 2006:125; cf. also Jub 50.4; Moore 2015:42).

defeat over evil reflects a steady plan from a God with continuous oversight of history,¹⁷² not a sudden move to act. However, the claim that God has created Belial, and even a reference to the empire of Belial (which seems to imply a rule and also a period of reign [13.4]) suggests that all history prior to the events of the eschatological war has been equally marked by evil. But the events set out in the War Scroll constitute the moment for the final battle in which the groups that have been equally matched¹⁷³ finally meet to bring victory to those in the company of God. In the War Scroll, history follows a teleological path to an end in the definitive defeat of evil, while simultaneously, *all time*—including that beyond the end brought about by the war—is envisaged as an ongoing succession of “eternal ages” (1QM 1.8; cf. *Apocalypse of Weeks*, 1 Enoch 93.17; 2 Bar 74.2-4).

Josephus’s Jewish War

Writing shortly after the war, in the late 70s CE, with the apparent purpose of redirecting blame for Jerusalem’s destruction away from Rome and onto the Jewish revolutionaries (cf. *J.W.* 2.352-55, 390-1; 6.249-53), Josephus tempers his account with a sense that life under Rome is not without its advantages or divine purpose.¹⁷⁴ Similarly to Polybius, Josephus stresses the importance of Rome’s achievement while presuming a pattern of the rise and fall of empires; for both, their political vulnerabilities allow for only subtle

¹⁷² See Chapter 5.

¹⁷³ Vermes 1997:163.

¹⁷⁴ Rajak 2002b:89, 99.

references to a future change of regime.¹⁷⁵ However, Josephus not only hints at a *change* of empire, but an *end* to the pattern of the rise and fall of empires. In contrast to Virgil, for Josephus the end is not Rome itself but, however subtly he alludes to it, the installation of an unending divine reign after Rome's fall.¹⁷⁶

Significantly, *Jewish War* is the only text of this study from among those I suggest reflect a teleological sense of history that is frequently compared to Luke/Acts. This heightens Josephus's importance for this investigation. Nonetheless, studies that examine Josephus primarily to illuminate NT texts tend to focus on different aspects of his texts.¹⁷⁷ Josephus scholars such as Per Bilde¹⁷⁸ and Harold Attridge¹⁷⁹ recognise a kind of eschatology reminiscent of apocalypses in Josephus, drawing attention to his understanding of the periodisation of history and providence.¹⁸⁰ Rebecca Gray also emphasises the significance of prophecy in Josephus, especially in his self-presentation, dovetailing with apocalyptic themes such as visions and determinism.¹⁸¹ G.I. Davies even

¹⁷⁵ See extended comparison in Cohen 1982:374 and Gruen 2011:159-61.

¹⁷⁶ Berthelot argues that Philo shares a similar view of Rome's eventual replacement by an unending rule of Israel (Berthelot 2011).

¹⁷⁷ For example, see Squires 1993 on divine guidance, which does not encompass the end of history (see my Chapter 4 below) and Rothschild 2004 on rhetoric.

¹⁷⁸ Bilde 1998:55-56 and Bilde 1988:188.

¹⁷⁹ Attridge 1976:176-78. See also Grabbe 2000:163-85 and Vermes 1991:149-66.

¹⁸⁰ Note also that not all scholars of Josephus support claims that he holds an "apocalyptic" or "eschatological" view. See for instance Rajak 1991:133; Rajak 2002b:89, though she has become less definitive in her exclusion of eschatological themes in Josephus's text in more recent work (Rajak 2002a:64-88).

¹⁸¹ Gray 1993:35-79.

begins a discussion of the nature of “apocalyptic historiography” with an extended treatment of Josephus, as an exemplary introduction to the theme, before turning to historical reviews in Jewish apocalypses.¹⁸² However, these elements of Josephus’s text rarely feature in Lukan studies, in which, instead, a focus on shared or divergent features of genre or rhetoric remain central.¹⁸³ Nonetheless, while recognising that Josephus remains an important conversation partner for Luke given significant similarities in the nature of their projects and form, I suggest attention to Josephus’s schema of history also illuminates Luke/Acts in important ways.

Josephus presents history as periodised. In a weaker sense, he follows the pattern of political leaders and military defeats as he describes the events from Antiochus Epiphanes to Titus’s “return to Italy and triumph” in his *Jewish War* (cf. 1.19, 29), and divides his account accordingly. He also makes frequent use of terms like *καιρός*.¹⁸⁴ However, here *καιρός* is not applied in the full range of its meanings. As a particular moment, *καιρός* describes the time when, for instance, Antiochus Epiphanes was in conflict with Ptolemy VI (1.31) or when the “great war of the Romans broke out” (1.218).

¹⁸² Davies 1978a:16-19.

¹⁸³ For instance, Clare Rothschild’s discussion of rhetoric (Rothschild 2004:216, 220, 223-4, 232). So also Lee 2013:27-33; Mason 1992. Squires discusses features of Josephus and Luke’s underlying understanding of history in relation to providence, but this does not extend to a discussion of history’s teleological shape (Squires 1993). Likewise Shauf 2015 deals with Josephus’s portrayal of God and divine forces in history, but not the end of history (pp.134-70).

¹⁸⁴ 296 times in total across Josephus’s works: 57 occurrences in *Jewish War*; 216 in *Antiquities* alone.

It also designates moments of opportunity for revenge (1.62) or attack (1.117, 127). But Josephus does not use *καιρός* to denote a period of time.¹⁸⁵

Josephus reveals a stronger sense of periodisation, however, in his Danielic-style interest in the succession of empires. For instance, in a speech assigned to his own character in Book 5 (*J.W.* 5.362-419),¹⁸⁶ Josephus's explanation of Rome's dominance (having *ὑποχείρια τὰ πάντα*, 5.366) takes the form:

For *τύχη* has moved over to them from all sides, and God bringing about rule (*ἐμπεριάγοντα τὴν ἀρχήν*) nation by nation (*κατὰ ἔθνος*), now (*νῦν*) is upon Italy.¹⁸⁷ (5.367)

Here Josephus describes a process in which God determines the reign of political empires.¹⁸⁸ As he describes this transition between regimes, Josephus follows not only writers who presume a succession of empires, as Polybius and Diodorus also do, but the four kingdoms succeeded by a fifth divine kingdom portrayed in Dan 2 and 7, and taken up in other texts such as 4 Ezra 11-12.¹⁸⁹ In these Jewish texts, the four worldly kingdoms

¹⁸⁵ In discussing Lindner's identification of Josephus as a "priestly apocalypticist" (Attridge 1976:176), Attridge attributes to "apocalypticism" both an eschatological outlook and a view of history as periodised. He argues that though *Antiquities* displays an interest in the future that may be considered eschatological, "there is none of the apocalyptic structuring of history into distinct periods subject to divine determination as there had been in the *Bellum*" (p.177-8). Though Josephus's treatment of Daniel in *Antiquities* challenges this view (see below), and this study's texts confirm that periodisation is not limited to an "apocalyptic" view of history.

¹⁸⁶ Many of the themes are paralleled in Agrippa's speech in *J.W.* 2.345-401 (cf. Rajak 1991:122-34). See also Acts 7.2-53.

¹⁸⁷ My translation.

¹⁸⁸ On divine guidance, including Josephus's use of *τύχη* and *θεός*, see Chapter 4.

¹⁸⁹ Arguably also evident in 1 Enoch's *Animal Apocalypse*, in the four periods governed by untrustworthy shepherds following the exile (1 Enoch 89.65-90.19). See Olson 2013:190.

are installed in turn, but finally replaced by an unending divine reign, which ensures vindication of the righteous and punishment of the wicked.¹⁹⁰ Significantly, despite his generally positive treatment of Rome, Josephus reveals that Rome will also come to an end, as he asserts that God rests upon Italy *now*.¹⁹¹

In *Antiquities*, Josephus extends these claims in his treatment of the Book of Daniel. Having emphasised Daniel's reliability as a prophet, Josephus identifies the penultimate regime in Daniel's vision in Dan 8.3-14 as Rome (*Ant.* 10.276). However, he keeps silence in relation to the end of Rome's empire implied by his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its explanation in Dan. 2.34-45. As he describes the statue from the dream, with sections representing the different regimes, Josephus refrains from identifying the stone "not made from human hands" which will destroy the entire statue of past empires in the biblical account. Instead, he directs the inquiring reader who "wishes to learn about the hidden things that are to come" to "take the trouble" to consult the book of Daniel itself (*Ant.* 10.210).¹⁹² Thus, according to Josephus, history is comprised of periods and even Rome's era will come to an end.

¹⁹⁰ Contra Hall 1991:83, who refers to the paradigm as it is taken up in these Jewish texts as a four-kingdom paradigm, rather than noting the distinctive difference of the fifth unending age in these texts.

¹⁹¹ See Crabbe 2015:24.

¹⁹² Per Bilde:188n.51.

Finally, Josephus portrays the direction of history leading up to the end differently in varied contexts. Particularly in *Antiquities*, he exhibits the nostalgia associated with traditional views of the golden age discussed above. Employing what Louis Feldman identifies as a “Greek framework,”¹⁹³ Josephus portrays creation as an idyllic age, in which the animals all spoke a common language (*Ant.* 1.41), and from which, after enjoying an initial period of bliss, humanity then brought about a decline (*Ant.* 1.46).¹⁹⁴ Even beyond this initial period, Gray argues, Josephus displays a sense of nostalgia that people of an earlier time were closer to God.¹⁹⁵ As he seeks to present the ancient roots of Judaism positively to an external audience, he couches his description of the patriarchs in glowing terms.¹⁹⁶

By contrast, in *Jewish War* Josephus appears more concerned to emphasise the positives of the present. As he recounts biblical and post-biblical history in his own speech in 5.376-94, he focuses on God’s faithfulness over time, as support for his exhortation to repent not only to God (5.415-6) but to Rome, the instruments of God’s punishment (5.372), and to live peaceably under Roman rule until God brings about the final reign. Despite the behaviour of the revolutionaries, and those they beguiled (*J.W.* 5.407; 6.285), leading to

¹⁹³ Feldman 1998:1.

¹⁹⁴ Feldman analyses Josephus’s depiction of a golden age at the beginning of his biblical account (Feldman 1998:3-8).

¹⁹⁵ Gray 1993:34.

¹⁹⁶ Gray suggests that this nostalgia extends in *Antiquities* from the patriarchs even until John Hyrcanus (Gray 1993:34).

the destruction of Jerusalem as punishment (5.412),¹⁹⁷ there is no indication in *Jewish War* that current life is in decline. Indeed the Romans are benevolent to those who repent (5.372-3) and more pious than those who failed to keep the Jerusalem Temple holy (5.402).¹⁹⁸

For Josephus, history follows a linear trajectory of successive periods to a final end. This is not the end about which Polybius attributes insight to Scipio, in which the next regime simply follows in due course, or the similar kind of end which the *saeculum* festival sought to delay for a further period, but the installation of a permanent divine reign that brings a halt to the entire process. This divine reign will be installed in God's own time.¹⁹⁹ In the interim, Josephus indicates life continues satisfactorily under Rome's rule.

3.3 Decline in teleological history

4 Ezra and 2 Baruch

Fourth Ezra and 2 Baruch each represent late first-century or early second-century responses to the fall of Jerusalem, couched in apocalyptic visions involving *vaticinia ex eventu* and angelic dialogues.²⁰⁰ Although there are significant differences between the

¹⁹⁷ Josephus structures this historical review to convince his reader that the destruction of Jerusalem was a result of taking matters into their own hands. See Chapter 5.

¹⁹⁸ Regev 2011:280-83.

¹⁹⁹ See Chapter 6.

²⁰⁰ By setting the events in the context of the first destruction of the temple (see Chapter 2), Mermelstein notes, 4 Ezra simultaneously confirms that the current crisis does not represent a

texts in terms of their theological reflections on these events, with respect to their schemas of history they are very similar.²⁰¹ Consistent with historical reviews in other Jewish apocalypses, the reviews in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch portray history in a strongly periodised, teleological schema of decline. As the divine or angelic characters reveal that the world is ageing and approaching its nadir, they assert the imminence of divine intervention to bring about the end of history, including the vindication of the righteous and punishment of the wicked.

The nature of history's periodisation is part of the content of the revelation these apocalypses purport to supply. They each refer frequently to historical periods, which can even be numbered (4 Ezra 12.11; 2 Bar 23-30; 53-76).²⁰² Fourth Ezra 6.7-28 sets out the explanation of Ezra's concerns in the dialogue with Uriel as a discussion of "the dividing of the times" (6.7).²⁰³ And 2 Baruch borders on a riddle with its picture of compounding "times" that "will inherit times, and periods periods," leading to "the length of periods and the hours of periods" (2 Bar 42.6; cf. 48.38).

"temporal rupture" (Mermelstein 2014:177) but a continuation in a series of transitions in history—though this time the restoration will be definitive and final, incorporating judgement of the unrighteous and vindication of the remnant.

²⁰¹ Similarities between the texts suggest some kind of dependence. In Chapter 2 I suggested the most likely explanation is that 2 Baruch is a response either directly to 4 Ezra or more generally to the kind of theological perspective it represents.

²⁰² Cf. 1 Enoch 89.65-90.19; 93.1-10; 91.12-17.

²⁰³ Dimant emphasises the writer of 4 Ezra envisages time in "specific, measurable segments" (Dimant 2013:37) and, similarly, for 2 Baruch (p.47).

Although the various visions and dialogues focus on different aspects of history or theological concerns, all are teleological. Indeed, Baruch prays, “for if an end of all things had not been prepared, their beginning would have been senseless” (2 Bar 21.17).

And the divine voice responds:

Baruch, Baruch, why are you disturbed? Who starts on a journey and does not complete it? Or who will be comforted making a sea voyage unless he can reach a harbour? Or he who promises to give a present to somebody—is it not a theft unless it is fulfilled?” (22.2-4; cf. 85.10)

The speech continues with further examples of situations in which the beginning requires the end.

This emphasis on the need for an end, however, does not eliminate the writers’ interest in all of history, or what 2 Baruch describes as “the course of times” (20.6). Across both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, passages of historical review vary with respect to the scope of history they include in the revelation. In some cases the review extends from creation to the culmination of history. For instance 2 Bar 53-76 divides all of history from creation into twelve periods of alternating positive and negative events (“bright” and “dark” waters) plus two further periods of greatest darkness and light.²⁰⁴ The periods set out in the vision follow Israel’s biblical past quite clearly, without the type of cryptic allegory often found in apocalypses. Likewise, the angelic interpreter in 4 Ezra, Uriel, outlines events

²⁰⁴ Second Baruch 53-76 is reminiscent of *Apocalypse of Weeks* in its scope and inclusion of the watchers, though the latter does not share 2 Bar 53-76’s oscillating pattern.

from creation to the end in the third dialogue (7.10-44). In 2 Bar 57.1-3, the review extends back to Abraham, as the beginning of the covenant.²⁰⁵

Other prophecies limit the scope to events identified, for instance, with the fourth empire and its promised end from the paradigm in Dan 2 and 7, such as the Eagle vision in 4 Ezra 11-12 (see also the vision of the cedar, vine, and forest in 2 Bar 39.1-8).²⁰⁶ In 4 Ezra's Eagle vision, the activities of multiple wings and heads on the eagle depict different historical events in Rome (4 Ezra 12.11).²⁰⁷ This framework, frequently taken up in apocalypses (and as discussed also in relation to Josephus's treatment above), bears similarity to the metal generations of Hesiod's *Works and Days* (106-201), especially as it appears in Dan 2 where the epochs relate to metals.²⁰⁸ In Hesiod's version, a generation of heroes (156-173) is inserted between the bronze and iron generations, interrupting the decline which nonetheless remains evident in Hesiod's portrayal of the present (174-6). Ovid also adapts Hesiod's model²⁰⁹ into a series of gold, silver, bronze, and iron ages, continuing the decline across the four ages in his *Metamorphoses* (1.89-150).²¹⁰ In stark

²⁰⁵ As noted above, Mermelstein identifies a transition in post-exilic texts to tracing history back to creation (Mermelstein 2014).

²⁰⁶ In 2 Bar 23-30 the writer also divides time into twelve periods, however, these periods demarcate times of atrocities prior to the revelation of the messiah.

²⁰⁷ For detailed discussion of the historical referents for features and activities of the eagle, see Bizzarro 2014:34.

²⁰⁸ VanderKam 1984:142.

²⁰⁹ On possible adaptation in local historiographies, see Clarke 2008:16; on other Greek and Latin sources, see Momigliano 1983:134-35.

²¹⁰ Note that there are actually five generations in Hesiod's model, though only four are assigned metals, and it is these that are used in other texts. Importantly, the ages described by Ovid come

contrast, at the end of 4 Ezra's Eagle vision, a lion, which Uriel identifies as the Messiah, destroys the eagle and saves the faithful remnant, who then exist joyfully in anticipation of a final judgement (12.31-34). As noted above in relation to Josephus, texts based on Daniel's paradigm envisage a final divine reign, whose inauguration brings an end to all previous political powers and suffering.

Although the different episodes in 4 Ezra present slightly different structures to end-time events,²¹¹ focusing on different issues,²¹² both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch feature elements such as: messianic woes (4 Ezra 5.1-12; 6.21-24; 2 Bar 26-28; 70.7), a period of insight for a privileged group (4 Ezra 6.20; 12.36-38; 13.53-56; 14.26, 45-47; 2 Bar 27.15; 48.3, 33),²¹³ revelation of a pre-existent messiah (4 Ezra 7.28; 12.32; 13.26, 52; 2 Bar 30.1) and glorious

at the beginning of primordial history, and lead into a decline that prompts the gods to bring an end to the iron age (1.177-252) with a flood (1.262-347). There is therefore no sense of foretelling the future as in the use of this imagery in Jewish apocalypses (VanderKam 1984:142), or identification of any of these world ages with the historical present.

²¹¹ 4 Ezra's third dialogue appears to conflict with the account of God's direct involvement and immediate culmination of history in the second (4 Ezra 6.18-28). For instance the third dialogue describes a messianic golden age of 400 years, the death of the messiah (7.29), and a seven-day period in which all will be dead prior to a general resurrection (7.31; cf. 2 Bar 30.1; 50.2-4; 52.2-3). See Hill on the (unique) inclusion of a chiliastic period in 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and the Book of Revelation (Hill 2001:45). Stone claims such a reference to the death of the messiah is "almost unparalleled," suggesting only 2 Bar 30.1 could be similar (Stone 1987:210).

²¹² As Stone notes, the focus of 4 Ezra is not to provide a systematic account of the course of history but rather to answer the challenges of theodicy posed by the situation of the writer, for which an account of history is a helpful tool (Stone 1968:295-312). He argues that, rather than smoothing the differences between episodes, "the end" should be understood as the "decisive turning point in history" in the context of a pericope, and the "eschatological sequence" set out in that passage (Stone 1983:239, 241). See also Stone 1990:103-5, including discussion of the related Latin, Syriac, Armenian, and Hebrew terms on pp.104-5.

²¹³ See also Chapter 4 on the role of privileged insight in *vaticinia ex eventu* in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.

Zion (4 Ezra 7.26; 13.35-36), judgement of the wicked (4 Ezra 7.70; 9.18; 12.34; 13.58; 2 Bar 44.15), and vindication for the righteous (cf. 2 Bar 15.2; 51.11-13; 54.15-16; 73.1-74.2), including “eternal peace” and “joy” (2 Bar 73.1).²¹⁴

But the writers’ interests do not only lie in the revelation of the events of the end.²¹⁵

They maintain an emphasis on explaining the *past*, with accounts of creation and the introduction of evil or periods of corruption, seen for instance in 2 Bar 53-76’s account of creation, the watchers, and the ensuing alternating times of faithfulness and sin. The reviews also focus on the *present*, in placing current experience within one of a succession of periods, though the deeper suffering in the present confirms that a change of periods is imminent.²¹⁶ And it is this concern with the present that leads to depictions of the *future*.²¹⁷ This point perhaps cannot be made strongly enough, in light of scholarship that has focused on the eschatological elements of apocalypses as reflecting interest in the events of the end of history *only*.²¹⁸

²¹⁴ See further discussion in Chapter 6. According to 2 Baruch, at this time wild beasts will serve children, women will no longer experience pain during labour, and harvesters will not tire. Ramael declares: “For that time is the end of that which is corruptible and the beginning of that which is incorruptible” (74.2). On 2 Baruch’s eschatological rewards, see Gurtner 2014:110-13.

²¹⁵ Rowland observes of Daniel: “The focus of the book is not so much on the future as on the divine control of the totality of human history” (Rowland 2002:139). He also suggests 2 Bar 53-74 appears to demonstrate “an interest in history in its own right” (p.142).

²¹⁶ See Chapter 6.

²¹⁷ As Collins rightly notes, despite any ostensible focus on the future in apocalypses, “The main political impact of the apocalyptic literature lies not in any program it may imply for the future but in its rejection and condemnation of the present order” (Collins 2002:40-41).

²¹⁸ See §1 above. Nickelsburg even summarises 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch as sharing a two-age understanding of history, going on to suggest somewhat obtusely that the four-kingdom

The succession of periods and teleological structure confirm a linear conception of time throughout 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. Reviews such as 4 Ezra 11-12 that are based on a Danielic succession of empires demonstrate this clearly, as the anticipated state unveiled in the final, fifth kingdom describes an entirely new situation. However, this is also true of *Urzeit zu Endzeit* reviews such as 2 Bar 53-76, where the final state in some way mirrors the beginning (cf. also 29.8). In 2 Bar 53-76, the end is not the same as the beginning, but a period of *greatest* brightness, which leads into eternal ages of this type (74.2-4).²¹⁹ Following the description of the resurrection in 2 Bar 30.3, the Lord says, those restored to life will “know that the time has come of which it is said that it is the end of times.”

Finally, the writers of these texts consistently present history in decline, especially in the period of the historical present.²²⁰ Baruch laments, “for now, therefore, everything is in a state of dying” (21.11). Similarly, 4 Ezra exhibits a persistent emphasis on the ageing and

paradigm represents one “period” (Nickelsburg 1981:283), though I suggest they each reflect a much stronger sense of multiple periods across the course of history.

²¹⁹ Even in *Animal Apocalypse*, despite its symmetry, the end is different because the final state will not be compromised again (1 Enoch 90.38). Scott identifies an ultimate return to an original state in the schema of history in Jubilees, asserting that the end exactly mirrors the beginning (Scott 2005:8). Nonetheless, in any such eschatological hope, the parallel with the perfection of the beginning is held together with a new element: that this will continue indefinitely beyond the final events of history.

²²⁰ Flannery Dailey presents history in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in an “ascending” spiral model rather than linear, to demonstrate connections between points in history (Flannery Dailey 1999:241). While some periods in the historical reviews in these apocalypses do incorporate shared patterns or repetition within the overall teleological shape, both texts are very clear that the direction of history is decline.

deterioration of the world. The voice from the bush in the seventh vision says: “for the age has lost its youth, and the times begin to grow old” (14.11, cf. 5.54-55; 2 Bar 85.10).

The calculations of the periods which then follow lead into Uriel’s claim:

For the weaker the world becomes through old age, the more shall evils be multiplied among its inhabitants. For truth shall go farther away, and falsehood shall come near. For the eagle you saw in the vision is already hastening to come. (14.18)

Similarly, 2 Baruch 23-76 outlines signs to the wise that the end is imminent (28.1), and Baruch is told: “It will happen when they lose hope, that the time will awake” (25.4). In this way, the writers consider the historical present as approaching the nadir of human history, which itself indicates the planned moment of decisive divine action.²²¹

Historical reviews in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch reveal history’s periodisation, decline, and end. Rather than the irony and possible despair of decline without an end, as in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, or even Tacitus’s portrait, here the decline offers a particular kind of hope: things are so bad that the time for God to bring an end to history and vindicate the righteous is imminent.

²²¹ See Chapter 6.

4. Periodised and teleological history in Luke/Acts

Turning now to consider Luke/Acts alongside these texts, a number of important features emerge. First, in several of the texts discussed above, history and eschatology are not only held together in a teleological schema of history but, importantly, the writers' assertions about continuity across the course of history serve to support their claims about the events of the end. For instance, while the War Scroll focuses on describing events anticipated as part of an eschatological war at the end of history, these descriptions incorporate hymnic reviews of God's faithful action in creation and covenant which assert an explicit continuity with the faithful divine action that will vindicate the sons of light at the end of history. Similarly, as the *vaticinia ex eventu* in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch set out the events and periods of all of history, they likewise confirm the promised events of the end. In what follows, I argue that Luke's teleological schema of history demonstrates a similar interest in the past as it also confirms continuity with, and assurance of, the events of the end.

Secondly, the discussion above suggests that in many texts a sense of periodisation allows for change within history—even very decisive and cataclysmic change—without forcing a complete rupture. However, the writers balance the concerns of continuity and rupture in different ways. For Diodorus, universal historiography provides the opportunity to consider a narrative of progress across the events of every time and place

and, although this is comprised of periods, these units do not necessarily equate with moments of any particular significance. Whereas, beyond even Polybius's stress on Rome's extraordinary period,²²² writers who draw on Daniel's pattern of a succession of empires, such as in 4 Ezra 11-12, import considerable significance to history's periods. Here the preceding three empires establish the pattern of regime change. But the movement from the fourth and most harrowing empire to the final,²²³ unending divine age, though in some ways similar, ensures that the end of history is nonetheless a meaningfully different transition. Thus, periodisation is extremely common in these texts,²²⁴ but it can function in different ways. I suggest that Luke/Acts also displays an understanding of periodisation, in which the central concern lies in divine control over the transitions throughout history, including the events of the end. Here the possibility of monumental changes can still be held together with an affirmation that God remains in charge.

Thirdly, the direction of history constitutes a significant preoccupation in a number of the texts discussed above. For some, this connects to important other literary traditions, such as in Tacitus's narrative of decline, or Diodorus's self-conscious refutation of tropes of decline from a golden age through his narrative of development through necessity.

²²² Chapter 6 also highlights the ways different writers stress the significance of the present, such as Polybius's focus on the "now" of Rome's moment.

²²³ Regarding the pattern of identifying the historical present with the nadir of history, see VanderKam 1984:142, Collins 2002:26-43, and Chapter 6.

²²⁴ Dodds also notes periodisation in Stoic perspectives on history (Dodds 1973:18).

Similarly, for the writers of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, the sense of decline reflects not only interpretations of the present time but theological affirmations about the signs of imminent divine vindication. But in several cases, the direction is less crucial to the schema portrayed and does not drive the understanding of history. Similarly, history in Luke/Acts is not driven by a focus on any particular decline or progress, though a life of discipleship in any time, as a response to continuous divine faithfulness, will likely be marked by tribulation caused by others.

In what follows I discuss the features of Luke/Acts that indicate Luke's schema of history is both teleological and periodised, before a brief discussion of the direction of history in Luke/Acts.

4.1 Teleological history in Luke/Acts

For Luke, as for Josephus and the writers of Qumran's War Scroll, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch, history is conceptualised as a movement that stretches from creation to the events of the end. Likewise in *Aeneid*, history extends to its end and goal, which Virgil identifies with the Roman empire. Though depicted in various ways, in each of these cases the events of the past are important for the writer's portrayal of the end; that is, history and eschatology are not falsely severed, but intimately connected in a teleological schema of history. Luke demonstrates this teleological approach through his attention to the

events of the past, emphasis on the continuity of God's faithfulness throughout the periods of history,²²⁵ and range of assumptions about the events of the end.

Luke's interest in the past extends back to creation. In the genealogy he traces the connection from Jesus back to "son of Adam, son of God" (Lk 3.38), underscoring not only the cosmic significance of Jesus' anointed ministry, death, resurrection, and ascension,²²⁶ but the continuity of divine guidance over this great expanse of time. As in the War Scroll and 4 Ezra, divine action in creation establishes God's identity and characteristic behaviour throughout the whole schema of history. Likewise, at the Areopagus, the Lukan Paul grounds his claims about the certainty of the judgement which God has set at the end of history (Acts 17.31) in the divine sovereignty and power of the Creator: "The God who made the world and everything in it, he who is Lord of heaven and earth" (17.24).²²⁷

The past also meaningfully grounds Luke's narrative through his emphasis on prophecy and its fulfilment. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, by presenting his account's events as the fulfilment of prophecies made within his narrative (Lk 1.17, 33; 2.34-5; Acts

²²⁵ See also Chapter 4 on the divine guidance of history.

²²⁶ Talbert 1982:46-7. Luke's version of the genealogy also emphasises universality, over against Matthew's account which ends with Abraham (Johnson 1991:72).

²²⁷ The immediate context for this characterisation is demonstrating the uselessness of idols (Haenchen 1971:520), though the affirmation of God's character as Creator remains important through the speech. See Rowe 2009:40 and below.

9.11-12, 15-16; 27.24) and biblical promises (Lk 4.18-19; Acts 2.14-36), Luke provides assurance that prophesied events yet to be fulfilled beyond the end of the narrative (Lk 17.24, 26-37; 20.42-44; 21.25-28; Acts 3.21; 17.31) will also take place. Importantly, this approach to prophecy establishes continuity with the events of the past as well as using the weight of OT texts to interpret the significance of the events unfolding within Luke/Acts.²²⁸ Sterling rightly observes that Luke sees his work as a “*continuation* of the LXX,”²²⁹ similar to other extensions of earlier historiographies²³⁰ and reflected also in Josephus’s treatment of post-biblical history in the second half of *Antiquities*. Such a continuation is not only stylistic, but appeals to organic connections between the past, present, and, indeed, the future.

In his assumptions about events at the end of history, Luke shares many of the features spelt out in 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and the War Scroll, and shared across texts of Second Temple Judaism. Expectations include resurrection (Lk 11.31; 14.14; 20.27-38; Acts 24.15; 26.23), a period of afflictions (Lk 21.9-26; 23.28-31; Acts 14.22), judgement (Lk 10.13; 11.31-

²²⁸ Acts uses the language of Pss 16, 110, and 118 to describe the eschatological significance of Jesus’ resurrection (Acts 2.25-28, 31, 34-35; 3.11-12), and in so doing makes a clear claim to a divinely-appointed *telos* of history (Lk 21.28-29 and 22.69, Acts 7.55-56, cf. Lk 1.33).

²²⁹ Sterling 1991:363. The importance of Israel’s past and a kind of extension of the style and themes of the LXX to Luke/Acts is widely accepted in studies of Luke/Acts and the arguments need not be rehearsed here. For a range of views see Sterling 1999; Rothschild 2004:158-84; Fishbane 1985; Drury 1976:46-66; and, though now rather dated, Goulder 1964:145-78. For prophecy and suffering see Moessner 1996:249.

²³⁰ For instance, as Polybius writes a continuation of the history of Thucydides.

32; 17.26-37; 21.34-36; 22.30; Acts 10.42; 17.31), vindication of the righteous (Lk 14.14; 18.28-30; 21.19), and restoration (Lk 21.28; 22.28-30; 24.21; Acts 1.6-7).²³¹

Luke depicts continuity across the events of the past and maintains that all of history is overseen by the sovereign Creator. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 4 below, Luke asserts that the events of his narrative, including the events of the end, are unfolding according to an unstoppable divine βουλή.²³² In all of this he affirms a teleological schema of history, while the striking events of the end represent a decisive new transition. As for the writers of texts such as 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, Luke's periodised understanding of history accounts for significant transitions without rupture in history.

4.2 Times and periods in Luke/Acts

As discussed above, Conzelmann saw in Luke/Acts a periodised, three-stage model of salvation history (the periods of Israel, Jesus, and the church),²³³ which he argued Luke employed in order to *distance* his narrative from eschatological claims.²³⁴ In more recent work, Sterling creates a similar model when he divides Lukan history by asserting: “the period of promise is the LXX; the period of fulfilment is Luke-Acts subdivided into the

²³¹ See Chapter 6 for further discussion of end-time events and their imminence in Luke/Acts.

²³² See Crabbe 2015:34; Darr 1998:139.

²³³ Conzelmann 1987:xliv.

²³⁴ Conzelmann notes Mussner's claim that Jesus' response to the disciples' question in Acts 1.7 does not directly refute this kind of “apocalyptic expectation,” only expectation of its imminence, implicitly associating χρόνοι and καιροί with apocalyptic views of history (Conzelmann 1987:7).

age of Jesus (Luke) and the church (Acts). The key to the division of the last two is the coming of the Spirit.”²³⁵ Numerous others have proposed similar adaptations of Conzelmann’s schema,²³⁶ while reluctance about Conzelmann’s three-stage view of salvation history has led some recent interpreters to assume that periodisation itself does not feature in Luke/Acts—frequently while maintaining the hypothesis that Luke/Acts does not reflect eschatological interest.²³⁷ However, the above analysis of the study’s key texts demonstrates a widespread belief in the periodisation of history, but diverse views about its significance.

Conzelmann centred his claims about Luke’s periodisation of salvation history on Lk 16:16: “the law and the prophets were in effect until John came (Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου); since then (ἀπὸ τότε) the good news of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and everyone tries to enter it by force.” The verse, and Conzelmann’s application of it, has created considerable debate, including important criticism from

²³⁵ Sterling argues for a two-age model of promise and fulfilment, with the major transition at the time of Jesus, but his division of the second period into two further periods inadvertently creates something close to Conzelmann’s middle of time because it does not retain decisive urgency in his account of the turn of the ages (Sterling 1991:361-2). Adams also attempts to span a two- and three-part schema, though without subscribing to the delay hypothesis (Adams 2007:172-73n.198). An alternate schema of periods within Luke’s account, which is not more convincing though it includes an explicit disagreement with Conzelmann’s model, is provided by Goulder 1964:111-142 (for his appendix responding to Conzelmann, see pp.142-4). See also Wolter 2004:253-84 for more recent affirmation of Conzelmann’s three-stage periodisation of salvation history.

²³⁶ See Chapter 1.

²³⁷ Pervo 2009:25.

Paul Minear for placing so much weight on such an uncertain verse, with limited reference to its context or other key passages in Luke/Acts.²³⁸ Indeed, the verse must be read in light of its position within a pericope concerned with the *continuing* validity of the law (the Matthean parallel has a different setting; Mt 11.12). Luke is clear that the contrast with the past lies not in any diminution of the importance of the law nor, as Luke/Acts elsewhere demonstrates (Lk 21.5-36; Acts 21.6-10), the end of prophecy from the time of John. Rather, Lk 16.16 confirms the significance of the proclamation of the kingdom of God as part of the pattern of end-time events which are already unfolding in continuity with the events of the past. Rather than the kind of new schema suggested by Conzelmann, this pattern of continuity across history and end-time events is reminiscent of the periodised history in numerous contemporaneous Jewish texts, including those discussed above.

²³⁸ Minear was particularly concerned with Conzelmann's dismissal of the infancy narratives (Minear 1966:122-23). The extensive debate on the eschatological status of John the Baptist in Luke's schema is less illuminating. See overviews of the verse's interpretation (including the difficult saying about entering the kingdom by force), in Carroll 2012:332-33; Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.182-87; 2.1115-16). Bovon agrees this verse is central to Luke's schema of history, but argues it moves the position of the kingdom from the parousia (Bovon 2002-2013:2.466, 469). Kümmel discusses Mt 11.12 and Lk 16.16 as part of an attempt to uncover the historical Jesus' eschatological understanding (Kümmel 1957:122-24). Knight argues the focus of the passage is the relationship between Judaism and Christianity (Knight 1998:76-77), which is arguably more similar to the unhelpful periodisation Wright attributes to NT salvation history, as a play in multiple "acts" in which the time of Israel is the precursor to the time of the church (Wright 1991:7-32). Conversely, Luke's emphasis on the continuity of the law and the unfolding of prophecy in Lk 16.16 disproves this type of distinction.

Like the other ancient writers discussed above, Luke presumes that history is divided into periods.²³⁹ At the most basic level, and in parallel with the treatment in the other Gospels, Luke shares an understanding of “the age” also evident in other late Second Temple Jewish literature (αἰών, cf. Mt 12.32; 13.22, 39-40 [Mk 4.19]; Mt 13.49; 24.3; 28.20).²⁴⁰ Following the account of the dishonest manager’s action, the Lukan Jesus observes that the sons of light fall short of the shrewdness of the sons of this age (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου Lk 16.8). Elsewhere he compares the sons of this age (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) who marry, with those who attain that age (τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου) and the resurrection of the dead, who do not (Lk 20.34-5). Indeed, the current time (τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον) of which hypocrites do not recognise the signs (Lk 12.56; cf. Mt 16.3) promises more than the disciples have given up, alongside eternal life in the age to come (τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ, Lk 18.30; cf. Mk 10.30).²⁴¹

Similarly, Luke also uses καιρός frequently,²⁴² both to denote periods and appointed moments.²⁴³ Peter exhorts repentance so that the καιροί of refreshing may come (Acts

²³⁹ Cullmann 1962:45-6. Barr’s important study, *Biblical Words for Time*, responds to problematic lexical claims by Cullmann. Barr concludes that the overlap in meanings for καιρός, αἰών, and χρόνος in both the LXX and NT precludes the distinctions Cullmann made (Barr 1969:84-85). Barr’s second edition makes a further response, rightly recognising that Cullmann’s other arguments did not all rely on his incorrect claims about the terms (pp.179-80). The revised edition offers a very helpful overview of related publications (pp.175-184).

²⁴⁰ See Rowland 1985:88-89.

²⁴¹ Note that in Mark the contrast is between νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ and ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι to come.

²⁴² 13 and 9 times respectively in Luke and Acts, compared to 11, 5, and 4 in Matthew, Mark, and John. Luke/Acts also makes greater use of χρόνος (7 and 17 uses, compared to 3, 2, and 5), however some uses are more mundane, such as the times of a person to indicate age.

3.20), and with pathos, Jesus laments that Jerusalem did not recognise the *καιρός* of its visitation (Lk 19.44; cf. Jer. 6.15 LXX;²⁴⁴ Lk 12.56; 20.10).²⁴⁵ Luke's frequent use of *χρόνος*, reflects considerable interchangeability with *καιρός*, as also reflected in the LXX and other NT usage.²⁴⁶ Paul warns of the command to repent *νῦν*, though previously the *χρόνοι* of ignorance had been overlooked (Acts 17.30) and Peter goes on from the promised *καιροί* of refreshing to assert that the appointed Christ, Jesus, will remain in heaven until the times (*ἄχρι χρόνων*)²⁴⁷ for restoring all things (Acts 3.21).²⁴⁸

Luke's underlying periodised schema of history is made particularly plain in Acts 1.7, by the use of both *καιρός* and *χρόνος* together in plural form. Prior to Jesus' ascension, the disciples ask whether now is the time (*χρόνω τούτω*) when the kingdom will be restored to Israel (v.6).²⁴⁹ Jesus responds: "it is not for you to know the times or periods (*χρόνους*

²⁴³ For a full study of the semantic fields in classical texts, LXX, and NT, see Barr 1969. *TDNT* emphasises the sense of "fateful" or "specific and decisive" point for *καιρός*, to which are attributed texts that are better suited to a "duration" meaning (e.g. Dan 2.21 LXX; Acts 1.7), though Dan 7.25 LXX is rightly included among a list of rare uses.

²⁴⁴ Fitzmyer 1981-1985:2.1259.

²⁴⁵ Bovon interprets *καιρός* here in the sense of "opportunity," given the associated eschatological pressure in the stories (Bovon 2002-2013:2.255; 3.19n.43); Johnson suggests it indicates a moment of eschatological significance (Johnson 1991:299, 305). I suggest that Luke's periodised and teleological view of history confirms a sense in which a concept like the *καιρός* of visitation reflects a transition in history which is both a moment of eschatological significance and a period. See below.

²⁴⁶ As found by Barr 1969:84-85 and Delling's *TDNT* entry for *χρόνος*, 9.585.

²⁴⁷ English translations such as NRSV and ESV render this as singular.

²⁴⁸ Indeed, in this last instance, Luke uses all three of these terms within two verses (the *καιροί* of refreshing, leads to sending Jesus who is in heaven until the *χρόνοι* for restoring, as foretold by prophets *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*), and it may simply be a stylistic preference that led him to do so.

²⁴⁹ Keener explores other texts' expectations of the restoration of Israel (Keener 2012-2015:1.687-88). Peterson uses Acts 1.8 to structure the periods of history in terms of the geographical spread of

ἡ καιρός) that the father has set by his own authority” (v.7). While traditional interpretation has focused on the epistemological claim in the statement, and rallied this text as evidence that Luke has distanced his account from eschatological claims,²⁵⁰ the more basic assumption the statement reveals has been overlooked. By Luke’s understanding, authoritatively announced in words attributed to Jesus, history comes divided into times and periods, which have been set by divine authority.²⁵¹

Luke’s use of χρόνοι and καιροί in Acts 1.7 is reminiscent of the only appearances²⁵² of the two terms in parallel in this way in the LXX: Dan 2.21 and 4.37. These verses also elicit a sense of the divinely determined succession of ages. In response to his insight in relation to Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, Daniel praises that God changes (ἄλλοιοῖ) the καιροὺς καὶ χρόνους and, interestingly, removes and establishes kings. The Greek text of 4.37²⁵³ reports Nebuchadnezzar’s praise at his own healing and restoration of his reign, but his

the mission (Peterson 2009:112-13). Interpreters frequently employ 1.8 as a literary structure for Acts (Gaventa 2003:65), though Tannehill demonstrates that it does not really map onto the narrative (Tannehill 1986-1990:2.17), and Ellis shows the inappropriateness of designating Rome the “end of the earth” (Ellis 2001:58; cf. Barreto 2010:120).

²⁵⁰ Conzelmann 1987:6; Haenchen 1971:143; Keener 2012-2015:1.686-7.

²⁵¹ Contra those who assume Luke uses the plural to denote a *single extended* period (Bock 2011:393; Marshall 1980:93-4).

²⁵² The only other uses of the two terms together in the LXX come from Nehemiah 10.35 and 13.31, where the situation is quite different. The terms do not form a pair, but “seasons *by times* year by year,” which are explicitly connected to annual celebrations: εἰς καιροὺς ἀπὸ χρόνων ἐνιαυτὸν κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν (10.35, cf. the same construction at 13.31).

²⁵³ The Greek text in 2.21 parallels the MT, but in Dan 4 the Greek and MT vary widely from each other in the section including 4.37. Here I have used the numbering in Ralphs, who numbers the subsequent verses also 37a-c. Collins numbers this verse 4.34 (Old Greek), in Collins 1993:213.

words almost directly echo Daniel's at Dan 2.21. In 4.37 Nebuchadnezzar praises God as:

αὐτὸς ποιεῖ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα καὶ ἀλλοιοῖ καιροὺς καὶ χρόνους ἀφαιρῶν βασιλείαν βασιλέων καὶ καθιστῶν ἑτέρους ἀντ' αὐτῶν.

The combination of terms in parallel clearly underscores the relevance of these ideas from Daniel,²⁵⁴ as does the context of the disciples' inquiry about restoration of the kingdom to Israel (cf. also the sense of duration with καιρός in Dan 7.25 and the eschatological anticipation of that setting).²⁵⁵ Moreover, the only other NT use of the combined terms supports this interpretation: in 1 Thess 5.1, "concerning τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν" introduces instruction on the day of the Lord and messianic woes.²⁵⁶ Therefore, while periodisation reflects similarity to a great range of texts, the χρόνοι and καιροί in Acts 1.7 connect to other areas of NT eschatological expectation and imply a schema reminiscent of Daniel and discussed above as a feature of *Jewish War*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch.

²⁵⁴ Also in contrast to interpreting the καιροί and χρόνοι as cyclical seasons. See discussion below.

²⁵⁵ See above in relation to the War Scroll.

²⁵⁶ Conzelmann cites 1 Thess 5.1 as evidence that the terms together "(in itself an innocent enough expression), became a topic in elementary Christian instruction" (Conzelmann 1987:7). The connections to Daniel suggest that this set phrase may have a longer history of association with the succession of empires.

Divinely determined periods are also evident in the Lukan Paul's account of the deeds of the Lord of Heaven and Earth to the Athenians. Having affirmed the divine sovereignty of the Creator, as noted above, Paul asserts of God's activity:

From one ancestor he made all nations to inhabit the whole earth, and he allotted the times of their existence (καιροί) and the boundaries of the places where they would live (τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν). (Acts 17.26)

Dibelius argues that καιροί here refers to the gift of seasons, inspired by Greek philosophical traditions (and noting the other connections to Greek philosophy evident in Paul's speech, cf. 17.18, 28).²⁵⁷ Although this is the sense of καιροί in Acts 14.17, where it is modified as times of fruitfulness (καρποφόρους) and describes divine benevolence in providing rain, the use in Acts 17.26 is reminiscent of the same traditions found in Acts 1.7.²⁵⁸ As Rowe observes, Luke frames Paul's Areopagus speech between the poles of "creation (17.24, 26) and consummation (17.30-31)."²⁵⁹ Rowe rightly discerns that, between these bounds, the speech sets out the call to turn from ignorance and "to locate

²⁵⁷ Dibelius argues this as part of a so-called "philosophical" interpretation (Dibelius 1956:29-34). So also Haenchen, who interprets 17.36 as seasons in light of Acts 14.17, rather than associating the verse with 1.7 (Haenchen 1971:523; Tannehill 1986-1990:2.212). Gaventa leaves the interpretation as "uncertain" (Gaventa 2003:251). Johnson attempts a third approach, neither the seasons of Greek philosophy nor periods of Jewish apocalypticism, but "a standard statement of God's creative power" (Johnson 1992:315). Although the imagery of separation is reminiscent of creation accounts, I suggest this does not account for the ways it is used in this passage.

²⁵⁸ By contrast, Johnson uses the χρόνοι at Acts 17.30 to caution against supplying "apocalyptic" overtones to καιροί in 17.26 (Johnson 1992:317). This distinguishes the meaning of the two terms too strongly (see Barr 1969:84-85), and overlooks the understanding of periods of history since creation and until final judgement that is evident throughout this speech.

²⁵⁹ Rowe 2009:40.

the decisive event of human history in the resurrection of Jesus.”²⁶⁰ The creation of humanity, as in the governance of human history, includes demarcations of dominion in time and space, as well as oversight of the events of the end. Notably, divine sovereignty in establishing political boundaries and governing the transitions through different empires is evident not only in Jewish texts like apocalypses and *Jewish War*, but the Graeco-Roman texts discussed above, from Polybius’s *Histories* and Diodorus’s *Library* to Virgil’s *Aeneid*.²⁶¹

However, as he draws on this periodised view of history, Luke does assert some crucial discontinuities at the end of history. Already, Paul announces in Athens, the times of ignorance are over (Acts 17.30; cf. 3.17). The rejection of Jesus, though similar to the rejection of the prophets, brings new consequences (Acts 7.52; cf. 2.36),²⁶² and Jesus has become the first to rise from the dead (26.23).²⁶³ Indeed, as I argue in Chapter 6, key events in Luke’s narrative, namely the resurrection and ascension, mark the movement to the final period of history—critically, events to which Luke attributes great

²⁶⁰ Rowe identifies this as a passage which, rather than affirming the pagan philosophical models, refutes them for a call to embrace a Christian understanding of history and engage in repentance (Rowe 2009:40-1).

²⁶¹ Cf. Virgil’s portrayal of Jupiter’s divine gift of rule without limits in time or space in the specific case of Rome (1.279). Ways in which the transition between empires is attributed to personal or impersonal forces are discussed in Chapter 4.

²⁶² Note that, although there are strong parallels between Stephen’s speech and Paul’s speech in Athens, the time of ignorance to which Paul refers is not directly analogous to the faults of which Stephen accuses his Jewish hearers.

²⁶³ See further discussion in Chapter 6.

significance as eschatological moments that have already taken place. An appreciation for Luke's periodisation clarifies the importance of this transition (simultaneously challenging the approaches taken by both Conzelmann and Dibelius), while recognising its place within Luke's teleological schema of history.

4.3 The direction of history in Luke/Acts

Finally, for several writers of the key texts of this study, the *direction* of history plays an important role in explaining the past, present, and future hope. But Luke is less concerned with such patterns. Certainly the events of the end brought about from Jesus' resurrection represent a cataclysmic and significant shift. But according to Luke's rendering, in the time leading to this end, history neither improves steadily to achieve its *telos*, nor does it sharply decline as sign and catalyst of the end—although God's action in Jesus does draw out opposition that leads to affliction (Lk 16.29-31; 23.28-31; Acts 5.41; 9.16; 14.22).

Thus, the characteristic behaviour of humans can lead to opposition and suffering at any point throughout history. As for Diodorus, Luke's schema of history is shaped by an appreciation for consistent human failings (cf. Lk 8.11-15; 13.1-5, 33-35; 20.9-19; Acts 7.2-53).²⁶⁴ Rather than the type of continuous decline throughout history seen in 4 Ezra and

²⁶⁴ See Chapter 5.

2 Baruch, with the historical present forming a nadir that will prompt the events of the end, Luke describes a past characterised by disobedience (Acts 7.2-53) and ignorance (Acts 17.30), arguably somewhat uniformly. Luke's schema of history affirms divine action across history and at its end, navigating a course between the teleological approaches of writers like 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, and Josephus, in which the stress respectively falls on history's nadir or the positives of the (ultimately provisional) present.²⁶⁵

5. Conclusion

These comparisons of a range of texts of the Graeco-Roman period reveal the shared and distinctive elements of Luke's schema of history. Firstly, the discussion has highlighted that, as writers demonstrate an interest in events of the past and the end of history, they establish some continuities across all of history, including its end. In this way, in contrast to Conzelmann's influential hypothesis, writers demonstrate a clear capacity to hold together history and eschatology in teleological schemas of history. Moreover, writers from Polybius to the author of 2 Baruch also depict periodisation in history, though the effects of such periodisation differ between texts. In many late Second

²⁶⁵ This contrast between Luke/Acts and *Jewish War* is seen also in the sense of urgency in Luke/Acts, which places greater emphasis on the affliction in current experience (Lk 12.11; 21.6, 12-24; Acts 14.22) and God's faithful action in intervening (Lk 2.68-79, 29-32; 12.32, cf. Mt 6.33; Lk 21.27-8; Acts 2.17-21, 32-39) than Josephus's relatively positive approach to the present and resultant lesser emphasis upon the events of the end (Crabbe 2015:39).

Temple texts, periodisation enables writers to balance continuity across the course of history with significant transitions at key moments, without risking a sense of rupture in history.

Luke likewise maintains an interest in the course of history over time, from creation to the end of history. The connections between the events of Luke's narrative and the prophecies and events of the past establish a continuity which also incorporates the events of the end. Thus, Luke's understanding is explicitly teleological. In this sense it is unlike anything hinted at by Polybius, Diodorus, Valerius, or Tacitus. Perhaps strangely, it is similar in some ways to Virgil's presentation of the end of history in *Aeneid*, where history is not only teleological, but the *telos* has already been achieved. Though in *Aeneid* this leads to triumphalism, in Chapter 6 I argue that Luke's portrayal of life at the end of history ensures the political consequences of the end of history in these texts sharply differ.

However, as in other late Second Temple texts and spelt out most clearly in apocalypses, the events of the end also represent significant differences from earlier times—oppression by the wicked will finally be brought to an end, with related cataclysmic changes to the current worldly order. Luke's understanding of the χρόνοι and καιροί of history draws on the type of periodised view of history set out in Daniel 2, balancing

continuity with significant transitions and ultimately the unique achievement of the final transition to divine reign.

This chapter highlights a number of further points of interest for this study as a whole. If, as I have argued, Luke presents a view that history is periodised and teleological, then the types of comparisons scholars frequently undertake do not lend themselves to drawing out the significant eschatological implications of Luke's understanding of history. For instance, of those texts discussed, this type of teleology is a feature of: Virgil's *Aeneid*, the War Scroll, 2 Maccabees, *Jewish War*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch. Crucially, aside from *Jewish War*, these texts are not those with which recent scholarship has put Luke/Acts in conversation—and as I've suggested, even then, comparisons to *Jewish War* tend to be put to a different purpose. Significantly, where an examination is determined by questions of genre, and thus the key features of texts such as Polybius's *Histories* and Diodorus's *Library* become the focus, any teleological elements are likely to fall outside scholarly consideration.

Finally, from the discussion above it is already clear that a writer's schema of history relates inseparably to other claims, such as assertions of divine intervention in the events of 2 Maccabees or human responsibility for the decline of empires in Diodorus's *Library*. The following chapters address questions about the processes that govern the course of history in the key texts: divine and human agency.

Chapter 4: Determinism and divine guidance of history

“Spare your fears, Lady of Cythera; your children’s fates abide unmoved. You will see Lavinium’s city and its promised walls; and great-souled Aeneas you will raise on high to the starry heaven. No thought has turned me... I will speak and, further unrolling the scroll of fate, will disclose its secrets... Thus it is decreed...”

- Jupiter to Venus: Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.257-62, 283.

1. Introduction

This chapter explores whether and how the portrayals of history in the study’s key texts show beliefs about determinism—that is, the view that the events of history are fixed¹—and divine guidance. The previous chapter has already indicated that a writer’s schema of history interacts in important ways with beliefs about divine agency. The treatment here responds to two types of scholarly approaches to Luke’s account of the plan of God, exemplified in the work of Hans Conzelmann and John Squires. As noted in Chapter 1, for Conzelmann Luke’s divine plan was part of his ‘solution’ to the delayed parousia. By this understanding, the plan represented a kind of trade off—Luke sought to reassure his readers by affirming divine providential care over the events of history, as consolation

¹ Popović notes diverse conventions between disciplines in terminology related to ‘determinism.’ He contrasts philosophical approaches based on “a necessary chain of causation,” with the type of historical determinism seen in apocalyptic texts, which relates to periodisation of history and its end (Popović 2014:255, see full discussion pp.255-70, esp. 255-58). Given my focus in this thesis, I consider determinism related to the structuring of history and ways writers portray the course of history as set—whether by divine forces like fate, or personified gods.

for the loss of hope in imminent eschatological vindication.² By contrast, John Squires sought to set Luke's understanding of the divine plan in the context of Hellenistic historiographies, in which he recognised a "programmatically role" played by divine providence.³

Both Conzelmann and Squires are right to note the centrality of the divine plan in Luke/Acts. But in different ways, their analyses are shaped by assumptions that would be called into question by attending to a broader range of contemporaneous texts. Contrary to Conzelmann's theory, belief in a divine plan does not equate God's purpose with all the events of history (while also separating history from eschatology). Rather, as texts like the War Scroll, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch demonstrate, divine guidance can govern the entire "course of times" (2 Bar 20.6). In such cases, divine oversight of the whole of history, including its end, provides confidence about the certainty of future events yet to be fulfilled.

Squires, on the other hand, similarly overlooks the eschatological elements of the divine plan in Luke/Acts, by tying his analysis to other Hellenistic historiographies.⁴ For Squires, Luke's approach to the plan of God does indeed relate to divine guidance of

² Conzelmann 1960:135.

³ Squires 1993:15, cf. 10-14.

⁴ Squires considered Diodorus Siculus's *Library*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus's *Roman Antiquities*, and Josephus's *Antiquities*.

history, but the portrait of history he considers very rarely extends to the events of the end.⁵ Squires's treatment helpfully illuminates some understandings Luke shares with his study's other texts, chiefly in relation to human response to divine providence. However, in addition to key differences in the terminology Luke uses to express his understanding of divine guidance of history, in Luke/Acts the plan itself functions in a very different way when it is understood not simply, for instance, as a mechanism for moral accountability as is frequently the function of the actions of τύχη or πρόνοια for Diodorus Siculus, but as the basis for assurance about the events of the end of history.

Therefore, in examining determinism and divine guidance of history in these texts,⁶ this chapter first analyses writers' depictions of the personal and impersonal forces which attract frequent attention in studies of Graeco-Roman texts, such as τύχη/*fortuna*, πρόνοια/*providentia*, and εἴμαρμένη/*fatum*. This includes attention to any ways in which these terms are relevant for Luke/Acts. I then consider how the writers present their views about determinism and divine guidance in their narratives, using their treatments

⁵ Squires argues that the "logic" that holds together the "various strands of the Plan of God" in Luke's narrative lies in Luke's apologetic explanation on two key issues: Jesus' death and the gentile mission (Squires 1993:188-89, 190-94). Squires refers to the final judgement (p.2), but eschatological events and future hope are not central to Squires's understanding of Luke's divine plan (or of Josephus's *Antiquities*). Schulz's earlier examination of Graeco-Roman terminology and Luke's divine plan forcefully separates the plan from eschatological elements (Schulz 1963:105-6).

⁶ Rather than a comprehensive study of all aspects of divine guidance in each text, the chapter focuses on those elements that will illuminate the implications for Luke's eschatology. For detailed treatments of a wider range of questions, see Bobzien 1998 (on philosophical texts); Feeney 1991, Braund 1997, and Galinsky 1996 (on Virgil); Mueller 2002 (on Valerius Maximus); and, for more general treatments, Boccaccini 2008 and Momigliano 1977a.

of prophecies as the lens through which to illustrate these themes. Finally, I consider prophecy and the divine plan as they support Luke's portrayal of divine guidance of history.

This discussion highlights three features of divine guidance of the course of history in Luke/Acts. (1) Despite the numerous studies of rhetorical and generic influences upon Luke/Acts, Luke makes strikingly little use of the characteristic language of Graeco-Roman historiographies on these themes, and nor can his portrayal be reduced to 'mere' rhetoric.⁷ (2) Luke's emphasis on the divine plan is not about a "false sacralisation"⁸ of events in history at the expense of eschatology, but part of his broader view that the entire teleological schema of history is overseen by the biblical God, whose faithfulness assures the future. (3) And yet, rather than being grounded in a view that history is pre-programmed, Luke's portrait of divine guidance leaves space for human participation or opposition—to which, Luke's reader should nonetheless be assured, the divine plan can inexorably adapt. Thus, Luke's account of a definite, unfolding divine plan serves his explanation of past events and assurance for the future.

⁷ See studies such as Rothschild 2004, Squires 1993, Cancik 1997:679-95, Sterling 1991. See also criticism of Rothschild in Uytanlet 2014:78-79 and Bauspieß 2012:277, and of Squires in reviews by Tannehill 1994:428 and Darr 1995:191-92, where reviewers saw a need for greater engagement with Jewish texts.

⁸ Flender's term (Flender 1967:106), although, as noted in Chapter 1, this reflects a concern shared by many post-war biblical scholars.

2. The forces in history

In the classic epics of Homer, Herodotus's historiography, and other earlier Greek texts, the gods are characters in the plot and essential to its unfolding. From the Hellenistic period, writers tend to move away from these traditions.⁹ However, as noted by Uytanlet, even where writers claim to limit the role of gods in their texts, their narratives remain "theological in nature."¹⁰ These writers attribute influence to forces such as *τύχη/fortuna* and *εἰμαρμένη/fatum*; as, for instance, Bernard Dick asserts of Lucan's *Civil War*: "If we must have a substitute for the absent deities of the *Bellum Civile*, then it would be more correct to say *Fortuna* and *fatum* fill the void left by the discarded divine machinery."¹¹ This is true also for several texts of this study. Moreover, Jewish Hellenistic writers that invoke these new traditions, such as Josephus's appropriation of *τύχη*, also apply them in their own ways. Perhaps paradoxically, Josephus adapts characteristic terms from non-Jewish Hellenistic texts, which in part function in those texts to draw attention away from a divine role in history,¹² in order to assert God's action.¹³

⁹ Dick 1967:240; Braund 1992:xxii, xxviii; Walbank 2007:353.

¹⁰ Uytanlet 2014:33. Uytanlet criticises Marguerat for arguing the reverse (p.33n.32).

¹¹ Dick 1967:240.

¹² Braund 1992:xxiii.

¹³ I therefore discuss Josephus alongside non-Jewish Graeco-Roman texts, given some similarities in lexicon, while distinguishing the differences in the ways he uses the terms. There are also differences of meaning across non-Jewish texts.

It is important, therefore, to consider these texts in light of the diverse ways in which writers adapt these terms¹⁴—although it is impossible in the space here to offer an exhaustive analysis. I focus on those aspects that illustrate representations of determinism or divine guidance of history, rather than, for instance, extended questions about divine character or related archaeological evidence for forms of cultic piety. The discussion demonstrates both the different ways writers use these terms and that Luke makes very limited use of any of the technical language for forces within history, though the term *δεῖ* represents an important exception.

2.1 τύχη/*fortuna*

Τύχη/*fortuna* appears extensively in many of the texts under discussion though, even within the same texts, the term can be used diversely. **Polybius** uses τύχη in notoriously varied ways.¹⁵ Given his stated interest in teaching future leaders how to avoid the pitfalls into which characters in his historiography stumble, he focuses on describing events in human terms,¹⁶ whereas τύχη, as ‘fortune’ or ‘chance,’ generally becomes a catchall term for those events over which humans have no control and an explanation of

¹⁴ Though he makes some helpful observations, Uytanlet’s synchronic approach (cf. Uytanlet 2014:33) unhelpfully intermingles references from Herodotus to Tacitus, and thus elides some important distinctions, including limited attention to differences between personified deities and the different uses of terms such as τύχη or πρόνοια within and across his texts.

¹⁵ At times τύχη in Polybius approaches a personified deity, whereas elsewhere it can signify “pure chance,” or even function as a metaphor (Walbank 2007:351, 354).

¹⁶ Walbank 2007:350-1. Eckstein also emphasises Polybius’s interest in ethical instruction, not simply strategic military or political learning (Eckstein 1995:281-82).

last resort (cf. 36.17.2-4).¹⁷ Polybius sets human action within the parameters of the power of τύχη, which be characterised, for instance, as acting “like a good umpire” (1.58.1). Here τύχη can alter the conditions under which a battle is conducted, but the human agents continue to strive for victory under their own efforts.¹⁸

Importantly, for Polybius τύχη plays a crucial role in influencing the transitions between political regimes. In the case of Demetrius’s prophecy about the fall of Persia and rise of Macedon discussed in Chapter 3 (29.21), which establishes a pattern of regime changes, the theme Polybius draws out is that τύχη lends “blessings” to enable the rule “until she decides to deal differently with them (ἄλλο τι βουλευθήσεται περὶ αὐτῶν)” (29.21.6-7).¹⁹ Beyond simply effecting change through occasional changes of favour, for Polybius τύχη also acts as a force which *drives* the course of history; τύχη is intimately involved in Rome’s rise. Polybius opines the current time as “the finest and most beneficent of the performances of τύχη... she has not in a single instance ever accomplished such a work, ever achieved such a triumph, as in our own times (οἶον τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς)” (1.4.1-5). Although, Polybius applies τύχη in diverse ways, when it comes to big movements of history, τύχη constitutes the underlying force.²⁰

¹⁷ Walbank 2007:354. Although see, for instance, 1.35.2, 5, where Polybius identifies τύχη and practical reasons as causes for the same event (cf. Walbank 2007:352).

¹⁸ See discussion of the setting here in Waterfield and McGing 2010:451.

¹⁹ Diodorus also includes this (31.10). See below.

²⁰ Walbank suggests Polybius sometimes comes near to Stoic Providence in portrayals of τύχη, perhaps unaware he is mixing them (Walbank 2002b:211).

Diodorus Siculus also links τύχη to his key themes. Sacks observes, “although it occurs ‘only’ about two hundred fifty times, τύχη is the most prevalent and variable force found in the *Bibliothēke*. It plays so many different roles in the narrative that, as in Polybius’s history, it ranges from a rhetorical device to a true goddess.”²¹

Diodorus describes the “incredible fickleness” of τύχη. He reflects “for who, taking thought of the inconsistencies of human life would not be astonished at the ebb and flow of τύχη?” (18.59.4-5). However, characteristically, Diodorus also connects changes of fortune to moral lessons. Even τύχη’s unpredictability provides lessons in virtue, about bearing changes of fortune well. But τύχη acts especially as a force of accountability for immoderation and arrogance (as, for example, for the Carthaginians in 14.76.1-4). In the fragmentary later sections, as he recounts examples of good and bad conduct in earlier regimes, Diodorus summarises “τύχη is wont to veer towards what is morally fitting, and to involve those who have contrived some injustice against others in the same difficulties themselves” (37.17). He continues with a further warning, reflecting on the consequences of immoderate behaviour: “perhaps in the present (κατὰ τὸ παρόν) they exercise tyrannical power, but later (ἕστερον) they will have to render an accounting for their tyrannical crimes” (37.17).

²¹ Sacks 1990:38.

Thus, for Diodorus, τύχη's favour plays a particular role in political success and, as noted in Chapter 3, explains the transition between empires in moral terms.²² Diodorus does not present this as part of any master plan.²³ When he incorporates Polybius's account of Demetrius's prophecy about Persia and Macedon, he gathers together stories to emphasise the power of τύχη²⁴ and inserts comments to stress that no one could have predicted these transitions in advance (31.10; cf. *Polyb. Hist.* 29.21), underscoring the need for humility in the face of potential changes of fortune. Moreover, a fall from favour with τύχη, though inscrutable, may itself derive from her revised assessment of the current regime's virtue (cf. 14.76.1; 31.10). Diodorus simply emphasises the consequences of immoderate behaviour and the constant vulnerability to changes of fortune.

Similarly to Polybius, **Josephus** also draws on the idea of τύχη lending favour to the Romans (having "moved over to them from all sides," *J.W.* 5.367), as noted in Chapter 3. But for Josephus, τύχη works in tandem with θεός.²⁵ Τύχη lends favour, but θεός

²² Τύχη reverses the fortunes of Greece (Diodorus 12.1.2-4; for further examples, Sacks 1990:38n.68).

²³ Comparing Diodorus and Polybius, Sacks argues that for Diodorus τύχη never achieves the sense of a driving force of history. However, he also observes that Diodorus's "approach to political and military actions is far less synthetic" (Sacks 1990:38), and "Diodorus rarely accounts for long-term causes and developments" (p.39). On Polybius, see Sacks 1981:123.

²⁴ Walbank 1957:3.393.

²⁵ Josephus commonly refers to θεός in relation to πρόνοια and τύχη in a surrounding sentence (Schwartz 2011:339). For instance, Vespasian's rule is attributed to τύχη in *J.W.* 4.622 (and πρόνοια), but in 3.6 and 5.2 to θεός. The close association between τύχη and θεός is exemplified in *J.W.* 5.367 (Gray 1993:40).

determines the rule of each regime in turn (5.367) and thus fulfils the broader role of guiding history that is missing for Diodorus but attributed to τύχη by Polybius. Τύχη is not an explanation of last resort for Josephus, but something essential to his understanding of the way history unfolds.²⁶ Josephus may flag his connections to Graeco-Roman traditions by employing the technical term, but as he attributes to τύχη a sense of divine agency and uses it in tandem with explicitly theistic words, he presents a picture of regime changes overseen by God consistent with his Jewish tradition (cf. *Ant.* 10.210, 277-80).²⁷

The Roman understanding of *fortuna* extends elements of these images of τύχη, though Scott argues that depictions of *fortuna* by writers like **Tacitus** are “demonstrably Roman” and not merely re-presentations of τύχη.²⁸ Tacitus subscribes to the notion of fortune’s favour of a given regime. In his *Histories*, from Book 2 onwards he emphasises the *fortuna Flaviania*, and particularly of Vespasian (*Hist.* 2.1).²⁹ Tacitus mentions those who strategically begin to address Vespasian as emperor as, “their minds suddenly turned

²⁶ Rajak 2002b:101.

²⁷ Although Hellenistic traditions never merely function as a container for Jewish ideas in Josephus’s writings (Contra Bilde 1988:205), he does use terms like τύχη alongside θεός and πρόνοια, to recount a thoroughly Jewish story about God and God’s people (Cohen 1982:369). Attridge emphasises rightly that form and content cannot be easily separated (Attridge 1976:182) and, suggesting that Josephus tells a Jewish story, Rajak notes he incorporates stylistic elements of each (Rajak 2002b:102).

²⁸ Scott 1968:71.

²⁹ Scott 1968:70. Scott emphasises the interaction between *fortuna* and responsibility for Tacitus, in keeping with his contemporaries (p.70).

from fears to confidence in fortune's favour" (2.80). While he has Vocula passionately defend Rome's resilience in the face of civil war, "there are still left faithful provinces...there still remain victorious armies, the fortune of the empire (*fortunam imperii*), and the avenging gods (*ultores deos*)" (4.57). Vocula goes on to assert that punishment by fates and gods will still be exacted for "those who break treaties" (4.57).

For **Valerius Maximus** everyday mishaps or calamities are attributed to *fortuna*. The anecdotes frequently illustrate reversals of fortune with a didactic or entertaining barb (cf. 6.9; 7.1). According to Valerius, observing the effects of *fortuna* on others, "can add much confidence to our minds and take away much anxiety, whether we look at our own situations or those of our neighbours" (6.9.praef). *Fortuna* or its absence can also explain characters' actions (1.7.ext2). The greater bulk of examples reflect *fortuna's* "volatility." Valerius surmises, "she loves to inflict adversity but only grudgingly vouchsafes prosperity" (7.1.praef). But he then introduces examples of good fortune with the claim that, once *fortuna* has "commanded herself to forget her malignity, she heaps blessings not only many and great but also enduring" (7.1.praef).³⁰

Importantly, in Rome, *fortuna* becomes entwined with imperial office. Lydia Matthews's study of *fortuna* in Roman religious settings, literary texts, coins, and philosophy

³⁰ On Valerius Maximus and other popular understandings of *τύχη/fortuna*, including the belief that fortune balances things out (and the hope that, if one must gain attention from *fortuna*, it may at least not be all *bad* fortune), see Morgan 2007:242-3.

demonstrates that the negative portrayals of *fortuna* as capricious are only evident in literary texts, while inscriptions, coins, and other sources are consistently positive.³¹ Popular piety reveals a devotion to *fortuna* that connects significantly with beliefs about maintaining the empire. Here *fortuna*, once connected to a particular person, Matthews argues, became associated instead with an office, allowing continuous attributions of favour through “de-personalised Imperial *fortunae*.”³² The close relationship between imperial power and *fortuna* in turn gave rise to the kind of sceptical treatments of *fortuna* offered by Ovid and Lucan; by criticising *fortuna* the writers were able subtly to criticise the imperial powers.³³

Thus, *τύχη/fortuna* takes on a wide range of meanings and purposes for these writers, even within the same text. *Τύχη/fortuna* can explain individual mishaps, particular *καιροί* of advantage for certain groups or leaders, drive the course of history, or confirm imperial power over time. As a random force, it can prompt virtue and humility or enable the kind of flexibility that gives readers hope that the future might be more positive—or it can become uncomfortably unpredictable when compared to the justice and reliability attributed instead to *fatum*. I return to the theme of ancient comparisons of *fortuna* and *fatum* below.

³¹ Matthews 2012:100.

³² Matthews 2012:4; cf. Scott 1968:76.

³³ Matthews 2012:4; Dick 1967:238.

Finally, given its importance to popular piety and a broad range of texts discussed here, it is salutary to note texts in which τύχη does not appear. Although 2 Maccabees makes considerable use of the related verb, τυγχάνω, this underscores the significance of the omission of the noun τύχη itself,³⁴ especially given its Hellenistic style.³⁵ In one use of the verb in 2 Macc 6.22, in the third singular active aorist subjunctive, (τύχη), it is possible that some indirect allusion to the idea of the divine force is in fact intended, but the connotations are negative. It comes in the context of ‘friends’ attempting to persuade Eleazar to feign compliance with Antiochus’s dietary stipulations (to “attain” kindness), and is possibly reminiscent of another meal setting in which libations to τύχη set up a contrast between curses and blessings in Isa 65.11 LXX.³⁶

Fourth Ezra’s Latin text does not mention *fortuna* and, though the languages are clearly different, nothing approaching the idea appears in the War Scroll or 2 Baruch. These were prevalent ideas, and the signs of Hellenism within Second Temple Judaism are well documented.³⁷ But only Josephus from among the Jewish authors discussed sees fit to

³⁴ Codex A includes τύχην as a variant reading for ψυχὴν in 2 Macc 7.37, but Bauernfeind rightly notes in *TDNT* (8.240n.18) that this must be secondary.

³⁵ Bauernfeind, *TDNT* 8.240.

³⁶ Childs sees in Isa 65.11 a reference to some form of “sacred meal” (Childs 2001:536-37). Similarly, see Gad/τύχη in Gen 30.11.

³⁷ See p.40n.66 above.

incorporate τύχη into his account in a positive sense,³⁸ and even then he does so in order to draw attention to divine involvement in history that is consistent with his heritage.³⁹ The only use of τύχη in the NT is found in Codex Bezae in the parable of the Good Samaritan, in the “chance” arrival of the priest on the same road as the beaten person (10.31). In this variant reading κατὰ τύχα replaces κατὰ συγκυρίαν,⁴⁰ though the term still does not provide the sense of a divine force having acted to bring the priest into the area. Nowhere in Luke’s narrative provides a sense of a personal or impersonal divine force like chance or fortune,⁴¹ even though, as discussed in Chapter 5 below, he does make use of themes of reversal and the Lord’s favour—which is extended to all, unlike τύχη/*fortuna* in the Graeco-Roman texts.⁴²

2.2 πρόνοια/*providentia*

Some writers imply considerable overlap between τύχη and πρόνοια. Although Walbank suggests that when **Polybius** portrays τύχη in the manner of the driving force of history,

³⁸ This is particularly true of *Jewish War*. By the time he writes *Antiquities*, Josephus has shifted his preferences to πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ (Cohen 1982:374).

³⁹ Rajak 2002b. See Chapter 5 below on Deuteronomistic theology in Josephus.

⁴⁰ This is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT. P^{75c} uses συντυχίαν, with the same meaning (cf. Fitzmyer 1981-1985:2.887). These are all simply variants for ‘chance’ or ‘coincidence.’

⁴¹ In *TDNT*, Bauernfiend notes the significance of the (surely deliberate) absence of the noun from the NT, despite uses of τυγχάνω (8.242).

⁴² These themes are also evident in OT texts (1 Sam 2.1-10; cf. Lk 1.46-55), and other Second Temple texts (cf. 1QM 14.6, 10-11).

he approaches the Stoic understanding of Providence,⁴³ Polybius does not use πρόνοια itself in this sense. Instead, he uses πρόνοια in the sense of human foresight, except in a couple of instances when describing popular assumptions about divine πρόνοια. For instance, Polybius praises Scipio's strategy for inspiring his soldiers prior to battle by claiming that Neptune appeared to him in a dream, supplying the battle plan and promises of assistance (θεοῦ πρόνοια, 10.11.8; cf. 10.2.12; 23.17.10). Elsewhere, Polybius praises Scipio for calming and preparing troops "to face perilous enterprises by instilling into them the belief that his projects were divinely inspired" (10.2.12).⁴⁴ The focus remains on Scipio's skill in using the religious beliefs of others for pragmatic advantage.

For **Diodorus Siculus**, πρόνοια interacts importantly with human action—indeed, right human action can support the work of πρόνοια.⁴⁵ As noted in Chapter 3, Diodorus believes that because of the benefits of learning from past events, by compiling their accounts historians become "as it were, ministers of Divine Providence (ὑπουργοὶ τῆς θείας προνοίας)" (1.1.3).⁴⁶ Diodorus goes on to describe his understanding of πρόνοια

⁴³ Walbank 2002:211. These views of πρόνοια are evident in philosophical works by Seneca and Cicero. There is some evidence of personification of *Providentia* as a deity (including *Providentia Augusta* and *Providentia Deorum*), but this survives only on coins (Schlapbach 2008:82).

⁴⁴ Polybius also praises Scipio for "relying (πιστεύω) not on τύχη but on inference from the facts (συλλογισμός)" (10.7.4).

⁴⁵ Sacks 1990:36, 64. On Stoic influence, see Burton 1972:36.

⁴⁶ Burton suggests that Diodorus's *understanding* of πρόνοια may arise from his sources, particularly Posidonius, though he uses a different lexical style (Burton 1972:36).

alongside the historian's parallel role of compiling a unified account of the events of history:

Providence, having brought the orderly arrangement of the visible stars and the natures of ἄνθρωποι together into one common relationship, continually directs their courses through all eternity, apportioning to each that which falls to it by the direction of fate (τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἐκάστοις ἐκ τῆς πεπρωμένης μερίζουσα).⁴⁷
(1.1.3)

Diodorus's explicit association between divine πρόνοια and the work of historians highlights his sense of purpose in universal historiography: supporting the work of πρόνοια in facilitating benefit and progress in history.⁴⁸

Valerius Maximus uses divine *providentia* rarely,⁴⁹ though he does, for instance, conjecture, “but divine providence, I think, (*sed, credo, deorum providentia*)” ensured two characters received “the outcome they deserved,” as he recounts a narrative which ends with poetic justice (7.6.3). Elsewhere Valerius muses, if (only) it had been possible to rectify a situation by divine *providentia*, but it wasn't (5.3.ext3f). But there is no sense that *providentia* directs history.

⁴⁷ Note that this is a different form of the “fate” lexeme. There are lexical connections between these ideas (μερίζω and μείρομαι, from which εἰμαρμένη is derived) but, as I note below, the standard form (εἰμαρμένη), does not appear in Diodorus. The noun μοῖρα appears four times: 1.73; 5.28; 9.20; 15.64. Squires includes μοῖρα more broadly in his understanding of Fate (Squires 1993:159), though the “divisions” Diodorus refers to can be very domestic, such as to do with the division of land.

⁴⁸ Sacks observes that Diodorus does not make a connection between πρόνοια and history akin to Polybius's association of Rome and τύχη (Sacks 1990:120).

⁴⁹ *Providentia* appears in 20 passages across the nine books.

By contrast, **Josephus** uses τύχη and divine πρόνοια in interesting and perhaps parallel ways.⁵⁰ Though both terms appear in *Jewish War* and *Antiquities*,⁵¹ after extensive uses of τύχη in the former, it is almost absent from the first half of *Antiquities* (five appearances in Books 1-10). It seems, rather, that Josephus prefers πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ to describe divine activity in the biblical narratives. Importantly, as with τύχη, Josephus maintains connections with the God of his tradition,⁵² of which πρόνοια becomes an attribute or function. In a particularly potent image, Josephus presents divine πρόνοια at the helm of the ship of history, as he defends belief in the biblical God with polemic against what he characterises as an Epicurean disregard for divine guidance of history (*Ant.* 10.277-80).⁵³

Where πρόνοια appears in the LXX and NT, it relates only to human foresight (cf. 2 Macc 4.6; Rom 13.14). In Acts 24.2, Paul affirms Felix's πρόνοια in the opening of his speech; no use of πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ appears in Luke/Acts. However, Squires argues for a programmatic role for providence across Hellenistic historiographies, and suggests that without the term πρόνοια itself, Luke's portrayal of a divine plan nonetheless displays a similar understanding.⁵⁴ The discussion below demonstrates that the divine plan relates

⁵⁰ For instance, in *J.W.* 3.391, Josephus says his insight and survival at Jotapata was “by τύχη, or really by πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ” (see discussion in Schwartz 2011:338).

⁵¹ See also, for instance, *Life* 15; 425.

⁵² He also frequently uses δαιμονίου πρόνοια, including in *Jewish War* (e.g. 1.82; 2.457; 4.622; 7.82, 318) and πρόνοια τοῦ θεοῦ (*J.W.* 3.28, 144; 391 [as above]; 4.219, 366; 7.453).

⁵³ See discussion in Unnik 1973:344-45, and at §3.3 below.

⁵⁴ Squires 1993:20.

in important ways to Luke's understanding of divine guidance of the past, present, and end of history, which highlights some important differences. Nonetheless, the sense of divine guidance which allows also for human participation, as for instance in Diodorus's approach to πρόνοια and the historian's role, does reflect interests in Luke/Acts, and contrasts strongly with the inflexibility of εἰμαρμένη/*fatum*.⁵⁵

2.3 εἰμαρμένη/*fatum*

Fate enters into texts as both a force in the narrative and a signpost of philosophical debates. With the literal sense of having been apportioned (the perfect passive participle of μείρομαι, "receive as one's portion"), εἰμαρμένη indicates outcomes that are both unalterable and predetermined.⁵⁶ *Fatum*'s origin in the verb to speak (*for*), similarly underscores its sense of having been set in advance; though Ronald Martin argues that *fatum* reflects a stronger association with *divine* guidance than the Greek εἰμαρμένη.⁵⁷ For some writers, the inflexibility of εἰμαρμένη/*fatum* problematizes human responsibility, leading to a preference for τύχη/*fortuna*, whereas for others *fatum* represents the reliability and justice that is missing from the fickleness of *fortuna*.

⁵⁵ Some Stoic texts do associate πρόνοια with causal determinism. See Bobzien 1998:46-47; also discussion at §2.4.

⁵⁶ Uytanlet discusses fate as χρεών (Uytanlet 2014:29). It does not appear in the NT or LXX. There are 12 instances across Josephus's corpus.

⁵⁷ Martin particularly associates this with Livy (Martin 2001:147).

In Jupiter's introduction to his prophecy in Book 1 of *Aeneid*, with which this chapter began, Virgil plays on the certainty of *fatum*, both for the *vaticinium ex eventu* that follows and the remainder of the epic to which it leads. Jupiter's words pun with *fatum* and its etymology—Jupiter speaks (*for*), and as he does, he expounds the Trojans' fates (*fata*, 1.262), and declares it has been decreed (1.283). Once declared, even the gods are bound by the fates they have spoken.⁵⁸

In **Valerius's** anecdotes, *fatum* appears unquestioned among the forces presumed to undergird history, though it is mentioned less frequently than *fortuna*.⁵⁹ Hannibal's dream about a monstrous reptile, spouting thunderstorms and destroying everything in its path, denotes a destruction of Italy that is both inevitable and independent of human aid, as Hannibal is instructed by his guide in light of the revelation, "so hold your peace and leave the rest to the silent fates (*tacitis permitte fatis*)" (1.7.ext1).

By contrast, Squires argues that **Diodorus Siculus** shares with Dionysius of Halicarnassus a discomfort with the idea of fate, and that Diodorus introduces parallel terminology to allow for elements of human responsibility.⁶⁰ However, most of the references Squires

⁵⁸ Cf. Dioysius of Halicarnassus *Rom. Ant.* 6.54.2 (Squires 1993:157).

⁵⁹ *Fortuna* appears in 56 passages; *fatum* in 35.

⁶⁰ Squires's overall helpful study creates some difficulties by using English terms. For instance, he describes δει as fate in some places, but then claims that fate "is almost completely absent" from *Ant.* 1-11 (Squires 1993:165), although the word δει appears 94 times in *Ant.* 1-10; Squires has assessed that none of the uses have this meaning, but not explained how he made this

attributes to fate are actually uses of ἀνάγκη, which is better translated “necessity” (see below). Although in some forms of Stoicism, the two terms can be used somewhat interchangeably,⁶¹ εἰμαρμένη does not appear in the extant sections of Diodorus’s *Library*. Similarly, **Polybius** uses the term only three times, generally to denote a character’s death (16.32; 18.54; 36.17).

Josephus likewise makes minimal use of εἰμαρμένη, often reserving the term as a euphemism for death (e.g. *J.W.* 1.662). In a scene that is exceptional in many ways, Josephus uses εἰμαρμένη when describing Vespasian surmising that “some just destiny (δικαία τις εἰμαρμένη)” had placed leadership in his hands (*J.W.* 4.622). The section is ripe with related terms—τύχη, δαιμόνια πρόνοια (4.622), and σημεῖα (4.623)—leading to Josephus’s account, steeped in his personal investment in the matter, of Vespasian realising that Josephus’s declaration at Jotapata had truly been divine (θεῖος), and thus Josephus should be released from imprisonment (4.625).

In his philosophical school passages (*J.W.* 2.119-66; cf. *Ant.* 13.171-73; 18.12-22), however, Josephus uses εἰμαρμένη repeatedly, suggesting that here he is deliberately signalling the

assessment. Similarly, he makes mixed use of ἀνάγκη, μοῖρα, δαιμονιον, χρέων, and so on, under a limited set of English headings. See p.152n.47 above.

⁶¹ In Parmenides and Empedocles, Ἀνάγκη is portrayed as a personalised force. Philosophies such as Hermeticism distinguished them, associating ἀνάγκη with astral fatalism (Dräger 2002:642). See below on the relationship between ἀνάγκη and εἰμαρμένη in Stoicism. Nonetheless, none of the key texts of this study, including Diodorus, appear to be drawing on philosophical texts (cf. Burton 1972:36-37).

traditional patterns of philosophical debate with the technical term.⁶² Josephus's formulaic excursuses include loose affiliations with Stoicism and Epicureanism (though scholarly consensus maintains that Josephus does not base this on direct engagement with relevant philosophical texts).⁶³ But, even here, Josephus introduces θεός. He criticises the Sadducees, who remove θεός from all events, while noting that the Pharisees and Essenes attribute events to εἰμαρμένη and to θεός, thus connecting the two. As discussed more fully in Chapter 5, Josephus's portrayal of the Pharisees as they attribute events to εἰμαρμένη and the cooperation of ἄνθρωποι is consistent with his presentation of both divine determination *and* human responsibility. Hence, even when Josephus uses the more technical terminology, and in the type of passages that signal a philosophical treatment, he still adapts εἰμαρμένη in ways that will serve his portrayal of divine guidance of history.

Although writers like Josephus introduce elements of flexibility to εἰμαρμένη, others affirm εἰμαρμένη/*fatum* over τύχη/*fortuna*. Matthews observes the ways in which

⁶² Mason argues that the differences between the treatments of these groups in each excursus and the formulaic nature of these passages caution against drawing conclusions about their historicity (Mason 2007b:65-66; cf. Haaland 2007:267; for a contrasting view, Klawans 2012:8-9). Setting aside these questions, Josephus's philosophical schools passages illuminate his attitude to particular views, based on his description of groups he consistently presents negatively (the Sadducees). Maston notes that the different presentation of the Pharisees in *J.W.* 2 and *Ant.* 13 reflect "rhetorical pressures" arising from this desire to contrast with the negative presentation of the Sadducees (Maston 2010:14). Klawans argues that the philosophical categories Josephus deals with here, particularly in relation to the Pharisees' position, relate to Jewish not Stoic philosophies, such as that of Chrysippus (Klawans 2009:76-81; Klawans 2012:49-91).

⁶³ Sanders 2007:91. In *Ant.* 10.276-81, Josephus criticises Epicureanism (see Unnik 1973:343; Vermes 1991; and below §3.3), though using πρόνοια and θεός not εἰμαρμένη.

conflicts between fortune and fate are drawn down (at times, caricatured) philosophical party lines in the imperial period:

For many of our philosophically literate sources, a belief in the supremacy of *fatum* and *deus* is presented as the defining character of Stoic thought. In contrast, these sources present Epicurean philosophy as positing a belief in the supremacy of *fortuna*. Writers hostile to the Epicurean school represent this philosophy as replacing the moral and predictable forces of god and fate with capricious and amoral *fortuna*, a force over which human *uirtus* is powerless.⁶⁴

In particular, the conflict between *fortuna* and *fatum* emerges in these texts from the association between *fortuna* and the empire discussed above.⁶⁵ Responding to the disempowerment of Roman elites at the end of the Republic and building on the association of *fortuna* with the emperor, “Seneca developed a Roman brand of Stoicism that posited as the defining battle of the philosopher’s life the struggle against the supremacy of *fortuna*.”⁶⁶

For most texts discussed here, however, as noted in relation to Josephus above, the discussion does not presume the technical arguments of philosophical texts, even where writers employ the technical terminology.⁶⁷ **Tacitus** offers an excursus on *fatum* and *fortuna* in *Ann.* 5.22, which Griffin suggests indicates he may not have understood the

⁶⁴ Matthews 2012:6.

⁶⁵ Dick argues that Lucan’s contrast between Caesar and Cato (who rejects *fortuna*) cautions against placing trust in fortune (Dick 1967:240-41).

⁶⁶ Matthews 2012:6.

⁶⁷ Burton posits Diodorus is likely “unconsciously influenced by Stoic doctrine” (Burton 1972:37).

related philosophical debate.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, Martin rightly stresses Tacitus's deliberate vagueness and hesitation on these matters. Tacitus begins the excursus: "for myself, when I listen to this and similar narratives, my judgement wavers. Is the revolution of human things governed by *fatum* and changeless necessity (*necessitas immutabilis*), or by accident (*forte volvantur*)?" (5.22).⁶⁹ After canvassing various views, but before assessing them, Tacitus draws an abrupt halt: "at present I do not care to stray too far from my theme" (5.22). The narrative turns to the next anecdote.

In whichever ways these writers portray the role of fate, often constrained by polemic either against divine involvement in history or another philosophical group, this was an idea with considerable currency. The tensions which emerge from writers focusing on the reliability and fairness of fate over the fickleness of fortune, or those who prioritise the flexibility of fortune over uncompromising fate, also demonstrate important distinctions in the ways that writers engaged with these ideas. Nonetheless, again, εἰμαρμένη does not feature in Luke/Acts, 2 Maccabees, or any of the other Jewish Hellenistic texts of this study aside from Josephus's writings. However, where it relates to the idea of *necessity* more overlap emerges.

⁶⁸ Griffin 2009:168, n.2. Griffin also notes Tacitus's inconsistency, using *fatum* as 'chance' in 6.46.3 (p.168n.2).

⁶⁹ Martin 2001:149.

2.4 ἀνάγκη/*necessitas*

The concept of necessity, or ἀνάγκη, has a long history in Greek philosophy and can also be attributed status as a personal deity.⁷⁰ With Stoicism, ἀνάγκη became connected to a type of appreciation for causes that leads to a deterministic natural law—things happen in a necessary and inevitable sequence of causes.⁷¹ This facilitates the Stoic association between ἀνάγκη and εἰμαρμένη. For **Valerius**, at points the ideas are entwined. For instance, the elder Cyrus becomes an example of “the unconquerable necessity of fate (*invictae fatorum necessitates*)” through a disaster foretold in a dream (1.7.ext5).

Diodorus Siculus uses ἀνάγκη with τύχη in ways that allow for human responsibility alongside necessity (cf. 15.63.2).⁷² Squires observes that Diodorus “diminishes the power” of ἀνάγκη by equating it with τύχη.⁷³ The way that Diodorus tempers the inflexibility of ἀνάγκη with other forces thus complements his emphasis on virtue and benefit, preferring human participation with divine providence over behaviour that is simply *constrained* by fate.

⁷⁰ Ἀνάγκη extends from pre-Socratic conflation of physical and logical necessity, and the later separation of these ideas in Plato. According to Aristotle, necessity is understood as “that which cannot be otherwise (Aristot. *Metaph.* 5.5.1015a 33f)” (cited Dräger 2002:642).

⁷¹ Bobzien 1998:33-44.

⁷² In LCL, Oldfather translates ἀνάγκης καὶ τύχης here as “necessity and fate” (15.63.2).

⁷³ Squires 1993:160.

Josephus sets out a relationship between the various forces in *Antiquities*, as he reflects upon whether blame for Herod murdering his own sons ought to be laid with his sons for angering him, Herod himself, or τύχη, “who has a power greater than all prudent reflection” (16.397). Josephus goes on to offer a formula which may obscure as much as it clarifies:

we are persuaded that human actions are dedicated by her [τύχη] beforehand to the necessity of taking place inevitably (ἀνάγκη), and we call her Fate (εἰμαρμένη) on the ground that there is nothing that is not brought about by her. (*Ant.* 16.397)

Returning to his question of responsibility, Josephus states that the model of recognising the influence of such forces (his mix of τύχη, ἀνάγκη, and εἰμαρμένη), “has been philosophically discussed before our time in the Law” (16.399). Having thus equated the forces of his discussion here with the divine actor of the Jewish law, he turns to explain the culpability of both Herod and his sons in their own ways (16.399-404).

This exemplifies Josephus’s treatment of these questions: he uses Hellenistic terminology to denote the divine in his tradition, and he draws on the concepts about divine control of history principally in order to explain the responsibility of particular human characters.⁷⁴ This is true in his description of individual situations, such as Herod

⁷⁴ See further discussion in Chapter 5.

murdering his sons, or the Jewish people as a group, for being persuaded by the revolutionaries, as in the war against the Romans (*J.W.* 5.377-8, cf. 401-3, 407; 6.285).⁷⁵

Thus, although ἀνάγκη may have been used somewhat interchangeably with εἰμαρμένη in more formal Stoic circles, it is at least interesting that Diodorus and Josephus make fairly frequent use of ἀνάγκη, but Josephus uses εἰμαρμένη only sparingly and it does not appear in the extant sections of Diodorus's *Library*. Moreover, as they surround ἀνάγκη with other terms and apply it in different contexts, they subtly adapt its meaning to their broader purposes, underscoring the sense of human responsibility. For Diodorus, this facilitates the moral programme of his historiography; for Josephus, it allows the forces which represent God to be reliable, while blame remains with the human actors.⁷⁶

Similarly, although εἰμαρμένη does not appear in the NT, ἀνάγκη is used 17 times. Five of these refer to need or distress; 12 to something being necessary (or *not* necessary, 1 Cor 7.37; 2 Cor 9.7; Heb 7.27; Plmn 14).⁷⁷ Ἀνάγκη is only used as necessity once in Luke/Acts: in the mundane claims of the parable's character who declines the invitation to the great banquet because they "must" inspect a recently purchased field (Lk 14.18).⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Gray argues Josephus only attributes responsibility to the revolutionaries (Gray 1993:38). But Josephus does sometimes extend blame to the people as a whole (cf. 6.285).

⁷⁶ See Chapter 5.

⁷⁷ See Heb 9.23 for a positive use of ἀνάγκη.

⁷⁸ The other use is as distress in Lk 21.23.

Notably, Luke does not use ἀνάγκη in Lk 17.1, although Matthew does in the parallel passage (Mt 18.7). Unlike Matthew’s “temptations must come,” Luke’s parallel assessment is articulated instead by ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἔλθειν, (literally, “it is impossible for stumbling blocks not to come”), making it clear that stumbling blocks are inevitable, rather than that they might be ‘necessary’ or in any way divinely determined.

Luke also uses the adjectival form, however, in a significant passage. Paul and Barnabas declare to a hostile Jewish crowd in Pisidian Antioch, “it was necessary (ἦν ἀναγκαῖον) that the word of God be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it aside (ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε) and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life,⁷⁹ behold, we are turning to the Gentiles” (Acts 13.46).⁸⁰ Here Luke does employ a strong sense of necessity, though distinguished from any idea of ἀνάγκη as a personified deity, as would potentially be implied by the noun.⁸¹ Importantly, the element declared necessary is the *proclamation*—the rejection of the good news is entirely the domain of human response.⁸² This is important for Luke’s

⁷⁹ Consistent with the way he overlooks eschatological themes, Pervo says of the reference to eternal life in v.46, the “eschatological phrase comes as a surprise” (Pervo 2009:343). Barrett notes the irony of the people’s arrogance and the comment about believing themselves “unworthy” (Barrett 1994-1998:1.656).

⁸⁰ The other use of the adjective, Acts 10.24, simply denotes Cornelius’s intimate circle. See also the requirements (ἐπ’ἀνάγκης) determined by the Jerusalem council (Acts 15.28).

⁸¹ Bovon 2002-2013:1.363.

⁸² So also Barrett 1994-1998:1.656. See below regarding a similar sense of testing and then rejecting, in Lk 9.22.

treatment of divine control of history throughout, demonstrated by the following discussion of δεῖ, and of the divine βουλή below.

Aside from this passage, Luke makes surprisingly little use of the key terms for divine guidance of history common in Graeco-Roman texts. Εἰμαρμένη is absent. Τύχη appears only in a variant in Codex Bezae (Lk 10.31 D). Luke uses πρόνοια only in the introductory niceties of Paul's speech as deference to Felix's foresight and care, and as a noun denoting necessity, ἀνάγκη, appears only in the setting of a claim to domestic obligation, which the wider context undermines. However, he does make use of one technical term related to necessity: δεῖ.

2.5 δεῖ

Luke's use of δεῖ is frequently discussed in the context of a divine plan in Luke/Acts. However, the term functions differently to others that denote necessity, fate, or fortune.⁸³ Despite Cosgrove's warning that δεῖ cannot be used as a "*terminus technicus* for divine necessity,"⁸⁴ Lukan studies frequently slide into exactly this kind of shorthand.⁸⁵

⁸³ Impersonal verb from δέω I bind, it is bound.

⁸⁴ Cosgrove 1984:173.

⁸⁵ This kind of terminology appears in Mowery 1991, Rapske 1998, Thompson 2011, Squires 1993:169-70, Tannehill 1986-1990:1.54, 193. Conzelmann attributes to δεῖ a central role in Luke's understanding of the plan of God, connected to the passion and "the saving events as a whole" (Conzelmann 1960:153-4). Fitzmyer discusses δεῖ in his introduction on Lukan theology, but focuses instead on fulfillment language in Luke/Acts (Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.180). Johnson discusses δεῖ in relation to Lk 24.26, but centres on OT interpretation (Johnson 1991:395-6), and makes no mention of it in earlier passages using δεῖ, such as Lk 2.49 and 9.22. Bovon claims that

Moreover, as noted in Chapter 2, Clare Rothschild argues that Luke uses δεῖ as a rhetorical device, employed in reports of the least probable events as a way of emphasising a story's authority⁸⁶ and, as noted above, that such rhetoric was "independent of an individual author's theological beliefs."⁸⁷ I argue δεῖ functions differently from Rothschild's proposal,⁸⁸ but it still does not denote belief in an inflexible sense of necessity or fate in Luke/Acts.

BDAG judges in relation to δεῖ that, "strict classification of usage is not possible because of the multifunctional adaptability of this verb, especially in colloquial discourse."⁸⁹ Yet,

Luke uses δεῖ to indicate the salvation-historical significance of an event/issue—e.g. in relation to Lk 2.49 and 4.43 (Bovon 2002-2013:1.164). Haenchen, however, associates δεῖ with divine will and, unlike these other commentators, recognises the conflicts that arise as a result of this understanding, though he observes that Luke himself is not concerned about these conflicts. Rather, Luke's focus is on confidence in divine control of history (Haenchen 1971:159n.8). While I agree that there are points at which divine sovereignty trumps other concerns (see discussion of Acts 2.23 and 4.28), these passages do not employ the term δεῖ. Haenchen elevates δεῖ with claims such as: "in Luke, δεῖ implies that God wills something and that it therefore must happen" (p.159n.8). Rather, I suggest that the logic is: *God can foresee something, and thus it must happen*. That God's will ensures that all things will ultimately be turned to furthering God's plan is certainly a theme of Luke/Acts, but it is not part of Luke's use of δεῖ.

⁸⁶ Rothschild 2004:194.

⁸⁷ Rothschild 2004:7. Rothschild continually imports a purpose to Luke/Acts that I do not find compelling: "viewed, rather, in terms of the author's goal of competitive historiography, LXX citations in Luke-Acts are less concerned with literal realisation of an old promise than verification of the present account" (p.169). If Luke's purpose is to "commend [his] version of what took place" (p.182), this is not so much about Luke's competition with others in the historiographical marketplace, but his interpretation of the events themselves (closer to the view argued by Squires 1993:125).

⁸⁸ For criticism of Rothschild's conflation of rhetoric and content, see Chapter 2 above.

⁸⁹ Grundmann's entry in *TDNT* likewise confirms the source of necessity is not intrinsic to the verb, and that in philosophical use it means "logical or scientific necessities" (*TDNT* 2.22).

none of the eight variations of meanings catalogued list *divine* necessity or fate.⁹⁰ Often the term takes ordinary meanings to do with practices or traditions that “must” be followed, for example, because of religious obligation,⁹¹ or other things that “ought” to be done—including the sense that something ought to have been done but was not (often communicated with the imperfect). δεῖ appears 40 times in Luke/Acts, and many of the occurrences relate to these kinds of ordinary meanings: the disciples “need” to pray and not lose heart (Lk 18.1), the Passover lamb “had to be” sacrificed (22.7), and the Pharisees “ought” to have practiced justice (11.42; cf. Acts 20.35).⁹²

For other uses, BDAG enumerates meanings related to an “internal necessity” that arises out of a “given situation,” events that “take place because of circumstances... with the context determining cause,” or “compulsion caused by the necessity of attaining a certain result.” Though these meanings may still lend themselves to a divine cause of the necessity if the context suggests it, the term by itself does not convey divine action.

Unfortunately, when suggesting δεῖ does display elements of divine necessity (p.22), Grundmann cites Acts 5.39 in support (which does not use δεῖ but only βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ).

⁹⁰ BDAG:214. For earlier material, LSJ does give an association with fate as one of many meanings, citing Herodotus 2.161; cf. also *TDNT* 2.22 regarding Herodotus 8.53.

⁹¹ Similar use in Diodorus, *Library* 10.9.7.

⁹² δεῖ also denotes practices or fitting responses in Acts 15.15; 16.30; 26.9, and things that “ought” to be done at Lk 15.32; 13.14, 16; Acts 19.36; 24.19; 25.24; 27.21.

Importantly, Luke's use of $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ is not equivalent to his understanding of the divine $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$;⁹³ divine guidance of history in Luke/Acts is not reduced to a kind of fate or pre-programmed plan in which each character simply plays her or his predetermined part.⁹⁴ Where Luke employs $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ as a form of internal necessity,⁹⁵ it relates to one or both of (a) the necessity of foretold events taking place, and (b) an inherent necessity arising from the context in which characters find themselves as they seek faithfully to proclaim the gospel and fulfil their mission.⁹⁶ In the latter use, suffering often comes about because the context of proclamation leads to opposition—that is, short of denying the gospel, suffering cannot be avoided.

Although there is considerable overlap between these two applications of $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ in Luke's text, it will help to discuss them separately. Seven times in Luke/Acts, $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ is explicitly related to biblical prophecy.⁹⁷ For instance, as frequently in discussing his own suffering, Jesus claims:

⁹³ Cosgrove 1984:173.

⁹⁴ Cosgrove 1984. Contra to Squires, Luke's approach to necessity does not "come very close to the hellenistic idea of Fate" (Squires 1993:167). By contrast, Conzelmann claims that Luke/Acts contains "no reflection on fate and free will" (Conzelmann 1987:xlvi).

⁹⁵ Others that might be put in this category can be discounted: Lk 2.49; 12.12; Acts 1.21; 19.36.

⁹⁶ Thus this also meets the final BDAG definition above, in which something is necessary in order to achieve a desired result: faithful proclamation of the gospel and fulfilment of Jesus and the apostles' mission. Cosgrove argues Luke's $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ highlights human interaction with necessity through obedience (Cosgrove 1984:176). Miller discusses in terms of the difficulties of human interpretation of divine disclosures (Miller 2007:234).

⁹⁷ Cosgrove 1984:173-74.

For I tell you, this scripture must be fulfilled in me (δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί), ‘And he was counted among the lawless (ἄνομοι);⁹⁸ and indeed what is written about me (γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ) is being fulfilled (τέλος ἔχει).” (Lk 22.37; cf. 24.26, 44; Acts 1.16; 3.21; 4.12; 17.3)

Similarly, as Peter addresses the remaining apostles, he asserts, “the scripture had to be fulfilled (ἔδει πληρωθῆναι), which the Holy Spirit through David foretold concerning Judas” (Acts 1.16).⁹⁹

This use of δεῖ reflects the use in Dan 2 LXX.¹⁰⁰ As Daniel begins his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, he says:

But there is a God in heaven revealing mysteries (ἀνακαλύπτων μυστήρια), who has disclosed to king Nebuchadnezzar the things which must happen (ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι) on the last days. (Dan 2.28, LXX, my translation)

Here the necessity relates to a logical requirement that, if something has been reliably foretold, it is bound (the literal meaning of δεῖ, from δέω) to happen.¹⁰¹ Thus, although some particular events Luke claims had been prophesied might be difficult to locate in

⁹⁸ See below in relation to Acts 2.23.

⁹⁹ Conzelmann notes Codex Bezae attaches δεῖ instead to the selection of the replacement in Acts 1.16 (Conzelmann 1987:10-11). Following Rothschild’s understanding of rhetorical purpose, Keener argues Luke uses δεῖ here to combat the public embarrassment of Judas’s betrayal (Keener 2012-2015:1.1756-57).

¹⁰⁰ Erich Fascher claimed that Luke’s δεῖ reflected LXX usage rather than Graeco-Roman (Fascher 1954:228, 245-47, 254), although Dan 2 is the only place in which δεῖ takes on a meaning related to this type of necessity (though here it is used three times in two verses!). Fascher’s claims about the LXX raise important considerations, but most of the LXX uses of the term fall into the more ordinary categories, such as Lev 4.2; 5.17; Esth 1.15; 2 Macc 11.18. By contrast, on associations with Graeco-Roman concepts see Schulz 1963:108-9.

¹⁰¹ The LXX introduces necessity into the passage; it is not present in the MT; see comparison of texts in Collins 1993:150-51.

actual scripture passages,¹⁰² his use of $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ nonetheless reflects this reasoning: prophesied events *must* happen (Lk 24.26).¹⁰³ Similarly, the necessity of Paul's journey to Rome centres around prophetic revelations that this will take place, and thus therefore that it must (Acts 23.11; 27.24).¹⁰⁴ Even the shipwreck is described as "necessary," once it has been revealed to Paul that it will take place (Acts 27.26).

The second, but often related, application of $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ as an internal necessity emerges from events that must take place if characters are to fulfil their mission within their particular context.¹⁰⁵ Thus, in order for Jesus to fulfil his mission, he must proclaim the gospel in other places (Lk 4.43).¹⁰⁶ Likewise, Paul must testify in Rome (Acts 23.11; 27.24).¹⁰⁷ And as they fortify disciples with confidence in the message of the gospel, despite inevitable opposition and persecution, Paul and Barnabas assert, "it is through many persecutions

¹⁰² For instance, the Lukan Paul claims that Moses and the prophets prophesied that the messiah would be subject to suffering (Acts 26.22-23; see Chapter 6), although no clear passages are cited (Johnson considers OT possibilities, Johnson 1991:395-6).

¹⁰³ Bauspieß attributes a "theologisches Sinn 'notwendig'" to $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ here, contrasting with both a rigid sense of fate and Rothschild's rhetorical device (Bauspieß 2012:277). For Bauspieß this theological sense connects to Luke's soteriology and approach to knowledge or insight (*Erkenntnis*, pp.277-85).

¹⁰⁴ Uses of $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ regarding Paul's travel to Rome also appear at Acts 19.21 and 25.10. In the latter, the setting confirms he is asserting that he "ought" to be tried before Caesar. In 19.21 it is less clear (see Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger 2004-2009:4.152; Crabbe 2016, *forthcoming*, and §4.2 below).

¹⁰⁵ Cosgrove 1984:175.

¹⁰⁶ Similarly, in 2 Maccabees, Eleazer's approach to his martyrdom is fitting (6.20). Similarly, Diodorus 11.91.1.

¹⁰⁷ Given Paul's prophetic dreams on this subject, this theme reflects both types of necessity.

(θλιψις) that we must (δεῖ) enter the kingdom of God” (14.22).¹⁰⁸ Although sometimes interpreted as a claim that suffering is a prerequisite for the kingdom, here as elsewhere, the necessity arises from the setting: in order to attain a certain result—that is, steadfast proclamation of the gospel without backing down in the face of opposition—enduring persecution will be necessary. This is confirmed by the discussion two chapters later, in which the troubled jailor asks Paul and Silas, “what must (δεῖ) I do to be saved (ἵνα σωθῶ)?” They provide the foundational response: “believe on (πίστευσον ἐπί) the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved, you and your household” (16.30; cf. Acts 4.12).¹⁰⁹ Suffering is not a prerequisite for God’s saving action in Luke/Acts. But a life of discipleship in a context in which others reject the good news may well make suffering necessary.¹¹⁰

Paul’s Damascus experience incorporates both of these senses of δεῖ: what Paul must do to fulfil his mission is revealed to him (Acts 9.6), and Ananias receives a vision about “how much [Paul] must (δεῖ) suffer” in fulfilling this mission (Acts 9.16). Luke includes a

¹⁰⁸ Gaventa distinguishes suffering as “an entrance requirement” for the kingdom from suffering according to a divine plan, but says Luke still affirms the latter (Gaventa 2003:209). See also Cunningham 1997:14.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Acts 4.12. I recognise that aligning Acts 14.22 and 16.30 as I have done here equates “salvation” with “entering the kingdom of God,” but I believe this is justified in the broader literary context (cf. Lk 4.43; 7.50-8.1).

¹¹⁰ Contra Squires’s loose connection between Stoic views of the merit of suffering and Jesus’s experience at the Mount of Olives (Squires 1993:171). Suffering in Luke/Acts does not have this “character forming” sense, but an entirely different element of necessity (δεῖ) is evident here, which relates to following through with proclamation leading to rejection of the prophet (Johnson 1991:16-17). This is also consistent with Bovon’s understanding of God recasting Jesus’ murder (Bovon 2002-2013:1.383) below.

nice play on words in the dialogue between Ananias and God, in which Ananias objects that Paul has the chief priests' authority "to bind (δῆσαι) all who invoke your name" (9.14), but God's response outlines the necessity (δεῖ) that will unfold in suffering, as Paul himself acts "for the sake of my name" (9.16).

In the example key to Luke's narrative, Jesus' suffering is described both as a necessary fulfilment of what has been foretold and a necessity that arises as a consequence of the opposition his mission receives. In his first passion prediction, Jesus declares:

The Son of Man must (δεῖ) undergo great suffering (πολλὰ παθεῖν), and be rejected (ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι) by the elders, chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised. (Lk 9.22)

Bovon observes that the term used for the rejection by the elders indicates a period of testing followed by rejection: ἀποδοκιμάζω.¹¹¹ Jesus must suffer, not only because this was foretold by the prophets, but in order to fulfil his mission (cf. Lk 17.25). This feeds into other Lukan themes, such as the tragedy of the rejected prophet¹¹² and the tragic reversal brought about by some people rejecting his proclamation (Lk 13.33-4; cf. 4.16-30; 7.30).¹¹³

¹¹¹ Bovon 2002-2013:1.383.

¹¹² Johnson 1991:16-17.

¹¹³ Matthew includes only the lament for Jerusalem, in the verses which follow (Matt 23.37-39). See discussion of reversal in Chapter 5 below.

However, while using δεῖ to indicate that suffering becomes necessary through the circumstances of opposition, Luke still asserts that the divine βουλή is at work through Jesus' death and his vindication in resurrection and ascension (Acts 4.24-30).¹¹⁴ Although he unhelpfully introduces the language of fate, Bovon's commentary on Lk 9.22 otherwise captures the crucial element of this theme. Jesus' suffering is necessary because it is foreseen and a result of human action, but in turn even this is nonetheless incorporated into the divine plan:

Luke adopts two theological points from Mark with special avidity: δεῖ ("it is necessary") and παθεῖν ("to suffer"). God has a plan (cf. Acts 2:23). Between divine fate and human freedom runs the path of the living God, who foresees the suffering of the Son of Man and integrates it."¹¹⁵

Bovon observes that the opposition to Jesus as it unfolds across the Gospel leads to his murder. But God responds in a way which gives Jesus' murder "an entirely new meaning."¹¹⁶ Luke is clear that, as suffering is associated with δεῖ, it reflects a necessity brought about not by God, but by those who reject God's invitation, even as God enabled the prophets to foresee that they would.

¹¹⁴ Notably, Luke does *not* use δεῖ in this key verse (cf. also 3.18).

¹¹⁵ Bovon 2002-2013:1.363.

¹¹⁶ Bovon 2002-2013:1.363.

2.6 Summary: personal and impersonal forces in history

These writers use terms like *τύχη/fortuna*, *πρόνοια/providentia*, *εἰμαρμένη/fatum*, and *ἀνάγκη/necessitas* diversely, even within the same text. At times they attribute a strong sense akin to a personal deity, as in some of Polybius's descriptions of *τύχη*, whereas elsewhere they supply more vague notions of impersonal forces.¹¹⁷ As they participate in traditions begun in the Hellenistic period, of reducing the role of personalised gods, these writers not only change to attributing activity to divine forces, but they can also vary in how confidently they attribute the action to that force. Polybius, Diodorus, Valerius, Tacitus, and even Josephus at times, describe an event as taking place “as if” by divine providence. Or they describe *others'* beliefs that fortune was the cause.¹¹⁸ However, each writer who uses these terms nonetheless also supplies examples in which the attribution to the divine force is explicit and affirmed by the narrative.¹¹⁹

That these writers can apply the same terms to different characterisations of divine forces naturally demonstrates the importance of looking beyond this terminology.

Clearly the underlying concepts remain significant, as even in, for instance, comparing

¹¹⁷ Regarding the emperor's *apotheosis*: despite his panegyric, not even Valerius attributes supernatural attributes and divine guidance to Caesar (1.praef; see Wardle 2000:479, 492-3). Tacitus provides an ironic example (*Hist.* 4.81; see Syme 1958:1.206). On divine favour and kingship, including “deified rulers” see Uytanlet 2014:31-34.

¹¹⁸ Cf. *Doings* 1.5.praef; 1.6.1; *J.W.* 1.593; 3.28, 144, 391; 4.366; 6.252, 266. See Walbank's discussion of Polybius in Walbank 2007:353.

¹¹⁹ Cf. *Doings* 1.5.ext1; 1.6.6. Schwartz notes that Josephus confirms God is the one “pulling the strings” *J.W.* 6.250 and 7.319 (Schwartz 2011:339).

the uses of τύχη/*fortuna* as a driving force of history at times for Polybius, a moral force responding to human immoderation for Diodorus, or a catalyst for capricious change in the moment for Valerius. Moreover, the above analysis demonstrates that for a Jewish Hellenistic writer like Josephus, even where he uses these terms, he applies them to his own portrayal of the divine. Finally, this discussion has also demonstrated that the other Jewish texts of this study make very minimal use of this kind of terminology, and that, despite the focus on Luke's Graeco-Roman attributes, this is true for Luke/Acts too. Moreover, the concept of δεῖ as Luke uses it does not indicate divine planning. Moving beyond a study of key terms, therefore, I suggest it is helpful to consider more narrative ways in which writers communicate a sense of determinism or divine guidance of history. Their treatments of prophecies are illustrative.¹²⁰

3. Prophetic insights into the future

The key texts of this study depict characters gaining insights into the future through a range of means, from portents and prodigies to dreams, oracles, and revelatory encounters with angels. As the writers affirm the accuracy of these insights, they also affirm that the course of history is to some extent set. At times, they also make claims about divine guidance of these predetermined events. The following outlines prophetic insights described by writers such as Diodorus and Valerius, and the *vaticinia ex eventu* in

¹²⁰ It is not possible to give a comprehensive analysis of all narrative indications of determinism and divine guidance, but prophecy offers a good example across the study's key texts.

Virgil's *Aeneid*, as they depict history in a way that indicates determinism and divine guidance, before turning to prophecy in the Jewish texts.

3.1 Prophetic insights according to Polybius, Diodorus, Valerius, and Tacitus

Writers such as Diodorus Siculus, Valerius Maximus, and even occasionally Tacitus and Polybius affirm that insights into the future provided by portents, dreams, and oracles can be truthful, even if the writers also sceptically note examples in which people wrongly took a natural event to be a portent. In these texts, accurate prophetic insights enable writers to communicate a sense of inevitability about an outcome after the fact¹²¹ or to attribute human responsibility for failing to respond to a prophetic warning—or both!

In Book 1, **Valerius Maximus** devotes sections to numerous types of prophetic insights, including: augury (1.4), omens (1.5), prodigies (1.6),¹²² dreams (1.7), and wonders (1.8). In the world of his narratives, the insights provided by these events are proved to be true.

¹²¹ Two types of retrospect affect writers' depictions of determinism and divine involvement: the extent to which a writer allows the end of the narrative they plan to tell to intrude into their account of earlier events (see Grethlein 2013:8); and the consequences of the writer's later historical setting. The first is a literary technique, illustrated by narrative asides like, "it is no light thing to show irreverence to the divine laws—a fact that later events will make clear" (2 Macc 4.17; cf. 8.11; cf. *Ant.* 16.404). The second concerns information the writer and reader know, but characters do not, and constitutes an essential element in *vaticinia ex eventu*, as discussed below and in Chapter 6.

¹²² Following Bailey's translation (Bailey 2000), I retain the somewhat antiquated term "prodigy" (Latin: *prodigium*) in part because it differentiates between the categories of prophetic insights Valerius discusses in Book 1.

So Consul L. Sulla's experience with a snake emerging from an altar during the Social War is interpreted as encouragement to take immediate military action, which is then successful (1.6.4). Signs can be misinterpreted, but still fulfilled in unexpected ways. Valerius describes Hamilcar's dream about dining in Syracuse, which Hamilcar interprets as a sign of victory over the town, only to discover that he would dine there as a captive (1.7.ext8, cf. 1.5.4; 1.7.8).

Valerius includes anecdotes in which characters go to extreme lengths in unsuccessful attempts to evade a predicted calamity (cf. 1.6.7). This frequently plays on irony. Here the effect of the irony is not only, as defined by the *OED*, a situation that "seems deliberately contrary to what was or might be expected; an outcome cruelly, humorously, or strangely at odds with assumptions or expectations,"¹²³ but, to enlist John Lyons's helpful definition of the effect of irony in texts, it also produces layers of meaning running against one another in a text to create "insiders" and "'fall guy(s),' the person(s) who do(es) not or should not get 'it'."¹²⁴ Readers of his anecdotes recognise the signs and know that a character attempting to thwart a portended disaster by extravagant means is set up to fail. But, as the stories gel with the claims inherent in material elsewhere (cf.

¹²³ *OED*, meaning 3.

¹²⁴ Lyons 1997:29. Lyons introduces this definition in his discussion of Gamaliel in Acts 5. See §4.2.

3.7.ext6),¹²⁵ his exempla affirm the underlying assumptions about the accuracy of such prophetic insights.

Valerius's account of King Croesus's tragic attempts to escape predicted events demonstrates the effect. Following a "sleep-vision (*quietis imago*)" which disclosed that his son was destined to be taken "by steel," Croesus took extreme measures to keep his son from harm. But in an ironic tragedy, which Valerius introduces with the words "necessity opens the way to mourning (*necessitas tamen aditum luctui dedit*)," the son was eventually killed while dealing with a boar, by the sword of the guardian employed for his safety (1.7.ext4). Here Valerius reflects the popular view that the future is inescapably determined (cf. 1.6.10; 1.7.6; 1.7.2; 1.7.ext8), while providing an anecdote that will entertain the hearer, who can both appreciate the irony and be pleased to have avoided similar tragedy at the hands of *necessitas*.¹²⁶

In some cases, however, Valerius recounts prophetic insights that he suggests ought to have functioned as a warning. As Mueller observes, Valerius "accepts fortune, fate, necessity, and nature as an integral part of divine law. He does not bother with

¹²⁵ Exemplified by comparison between Cicero and Valerius in relation to Haruspicy, which shows Valerius altering the story to safeguard claims about the accuracy of haruspicy (3.7.ext6). See Mueller's comparison (Mueller 2002:118-21).

¹²⁶ On this technical term see §2.4.

philosophical complications arising from simultaneous belief in fate and divination.”¹²⁷

Despite the sense of inevitability he portrays elsewhere, Valerius frequently (and quite passionately) bemoans characters’ failure to heed prophetic warnings by acting to *avert* the portended tragedy (1.4.2; 1.6.6; 1.6.11; 1.6.ext1b). Although, in one interesting example, Ti. Gracchus accurately understands a prodigy, which warns him that his friend intends to betray him. But Gracchus then allows the events to unfold anyway; Valerius affirms his virtue in assenting to the portended future (1.6.8).

Diodorus Siculus describes Philip the Macedonian interpreting an oracle as part of his plans for victory over the Persian king, involving misinterpretations that lead to an ironic twist. The reader is aware of Philip’s mistake from the outset. He interpreted the oracle “in a sense favourable to himself,” while the reader is told, “actually, however, it was not so, and it meant (σημαίνω) that Philip himself in the midst of a festival and holy sacrifices, like the bull, would be stabbed to death while decked with a garland” (16.91.3). Diodorus continues the narrative in what becomes an ironic description of Philip’s planning for the festival, punctuated by other portentous elements (16.92.2-3). Philip’s death in 16.94 confirms the oracle’s accuracy, as the reader has known throughout would inevitably ensue.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ Mueller 2002:188-89. See Chapter 5 on the ways this tension emerges in texts in terms of human culpability.

¹²⁸ On Diodorus’s references to fulfilment of the oracle, see Squires 1993:124-25n.20-21.

As noted above in relation to πρόνοια, **Polybius** recounts characters fabricating claims to prophetic insight simply in order to persuade their audiences (10.2.12; 10.11.8; 23.17.10). Though he does indicate that Demetrius's prophecy about Persia and Macedonia was accurate (29.21).¹²⁹ **Tacitus** is also generally more sceptical about prophetic insights into the future. He considers techniques such as astrological divination to be open to misunderstanding, suggesting that interpreters are unable to distinguish between true and false signs.¹³⁰ Moreover, very human conditions can lead characters to lean towards inappropriate attributions in relation to portents and prodigies.¹³¹ As Griffin summarises:

Tacitus believed that people, when in an overwrought state, interpret natural or chance events as portents indicative of fate or the wrath of the gods (*Hist.* 4.26.1–2, cf. *Ann.* 4.64.1; 12.43.1).¹³²

But importantly, despite Tacitus's scepticism, he does present some events as genuine portents.¹³³ The key example lies in those that signified Vespasian's rise, involving "a favourable omen of great significance, as the haruspices all agreed" (2.78)¹³⁴—though

¹²⁹ See also Walbank 2002a:256–57.

¹³⁰ Griffin 2009:170. On Tacitus's criticism of superstition and astrology (cf. *Hist.* 2.78), and his reasons for countering superstitions (Liebeschuetz 1989:194–96).

¹³¹ Tacitus sometimes criticises interpretations of events as signs, even when what was believed to be 'foreshadowed' then takes place (*Hist.* 1.86).

¹³² Griffin 2009:171.

¹³³ Cf. *Hist.* 2.4. According to Roman religion, failure to consult haruspices appropriately could lead to divine punishment (Mueller 2002:9).

¹³⁴ Liebeschuetz 1989:192–93.

even here, awareness of the meaning of these signs unfolds gradually and through struggle.¹³⁵ Ultimately, the omens which foreshadow Vespasian's rule gain Tacitus's unequivocal support. He declares, "prodigies had indeed occurred" (*Hist.* 5.13).¹³⁶ This confirms that for Tacitus, as in the case of the other writers, prophetic signs *can* be accurate (though less frequently than popularly claimed); his reserve stems rather from his assessment of any given case.¹³⁷

3.2 Prophecy in Virgil's *Aeneid*

Prophecy takes a different form in Virgil's *Aeneid*, though themes shared with the texts above still emerge. For instance, the events prophesied are certain to unfold—though, as characters can also misunderstand or receive only part of the prophecy, fulfilment of prophecies can involve an unexpected twist, as for Valerius or Diodorus. As noted in the previous chapter, the historical reviews in 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and *Aeneid* set out history in highly structured terms. In each case, prophecies couched as *vaticinia ex eventu* are inherently deterministic. In *Aeneid*, these passages, in which past historical events are 'predicted' (1.262-304; 6.752-892; 8.624-728), serve to confirm that all of the events of history have been determined. This form of the prophecy allows Virgil to interpret the

¹³⁵ The 'development' in Vespasian's understanding of his portended status suggests an element of irony, though Tacitus seems to affirm the oracle's accuracy (cf. 5.13).

¹³⁶ Sailor labels this declaration "striking," given it is so uncharacteristic (Sailor 2008:245). Sailor also argues Tacitus deliberately evokes here Aeneas's correct interpretation of signs in *Aen.* 8.520-29 (pp.244-5).

¹³⁷ See also *Hist.* 2.4.2; 4.81-2.

significance of the events of past and present, and to use the ‘prediction’ of past events to establish trustworthiness in prediction beyond the present time: the endless continuation of Rome’s present rule.¹³⁸

O’Hara connects interpretation of prophecies in *Aeneid* with the stunning irony with which Aeneas misinterprets Dido’s mural depicting the Trojan War (1.450-90).¹³⁹ What Aeneas takes as a sensitive acknowledgement of the Trojans’ suffering, the story reveals to be a glorification of victory. Indeed, Aeneas is the butt of misunderstanding on numerous occasions. He remains oblivious to the significance of the shield in Book 8, is noted to exit through the gate of “delusive dreams (*falsa insomnia*)” (6.896)¹⁴⁰ following his underworld tour, ensuring he does not remember the revelations therein,¹⁴¹ and, far from being privy to the conversation between Jupiter and Venus in the review in Book 1, he fails initially even to recognise Venus, let alone her cryptic hints about the future, in the following incident in the forest (1.321-411).

However, in contrast to O’Hara’s suggestion, the resulting ambiguity pertains only to the *interpretation*, not *accuracy*, of the prophecy. Prophecies throughout *Aeneid* are proved to

¹³⁸ See further Chapter 6.

¹³⁹ O’Hara 1990:183.

¹⁴⁰ Contrast Homer, *Od.* 19.562-7.

¹⁴¹ This reference remains more in question (cf. Feeney 1986:15; O’Hara 2007:95). I follow Goold in suggesting that the ambiguity of the gates functions to explain how Aeneas forgets the insights from the underworld in Books 7-12 (in Fairclough and Goold 1999:1.597).

be truthful, though they can at times mislead characters by providing only a partial insight into the future (see, for instance, 6.343-46, or prophecies which mislead through semantic ambiguity, such as 3.94-98, 255, cf. 7.116).¹⁴² As the discussion above demonstrates, Virgil is not alone in reserving a twist in the plot, in which a character's misinterpretation of prophecy is eventually exposed in the course of the prophecy's inevitable, if unexpected, fulfilment. In all of these cases, however, the literary technique *relies* on the reader being able to recognise the foretold events in the outcome as it is recounted. Whatever ambiguity this introduces for Aeneas as a character, the dramatic irony on which the plot rests serves to confirm the accuracy of the prophecies. Virgil's *vaticinia ex eventu* underscore that the course of events is set, even if not all the characters realise, and, as noted above, once spoken even Jupiter is bound by what has been fated.¹⁴³

3.3 Prophecy, determinism, and divine guidance in the study's Jewish texts

The writers of this study's Jewish texts also portray history as to some extent set in advance, which can be illustrated through their use of prophecy. At one end of the

¹⁴² O'Hara claims Jupiter's prophecy in Book 1 is false because it prioritises comforting Venus over disclosing the future (O'Hara 1990:3). By contrast, however, Jupiter is a trustworthy character in the text. See further discussion in Chapter 6. Interestingly, although O'Hara acknowledges the *ekphrasis* form in Book 8 eliminates ambiguities associated with disclosure and interpretation, creating a direct connection in the text between Vulcan and the reader, he also wishes to exclude the Book 8 prophecy on the basis that all prophecy in *Aeneid* is unreliable (p.173).

¹⁴³ I discuss the significant political considerations that this view of history evokes in Chapter 6.

spectrum and in keeping with its focus on divine assistance in particular moments in history, in **2 Maccabees** prophecy shapes immediate events—Judas inspires his troops with his account of his dream about the gift of a golden sword, which he interprets as divine assurance of success in the upcoming military campaign (2 Macc 15.12-16).¹⁴⁴ By contrast, *vaticinia ex eventu* in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, the War Scroll's picture of the future, and Josephus's treatment of prophecy provide a wider focus on history, which interprets the past and provides assurance for future events yet to be fulfilled.

3.3.1 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch

As in *Aeneid*, in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch the *vaticinia ex eventu* underscore that all of the events included in the prophecies have been set in advance. In so doing, the writers interpret the past and present, and give reasons for trusting the claims made about the future.¹⁴⁵ Given the teleological shape of their schemas of history, which includes history and the events of its end, the writers' portrayals of determinism and divine guidance over the whole course of history interact importantly with their eschatology.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁴ In 2 Maccabees, God is involved in particular events, but the writer does not provide a strong sense of divine guidance of history more broadly. On the role of God in 1 and 2 Maccabees and Acts, see Schwartz 2009:128-29 (though I disagree with his portrait of Luke's politics; see my Chapter 6).

¹⁴⁵ Rowland 2002:12; VanderKam 1984:142; cf. Stuckenbruck 2005:91-92. The discussion in Bockmuehl helpfully emphasises the connection between apocalyptic literature's interest in the revelation of heavenly realities and hope in the present (Bockmuehl 1990:26-27). Henze on 2 Baruch argues that the interest in determinism across history should not be taken too heavily, as it serves primarily to emphasise divine sovereignty and the certainty of the prophesied end (Henze 2011:280). This is an important theme in Chapter 6 below.

¹⁴⁶ See Chapter 6 below.

The term ‘apocalypse’ (ἀποκάλυψις) reflects the importance of special revelation for texts of this form.¹⁴⁷ As noted in Chapter 3, the periodised nature of history itself is part of the content of the divine disclosure in historical apocalypses, as the seer receives a vision of the periods of history unfolding in turn. Rather than merely rhetorical flourishes, these generic features serve claims to privileged access to information about the nature of the world and its end—a special insight which the writer also shares with the implied reader (cf. 4 Ezra 4.22-3; 8.63).¹⁴⁸ Traditions of sealed secrets disclosed to the pseudonymous protagonist from the past (4 Ezra 14.45-8; cf. Dan 12.4) suggest the implied audience sees itself as a select group who have been granted the ability to understand the processes that undergird the world as it really is and history as it will certainly unfold. Baruch addresses the Mighty One, “You pull down the enclosure for those who are spotless” (54.5; cf. 55.3), claiming that revelation granted to the righteous casts aside the impediments for seeing the world accurately.¹⁴⁹ While the emphasis on

¹⁴⁷ Though Collins 1979a is widely taken as the starting point for definitions, debate about various features continues; there is, however, consensus about the central role of revelation. As they relate to nuancing Collins’s definitions in order to apply it to elements of “apocalypticism” in other texts, see, for instance: Reynolds 2013:40-1 (on John); García Martínez 1998:264-5 (on the Dead Sea Scrolls); and Hanneken 2012:2-3 (the inversion of the form and content in Jubilees). See also Davies’s helpful discussion about “apocalyptic and historiography,” including as the ideas relate to Josephus (Davies 1978a).

¹⁴⁸ Newsom 2014:202-3.

¹⁴⁹ In these apocalypses, most space is devoted to disclosures about the vision’s interpretation (Henze 2011, 272).

privileged knowledge does not necessarily imply a group which wishes its esoteric insights to *remain* secret, it bolsters the claims of the prophecies' accuracy and authority.

Thus, in 2 Baruch, Ramael¹⁵⁰ has been “sent by the Mighty One” to reveal to Baruch both the times “which have passed and those which in his world will come to pass” (2 Bar 56.1-2). Similarly in 4 Ezra, despite the rigorous dialogue between Ezra and Uriel in relation to the justice of the events to unfold, the two characters nonetheless agree that the events have been determined. At various points Uriel claims that all of this has been planned from before everything (4 Ezra 6.6; 7.74). For his part, Ezra laments the inevitable events and suffering to be endured while awaiting divine judgement (5.43).¹⁵¹ Moreover, the messianic lion in 4 Ezra's fifth vision claims to have created four empires (the last being the eagle) to rule, asserting that this was designed to bring about “the end of my times” (4 Ezra 11.39). Here divine planning adds a further layer to the determinism, whether or not the writer also attributes responsibility to God for the fourth empire's further atrocities, which the lion goes on to list (11.40-46).

The view of history that emerges from apocalypses is often described as “apocalyptic determinism.”¹⁵² In Chapter 5 I discuss any scope these writers envisage for human

¹⁵⁰ This is the only instance of an angelic interpreter in 2 Baruch; the writer normally portrays direct communication with the divine (Henze 2011:272).

¹⁵¹ Cf. 1 En 90.39-42.

¹⁵² Popović 2014:256.

decisions for faithful practice within this deterministic framework. However, as they describe the unfolding periods of history, these texts depict history proceeding according to a determined pattern. Moreover, the prevalence of, for instance, reinterpretations of Daniel's prophecies, even in texts of different genres (4 Ezra 12.11-12; cf. *Ant.* 10.210 below), confirms this is a view late Second Temple Jewish writers frequently share about divine guidance over the periods of history and its end.

3.3.2 The War Scroll

In the War Scroll, the writer's claims about the future are couched in terms that both assert their accuracy and the privileged status of the readers (17.8). The War Scroll does not contain prophecies in the form of *vaticinia ex eventu*, but the writer does set out prophetic claims about events to take place in the future, beyond the implied reader's time.¹⁵³ The writer provides no hint of any question of the accuracy of the scenario it outlines.

The writer portrays the eschatological war's events as divinely determined, with no scope for change or impact by human actors, despite the active (but also predetermined) roles that humans are to perform as the plan itself unfolds.¹⁵⁴ The day on which the Kittim will fall has been "determined by [the God of Israel] since ancient times" (1QM

¹⁵³ The War Scroll also applies Num 24.17-19 as prophecy of the Kittim's destruction (1QM 11.6-8).

¹⁵⁴ See further Chapter 5 on humans as divine instruments.

1.10; 13.14; 17.5).¹⁵⁵ The hymn to be sung following victory asserts: “for you know our appointed time and today it shines for us” (18.10). The sons of light also enjoy support from significant figures who have been appointed from ancient times¹⁵⁶ and supernatural beings actively engaged in the conflict, with “the assembly of the gods and the congregation of men” battling each other amid “the roar of a huge multitude and the shout of gods and of men” (1.10-11).¹⁵⁷

Vermes summarises the divinely determined structure of the war:

The phases of its battle are fixed in advance, its plan established and its duration predetermined. The opposing forces are equally matched and only by the intervention of ‘the mighty hand of God’ is the balance between them to be disturbed when he deals an ‘everlasting blow’ to ‘Belial and all the host of his kingdom.’¹⁵⁸

The events foretold in the War Scroll describe a divine plan (13.2), in opposition to the plan of Belial (13.4; cf. 17.4-6). According to 13.11, God has created Belial;¹⁵⁹ though created “for the pit,” his purpose is “to bring about wickedness and guilt.” The writer

¹⁵⁵ The writer also finds support for these claims in Isa 31.8 at 11.11-12 (1QM 11.10).

¹⁵⁶ See Chapter 6 regarding the various titles attributed to characters in the War Scroll. However understood in relation to other expectations in Second Temple Judaism, characters like the Prince of Light and the angel Michael confirm divine involvement in the events, certainty of victory, and the eschatological significance of the battle.

¹⁵⁷ See Chapter 5 for discussion of this plural picture of “gods” engaged in the battle.

¹⁵⁸ Vermes 1997:163.

¹⁵⁹ Dimant argues that 1QM is unique among the DSS for making this claim, though “Belial” terminology is an important marker of sectarian texts (Dimant 2011:245).

seems unconcerned by any resultant questions about divine responsibility; the Scroll's detailed picture of determinism focuses only on divine sovereignty and the certainty of eschatological victory for the sons of light.

3.3.3 Josephus's Jewish War

Josephus incorporates various approaches to prophecies, which portray the course of history as determined. Similarly to Valerius and Diodorus, Josephus describes accurate signs and portents. Herod correctly infers that a building collapsing immediately after he had left it was a good omen for commencing a successful military campaign (*J.W.* 1.331). Other characters experience portentous dreams (1.328; 2.114; 3.354), some Essenes' gift for foretelling the future receives admiration ("seldom, if ever, do they err in their predictions" [2.159]), and Jesus son of Ananias's mournful cry "woe to Jerusalem!" emerges not, as some suspected, as the symptom of mental illness (6.305), but as an inspired seven-year long witness to Jerusalem's destruction (6.308).¹⁶⁰

As both character and narrator in *Jewish War*, Josephus makes authoritative claims about the correct *interpretation* of signs. For instance, after describing storms and earthquakes taking place while the Idumaeans camped outside the city walls, Josephus narrates, "such

¹⁶⁰ Josephus also discusses *false* prophets (*J.W.* 6.285-8). Josephus does not support divination in terms of actively seeking augurs or signs, in keeping with emphases in Deuteronomy (Unnik 1973:348-50).

a convulsion of the very fabric of the universe clearly foretold (πρόδηλος) destruction for ἄνθρωποι, and the conjecture was natural that these were portents (τέρατα) of no trifling calamity” (4.287). But whereas the Idumaeans interpret the portent as their destruction and Ananus’s people consider it a sign of divine favour, Josephus observes that both “proved mistaken (κακοί) in their divination (στοχασταί) of the future (τὰ μέλλοντα) (4.289), as those who were to die were Ananus and his guards” (4.297).¹⁶¹

Josephus’s emphasis on accurately interpreting prophetic signs is central to his apologetic purpose in *Jewish War*. Among the errors he attributes to the revolutionaries lies misinterpretation of prophetic signs on the basis of optimism (*J.W.* 1.377; 2.650; cf. Diodorus 16.91 above). Their misinterpretation of “the ambiguous oracle” (χρησμός ἀμφίβολος, 6.312), likewise leads to the disaster, though Josephus himself knows that it, “in reality signified the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was proclaimed Emperor on Jewish soil” (6.313).

From his introduction as a character in 2.568, Josephus is a respected military figure (3.142), full of ingenious strategies (3.171-5, 186-8, 271-5). But his insight goes beyond superior military acumen; he is presented in the style of a prophet like Jeremiah and

¹⁶¹ Attridge notes that *Jewish War* exhibits greater fatalism than Josephus’s approach in *Antiquities* (Attridge 1976:183).

Daniel.¹⁶² Josephus's revelation at Jotapata establishes his prophetic identity (3.352-54, 4.623),¹⁶³ though the passage does not disclose the contents of Josephus's dreams, which he indicates took place earlier. Rather, in keeping with his focus on accurate *interpretation* of dreams and prophetic signs, Josephus indicates that the turning point represented by this important event lies in his sudden ability to understand what the dreams meant (cf. 3.352).¹⁶⁴

As in the prophetic warnings discussed above, Josephus presents portents and omens both as signs that Jerusalem's destruction had been foreordained to a particular date since long ago (6.250, 313-4)¹⁶⁵ and as warnings which ought to have been heeded to avert the destruction.¹⁶⁶ Josephus presents his own character drawing on his privileged insight and exhorting his hearers to repent to Rome (5.372) and to God (5.416). As Gray notes, Josephus is unconcerned about the apparent conflict between assessing a prophet's credentials on the basis of the accuracy of their prophecy, and recognising the prophet's

¹⁶² Gray 1993:35; Cohen 1982:366-81; Bilde 1998:55.

¹⁶³ Gray 1993:37.

¹⁶⁴ Miller's work on dream-visions in Acts and other ancient literature focuses on texts that he suggests indicate dream-visions were considered unreliable, although he recognises this as a minority view in ancient texts. However, aside from a compelling example in Sir. 34.1-5 (Miller 2007:56), Miller's examples generally relate to unreliable *interpretation*.

¹⁶⁵ Villalba i Varneda suggests that there are two causes involved in this destruction: God, who has determined that the destruction take place; and another force which has set the date and implemented it (Villalba i Varneda 1986:49-50). Given how Josephus uses this terminology, however, I do not believe he intends to separate the ideas.

¹⁶⁶ On Klawans's overview of fate and freewill in the "compatibilism" of Josephus, see p.157n.62 above. On these questions, see also my Chapter 5 below.

vocation as exhorting hearers to alter their behaviour (and thus to avert the foretold, inevitable disaster).¹⁶⁷

Finally, unlike Diodorus or Valerius, Josephus also demonstrates belief in determinism and divine oversight over the whole course of history and its end, as he also draws on biblical prophecies and applies them to his own context (*Ant.* 10.210; cf. 4.114-17).¹⁶⁸

Josephus's interpretation of Daniel, discussed briefly above in relation to the role Josephus attributes to divine πρόνοια, affirms an overarching belief in divine guidance of history that not only explains the past but guarantees the events of the end of history.

Josephus portrays Daniel positively both in terms of his wisdom and in his prophetic skill (*Ant.* 10.194, 200, cf. 10.237, 239-41). He uses Daniel's interpretation to Nebuchadnezzar to claim prophecies show:

how mistaken are the Epicureans, who exclude Providence (πρόνοια) from human life and refuse to believe that God governs (ἐπιτροπεύω) its affairs or that the universe is directed by a blessed and immortal Being to the end that the whole of it may endure, but say that the world runs by its own movement (αὐτομάτως) without knowing a guide or another's care. If it were leaderless in this fashion, it would be shattered through taking a blind course and so end in destruction, just as we see ships go down when they lose their helmsmen or chariots overturn when they have no drivers. (*Ant.* 10.277-80)

¹⁶⁷ Josephus comes close to presenting this as a conflict, by suggesting that he deserves harsher treatments than the abuse he has received from his listeners, for attempting to prevent the destruction that has already been determined (*J.W.* 6.108). However, the claim underscores his passion in exhorting his hearers.

¹⁶⁸ Bilde 1998:53.

Josephus incorporates various Hellenistic terms, and even polemical treatment of a particular philosophy. But he describes history as overseen by God (cf. *J.W.* 2.159-166; 5.367; 6.310). On the accuracy of the Daniel's prophecy, Josephus says: "those things which He foretells must come to pass (ἅ τε δεῖ γενέσθαι προλέγει), duly take place at the appointed hour (καθ' ὥραν ἀπαντᾷ τεταγμένως)" (*Ant.* 10.142). Thus, Josephus allows space for human responsibility, particularly for the tragic events of the recent past, but he affirms divine guidance over not only particular events within history, but the whole course of history and its end.¹⁶⁹

3.4 Summary: Prophetic signs and determinism

Despite their different ways of portraying these concepts and their different literary forms, writers from Diodorus to Virgil and the author of 2 Baruch recognise some form of accurate prophetic insight into the future, which suggests that history is to some extent set in advance. As writers like Valerius, Diodorus, and Tacitus, as well as Josephus, incorporate accounts of portents and dreams, they communicate a sense of inevitability about the ensuing events after the fact. In *vaticinia ex eventu* in *Aeneid*, Virgil supplies not only a similar sense of inevitability, given all of the events leading up to the end of the historical review were set in advance, but an interpretation of the significance of these events. The view of history evoked by prophecies such as those in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch,

¹⁶⁹ See further discussion of the temporal elements of Josephus's reasoning here in Chapter 5 below.

but also present in the War Scroll and Josephus's narratives, affirms divine guidance of the whole course of history including the events of the end.

Thus determinism in history can confirm hope (the promised end to present suffering is assured, as also the events of the past took place as predicted),¹⁷⁰ endorse existing authorities,¹⁷¹ or underscore the futility of human resistance.¹⁷² Across the texts of this study, divine forces can drive the course of history as part of a larger plan; in others they simply react in the moment—whether acting through caprice or interacting dynamically with human failures of virtue or positive contributions to divine priorities. Luke's approach to prophecy in the context of claims about divine guidance of history owes much to the view found in the Jewish texts discussed here, though his βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ also displays important flexibility and adaptability.

4 Prophetic insight and the divine plan in Luke/Acts

Prophecy and its fulfilment plays an important role in Luke's narrative and has attracted considerable scholarly attention.¹⁷³ Rather than offering a comprehensive account of

¹⁷⁰ Cf. 4 Ezra 11-12 and 2 Bar 53-76, also undergirds the function of prophecy in the War Scroll, *Jewish War*, and in many ways also Luke/Acts.

¹⁷¹ This is the effect of determinism in *Aeneid*.

¹⁷² Valerius frequently presents this view, as in the tragic inevitability of Croesus's son's death (1.7.ext4).

¹⁷³ On Luke's "proof from prophecy" see Cadbury 1958; Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.179-81; Keener 2012-2015:1.483-91; Mallen 2008:4-9; Rothschild 2004:158-84. On Luke's substantiation of the Plan of God through a retrospective means of fulfilment, see (Sterling 1991:359). Also Moessner 2008a,

this topic, the focus here remains on Luke's presentation of determinism and divine guidance. In the following, I first highlight some of the ways in which Luke's approach to prophecy illuminates these themes, and then examine Luke's explicit attributions to divine guidance in his portrayal of the divine plan.

Crucially, as in the similar dynamic discussed above in relation to Luke's use of δεῖ, in Luke/Acts, not all events that have been accurately *foretold* have been divinely *planned*. Rather, God's capacity to foresee accurately the tragic opposition to the divine βουλή makes possible divine planning to mitigate its effects. This, in turn, confirms again the assurance Luke promises to provide his reader: the dynamic βουλή can be opposed, but it cannot be stopped.

4.1 Prophecy in Luke/Acts: interpreting the past and assuring for the future

Luke treats prophecy positively and has his characters demonstrate that the future can be accurately foretold.¹⁷⁴ In many ways, Luke thereby demonstrates some continuity with a great variety of writers discussed above, from Valerius Maximus to the author of 2

Moessner 1996, and Sterling 1999. On prediction as a rhetorical technique, see Rothschild 2004:158. On ancient uses of Scripture, see Fishbane 1985; Sanders 2007.

¹⁷⁴ Squires discusses miracles and σημεῖα in Luke/Acts in the category of portents, arguing they are about God's ongoing care and involvement. Although Josephus does connect signs and providence in *J.W.* 6.310, this relates to the signs functioning as warnings. In Luke/Acts, however, as also in Mark, miracles constitute revealed evidence of the world as it really is. If there is an element of warning, it is about the urgency of repentance (Acts 17.31).

Baruch. Agabus's prophecy about a famine is endorsed (Acts 11:28),¹⁷⁵ the prophetic gift of Philip's daughters is portrayed positively (21.9),¹⁷⁶ and Ananias finds things just as he has been told when he goes to help Paul (9.17). Even the girl who prophesies through a Pythian spirit is portrayed as accurate (16.16-18),¹⁷⁷ akin to the special insight attributed to unclean spirits across the synoptic tradition (Lk 4.41; 8.28/pars).¹⁷⁸ But the certainty Luke's prophecies provide is not, as for instance in Valerius's anecdotes, that a particular occurrence is deemed to have always been inevitable and inescapable, but an assurance about future events, including the events of the end of history.

4.1.1 Prophecy made and fulfilled within Luke's narrative

Several characters offer prophecies which are then fulfilled within the narrative.¹⁷⁹ In addition to confirming the characteristic accuracy and positive portrayal of prophecy in Luke/Acts,¹⁸⁰ these prophecies also interpret the significance of the later events in the

¹⁷⁵ This ensures that Agabus's credibility is already established when he returns in Acts 21.10 to prophesy about Paul's treatment in Jerusalem, discussed at §4.2.

¹⁷⁶ Philip's daughters' prophetic abilities both affirm the possibility of accurate prophecy and establish an expectation that it will take place in these scenes (Conzelmann 1987:178).

¹⁷⁷ For background on Pythian sibyls, see Cancik 1998:87, 91, 94-96. Whereas Luke denounces elements of her situation, he does not question her predictions' accuracy. Spencer criticises Luke's perpetuation of cultural norms about women of lower economic status in his stigmatised portrayal of her prophecy, despite its accuracy and the promise of Acts 2.18 (Spencer 1999:146-51).

¹⁷⁸ Conzelmann 1987:131; Tannehill 1986-1990:2.197.

¹⁷⁹ Johnson identifies "programmatic prophecy," which interprets the narrative (Johnson 1991:16).

¹⁸⁰ Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger list numerous positive prophets in Luke and Acts (Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger 2004-2009:4.162n.108).

narrative, simultaneously performing an important literary function. The infancy narratives supply several examples. For instance, following his inspired arrival at the temple, Simeon's words over the infant Jesus inform the reader's encounter with later events. Luke has Simeon interpret a key element of Jesus' mission, as he pronounces Jesus, "a light for revelation (ἀποκάλυψις) to the Gentiles (ἔθνη), and for glory to your people Israel (λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ)."¹⁸¹ And, relatedly, he sets a foreboding tone of tragedy, as he prophesies to Mary:

This child is destined (κεῖται) for the falling (πτῶσις) and the rising (ἀνάστασις)¹⁸² of many in Israel, and to be a sign that will be opposed (σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον) so that the inner thoughts (καρδία) of many will be revealed (ἀποκαλύπτω)—and a sword will pierce your own soul (ψυχή) too. (Lk 2.34-5)¹⁸³

The reader is encouraged to trust Simeon's words: his affinity with the Holy Spirit, repeated three times in the preceding three verses, and his past prophetic insight,

¹⁸¹ On the tragedy of Israel in Luke/Acts, particularly as established in the infancy narratives, see Tannehill 1985:74.

¹⁸² Ἀνάστασις is used six times in Luke. Each relates to expectations of a resurrection of the righteous, or debate with Sadducees about the resurrection. The 11 uses in Acts refer to the resurrection of the dead as an eschatological event and the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection (see Chapter 6 for further discussion of resurrection as a key theme of the apostles' proclamation). There are no 'domestic' meanings of ἀνάστασις. In this context, Simeon's prophecy comes loaded with the idea of Jesus being situated for the *resurrection* of many, with parallel eschatological consequences for the falling of many, brought about by their opposition to Jesus.

¹⁸³ See Johnson on the motif of the rejected prophet (Johnson 1991:16-17). Alexander suggests that this prophecy (as also other elements of Lk 1-4) links in important ways to the ending of Acts (Alexander 2007:224-26). The tragedy foreshadowed by Simeon perhaps functions like the prophecies with twists discussed above—as their fulfilment is finally narrated, the reader realises the true meaning of the prophecy.

portrayed as fulfilled in this encounter with Jesus, underscore his reliability.¹⁸⁴ Thus, his interpretation of the events to unfold later in the narrative becomes authoritative. The parallel description of Anna's faithfulness and her actions in directing those looking for the redemption of Jerusalem to the infant further confirms the significance of the unfolding events (2.36-38).¹⁸⁵

Indeed, as prophecies throughout the infancy narratives are fulfilled, they interpret the unfolding events and provide assurance about further claims made about the future. For instance, having told Zechariah that John will prepare the way for the *Lord*, Gabriel simultaneously confirms Jesus' identity (Lk 1.17; cf. also 2.26). Gabriel's declaration to Mary, likewise confirmed by the epiphany's accuracy in other respects, must also be trusted: Jesus' kingdom will have no end (Lk 1.33). Epiphanies and dreams in Acts

¹⁸⁴ Rothschild attempts to distinguish between "human" and "divine" prophecies in Luke/Acts, arguing that, rhetorically, "human prophecies" make the historiographical narrative more believable to a Hellenistic audience (Rothschild 2004:182). However, separating the divine from human in these passages is impossible, as even Rothschild notes, "these categories overlap" (Rothschild 2004:176). All accurate prophecy in Luke/Acts requires *spiritual* insight into the world as it really is (see discussion of insight in apocalypses above). Simeon exemplifies the relationship: he is righteous (Lk 2.25) and anticipates God's redemptive action (v.26), but the Holy Spirit facilitates his prophetic insight and guides him to its fulfilment (vv.25, 27).

¹⁸⁵ There is some question about whether some infancy predictions are fulfilled or subverted by the narrative. Does Luke suggest Anna's actions confirm the association between Jesus and the redemption of Jerusalem, or is she correcting misunderstanding by pointing people in the correct direction for hope? (Lk 2.38; cf. Lk 1.68-79; Acts 1.7). I suggest the latter is the better reading (contra Gaventa 2003:65).

likewise reveal and interpret events that then unfold in the course of the narrative (Acts 9.11-12, 15-16; 10.3-6, 11-20; 27.24).¹⁸⁶

4.1.2 Events identified as the fulfilment of biblical prophecy

Luke also identifies the events of his narrative as the fulfilment of biblical prophecy. Much can be (and has been) said about these features of Luke's narrative.¹⁸⁷ Luke's use of OT prophecy performs several functions,¹⁸⁸ among which is included assurance that the community's present circumstances, as also the death of Jesus, were accurately foretold through the prophets. Luke uses biblical prophecy to confirm that God had foreseen even apparently disastrous events such as the rejection of the Messiah. However, as I argued in the discussion of Luke's use of $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ above, Luke does not equate these events directly with the divine plan. Rather, prophecy confirms that God has already adapted to the predictable outcome of Jesus' rejection to ensure the promised end (Acts 3.13-26; cf. 17.31).

In particular, Luke's explanations of Jesus' suffering and death make claims about biblical prophecy. Jesus' resurrection appearances, as also Paul's speech before Agrippa, assert that "Moses and the prophets" point to Jesus' suffering (Lk 24.26-27, 44-47; Acts 26.22-23;

¹⁸⁶ See Farahian on the connection between the prophetic dreams in Acts and Peter's quotation from Joel at Pentecost (Farahian 1991:204; cf. Spencer 1999:151).

¹⁸⁷ See p.193n.173 above.

¹⁸⁸ Moessner 2008a; Sterling 1999:217.

cf. Lk 16.29, 31; Acts 28.23). As exemplified in the programmatic events at Nazareth in Lk 4.16-30 (also identified with the fulfilment of biblical prophecy), and evident throughout Luke's narrative, that characters will reject the good news and its anointed prophet is predictable.¹⁸⁹ Stephen's speech confirms that obduracy is endemic in the history of God's people (Acts 7).¹⁹⁰ But Luke does not suggest God's faithful guidance of history *attempts to create or plans* this response, even though the future remains assured. Rather, as divine inspiration allows accurate prophecy that significant groups will reject God's guidance, the divine βουλή may also adapt to ensure that God's ends are ultimately achieved. Nonetheless, this does not remove the important note of tragedy inherent in this predictable rejection, foreshadowed first by Simeon's prophecy and evident still in Paul's closing comments in Rome in Acts 28.¹⁹¹

4.1.3 Events prophesied for the future

Finally, Luke/Acts includes prophecies about events that remain in the future at the end of Acts. In light of the picture of accurate prophecy elsewhere, the reader is invited to trust the promises related to the events of the end, in the proclamation of Jesus (Lk 13.22-30; 17.22-37; 21.25-28) and his apostles (Acts 17.31). In the manner of the *vaticinia ex*

¹⁸⁹ Jesus' speech at Nazareth (Lk 4.16-18) declares the fulfilment "today" (v.21) of a spliced citation from Isaiah 61.1-2 and 58.6 (vv.18-19) and establishes key themes of Jesus' ministry, including the negative reception he will receive from 'insider' characters (Crabbe 2011:251-4, 260-2).

¹⁹⁰ For further discussion of Acts 7 see Chapter 5.

¹⁹¹ See Chapter 5 below.

eventu discussed above, some prophecies purport to foretell events that have already taken place in between the time of the events in Luke's narrative and the time of Luke's writing, such as Jerusalem's destruction (Lk 19.43-44; 21.20-24). Luke 21.5-36 offers an extended account of historical events and events anticipated as part of the end, to which I return in Chapter 6 in discussing Luke's view on the position of the present time in relation to the events of the end.¹⁹² Here again, as in 4 Ezra or 2 Baruch, readers' capacity to identify the prophesied events in their own experience serves to reassure, both by confirming the events were predictable and known to God (and thus the divine plan has already incorporated them). Simultaneously, these prophecies build confidence that the remaining events of the end of history, also prophesied but not yet brought to completion, will likewise inevitably be fulfilled (Lk 17.24, 26-37; 20.42-44; 21.25-28; Acts 3.21; 17.31).

Like Josephus, Luke harbours concerns about false prophets.¹⁹³ But his narrative also offers evidence for readers who can read the signs in the appropriate way (cf. Lk 21.20, 28; Acts 2.17). Signs are demonstrated by the healing ministries of the apostles (Acts 3.1-

¹⁹² This pericope has been central to debates about Luke's separation of history and eschatology (cf. Fusco 1991; Conzelmann 1960; Mattill 1979; Mattill 1972; Maddox 1982:115-23; Ellis 1972c; Knight 1998:188-89 [responding to Conzelmann]). Though related to many topics within this thesis, it is particularly relevant to Chapter 6, and thus discussed there.

¹⁹³ Cf. *J.W.* 6.285-8. In Luke/Acts, false prophets endorse calculations of particular times, rather than maintaining the more important focus on remaining vigilant at *all* times (Ellis 1972b:122; cf. Lk 12.35-40). Despite this polemic, Luke maintains that true prophetic signs enable those who correctly recognise them to understand that the end is imminent (see Chapter 6).

10; 4.16, 22, 30; 5.12), as also the dreams and visions prophesied for the last days in the passage from Joel are fulfilled in the events of Acts (7.55-56; 9.3-7, 11-12, 15-16; 10.3-6, 11-20; 27.24; cf. Acts 2.17-21; Joel 2.28-32). As these prophecies are fulfilled, they fortify claims about the future signs. Here, portents are not indications of ideal moments to go to war or prophetic insights derived from practices of divination, as in Diodorus Siculus, Valerius Maximus, or Tacitus, but unnatural phenomena associated with eschatological events in Jewish apocalyptic literature.

4.2 Assurance of the divine βουλή in Luke/Acts

Finally, beyond prophecies that demonstrate the future can be foreseen, Luke explicitly affirms that God oversees the whole course of history.¹⁹⁴ Although only mentioned six times, the divine βουλή relates importantly to the way Luke explains the past and provides hope for the future.¹⁹⁵ In particular, it is intimately connected to the assurance Luke aims to provide his reader (Lk 1.4; Acts 2.36; 17.31). Although other characters at times also scheme according to a βουλή, in doing so they draw out a reminder of the βουλή of God through their opposing plan (Lk 23.51).¹⁹⁶ As emerges throughout Luke's

¹⁹⁴ Several recent studies have confirmed the importance of divine oversight for the events of Luke's narrative, in light of emphases in both Graeco-Roman and Jewish Hellenistic texts (Shauf 2015:181-265; Squires 1993:1-3 and *passim*; Uytanlet 2014:27-67).

¹⁹⁵ The term βουλή itself appears in Luke and Acts twice and eight times respectively, while once in each of 1 Cor, Eph, and Heb.

¹⁹⁶ Squires 1993:56. Squires makes a side comment that the existence of rival plans could imply that Jesus' death was not according to God's, but another, though he does not develop this idea (p.65). Regardless, it is clear that characters can reject God's purposes (βουλή), as in a narrative aside at Lk 7:30 (Crabbe 2011:255-56).

text, God's βουλή may be (and habitually is) opposed, but it cannot be stopped. Some key passages will illustrate.

4.2.1 Acts 5.10-42

Mirroring a similar incident at Acts 4.1-21, the episode narrated in Acts 5.10-42¹⁹⁷ includes controversy that leads to Jewish authorities seizing Peter and the apostles and imprisoning them overnight. Unbeknownst to the Jewish leaders who flamboyantly summon “the Council and the whole body of the elders of Israel” (v.21) the following day, the apostles have been released overnight by an angel. A humorous, slightly farcical, incident ensues, during which the (missing) apostles are sent for. The chief priest's accusations are then met by a speech from Peter and the apostles, in which they passionately appeal to the need to obey (πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ) God and not humans (5.29, cf. 4.19-20). This offers an important key to understanding the incident: which characters obey God or humans?¹⁹⁸ ‘The people’ themselves are impressed by the apostles as they perform signs and witness to God (v.13); the apostles attend to God's instruction throughout. By contrast, the Sanhedrin acts in response to their *fear of* the people (v.26),

¹⁹⁷ This pericope is normally treated from v.17, but the Portico scene directly prior sets the context for the arrest.

¹⁹⁸ Crabbe 2015:30.

who are their primary reference point, and eventually choose to listen to a particular person, who is himself identified, perhaps negatively, as popular: Gamaliel.¹⁹⁹

Gamaliel intervenes when the Sanhedrin is in a rage and, having offered a reflection on other revolutionary movements that had blown over, advises:

“keep away from these men and let them alone; because if this plan (βουλή) or this undertaking is of human origin, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them—in that case you may even be found fighting against God (θεομάχοι εὐρεθῆτε)!”²⁰⁰ (vv.38-39)²⁰¹

He persuades the council. But he inadvertently assures the reader. Irony lies in the tension between information to which some characters (the apostles) and the reader have access, which is hidden from Gamaliel, creating the “fall guy” who doesn’t “get ‘it,’”

¹⁹⁹ The consequences of Gamaliel’s popularity indicates a key difference to the kind of reception enjoyed by the apostles in v.13. That the people praise the apostles (ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτούς) is not presented negatively as it does not lead them to listen to people over God. Whereas, that Gamaliel is held in honour by all the people (τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ) indicates a different status; this makes him a desirable consultant for the Sanhedrin (Darr 1998:135), given the people are their reference point. Interestingly, both Luke and Josephus (Mason 2007a:37-38) criticise Pharisees as popular. Luke seems to portray Gamaliel negatively through stereotype on the basis of popularity, in addition to his inadequate response to the good news (cf. Lk 11.43).

²⁰⁰ The possibility of becoming a θεομάχος comes with a further set of ideas in Graeco-Roman literature, including hubris and the punishment it elicits. See Chapter 5.

²⁰¹ These conditions employ different constructions. The first, about a human origin for the apostles’ movement is expressed in the subjunctive (with ἐάν), while the second is a conditional in the indicative (εἰ δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστίν). Some translate with emphasis on the second half of the statement to indicate “since this is the case...” In this way, they paint Gamaliel as a positive figure (Gowler 1991:278; Squires 1993:58; Hakola 2009:199). I follow Darr, who cites Lk 11.19 to demonstrate that the conditional cannot always take this sense. Rather, Darr suggests that while maintaining conditional force, this construction emphasizes the “more pressing position” (Darr 1998:136-139). Thus, according to Gamaliel’s statement, whether this condition is true is still in question, but the (severe) consequences which follow if it is, are not.

as in Lyons's definition of irony above.²⁰² For those who know that an angel has just released the apostles from prison, it is completely clear that, "this βουλή is of God," and therefore the apodosis holds: the early discipleship community and its proclamation of the resurrection of Jesus cannot be overthrown.²⁰³

The possibility of being found to be θεομάχοι is real; opponents of God shape the unfolding narrative not only in the events earlier in the account, such as Jesus' death, but for instance in the persecution that breaks out following Stephen's death.²⁰⁴ But even this is incorporated into the assured progression of the divine plan (cf. 8.1, 4). The challenge for Gamaliel, as also for anyone who similarly remains ambivalent—or even opposes the apostles' proclamation²⁰⁵—is to recognise and accept the invitation offered in this inexorable divine activity. With irony, through Gamaliel's essentially fence-sitting

²⁰² Lyons 1997:29. Interpreters have offered diverse portraits of Gamaliel: secret believer (Lyons 1997:42), well-disposed Pharisee (Hakola 2009:199; Tomson 1999:603), supporter of the disciples (either intentionally or ironically, Darr 1998:129), or Paul's teacher in persecution (Johnson 1991:99), associated with the criticism of Pharisees in the Gospel (Darr 1998:125). Gamaliel is certainly the victim of irony, but in a manner that has broader implications—despite his wisdom on the unstoppable outworking of the divine plan, Gamaliel fails to recognise what God is doing and to participate. His fence-sitting exposes his inadequate response (Crabbe 2015:35).

²⁰³ Tannehill suggests an ironic contrast lies between Gamaliel's statement and "the Sanhedrin's impotence" in vv.17-26 (Tannehill 1986-1990:2.74). Pervo compares Luke and Josephus in relation to Gamaliel's statement, suggesting for both "God supports those who have the right understanding (5.35-39). In the most vulgar sense, God is on the side of the winners" (Pervo 2009:24). While there is a sense of this in Josephus (e.g. *J.W.* 2.345-401; 5.362-419; see Chapter 5), Pervo's analysis overlooks key elements of Luke's treatment of assurance in the face of opposition, based in part upon his reading of the Gamaliel incident.

²⁰⁴ See Chapter 5.

²⁰⁵ I take the view that Luke's implied audience are already disciples, although the narrative contains an apologetic edge to support these believers' own proclamation (cf. Sterling 1991:385-86; Squires 1993:192).

speech, readers are assured (cf. Lk 1.4) that the plan unfolding in the events of Luke's narrative, in the lives of its readers, and promised for the future, is unstoppable.

4.2.2 Acts 2.22-24 and 4.24-30

In Acts 2.22-24 and 4.24-30, events are also identified with the unfolding divine βουλή. In the latter Luke's more characteristic explanation of the negative events of the past as the result of opposition is overshadowed by his accent on divine sovereignty. Here the words of prayer following Peter and John's release reflect a strong polemical interest in disempowering enemies, by claiming that even opponents are only divine instruments (cf. Lk 23.12) and act by God's hand to do what had already been determined (προορίζω, v.28).²⁰⁶

Peter's proclamation in Acts 2.22-24 includes many of the same themes. Verse 23 makes use of three loaded terms in quick succession: ὀρίζω, βουλή, and πρόγνωσις. Commentators agree the passage is designed to lay blame at the (Jewish) characters in

²⁰⁶ Tannehill agrees that this is the "chief" instance of the kind of approach to divine sovereignty that leads even to identifying opponents as divine instruments, which he also notes Luke uses to explain how Jesus' death "ironically fulfilled God's purpose" (Tannehill 1986-1990:2.72). Προορίζω is not a common word. In the NT it also appears twice together in Romans, and once in each of 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians, but it is not used in the LXX or the Greek texts of this study. If *praedestineo* is taken to be the Latin equivalent, it also doesn't feature in this study's Latin texts, including 4 Ezra's Latin text. Note, however, that the Vulgate also doesn't give *praedestineo* in Acts 4.28, though it does for the other uses in Rom 8. Here it supplies instead *discerno*.

the audience,²⁰⁷ perhaps with some irony at the lesser responsibility attributed to those “outside the law” (ἄνομοι). But as they interpret the statement as an apologetic affirmation of divine sovereignty,²⁰⁸ commentators also frequently import assumptions about “divine necessity” simplified from elsewhere.

C.K. Barrett notes a significant ambiguity in the passage in the adjective ἔκδοτος, which he notes should appear with a verb, such as παραδίδωμι, λαμβάνω, or similar, but doesn't.²⁰⁹ Pervo suggests that ἔκδοτος is synonymous with παραδοθέντα, using this as an opportunity to laud Luke's lexical range.²¹⁰ This is a *hapax legomenon* for the NT, and a term absent from the LXX. Bruce notes that ἔκδοτος could indicate Jesus was handed over by God or by the people.²¹¹ He and Foakes Jackson direct readers to *Ant.* 6.316, 14.355, 18.369,²¹² but, Barrett suggests that, of these, only the last is clear.²¹³ It is indeed difficult to discern the intended force of the “handed over one” on the basis of the adjective. The verb ἐκδίδωμι, which is etymologically related, takes on the mundane meaning of letting property (cf. Lk 20.9/pars), as well as betrayal, killing, but also giving

²⁰⁷ Haenchen 1971:180. Haenchen also responds to Overbeck's claim that Luke is characteristically anti-Jewish here, countering that “it would be more correct to discover an exoneration of the Romans” (p.180n.10).

²⁰⁸ Marshall notes the apparent conflict between divine sovereignty and human culpability but does not develop the point (Marshall 1980:75).

²⁰⁹ Barrett 1994-1998:1.142.

²¹⁰ Pervo 2009:80.

²¹¹ Bruce 1988:123. Zerwick specifies “given up (to you) by God” (Zerwick 1988:354).

²¹² Foakes Jackson et al. 1920-1933:4.23; Bruce 1988; Conzelmann cites Polybius on ἔκδοτος (Conzelmann 1987:20).

²¹³ Barrett 1994-1998:1.142.

in marriage. LSJ cites meanings for ἔκδοτος which relate to not only a woman being given in marriage, but giving herself fully to her partner.

In the example of *Ant.* 14.355, παρέχειν supplies the expected verb in a context in which Herod exhorts each of the distressed Herodians “not to give himself wholly over (ἔκδοτος) to grief (τῇ λύπῃ).”²¹⁴ In keeping with Luke’s emphasis on Jesus’ suffering being necessary because of predictable (and tragic) opposition as he fulfils his mission, these other uses of ἔκδοτος at least raise the question about whether the sense in Acts 2.23 is not Jesus’ *betrayal* according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, but Jesus handing himself fully to the divine plan (τῇ ὠρισμένῃ βουλή).²¹⁵ Thus, ἔκδοτος becomes the one who dedicates or gives himself.²¹⁶ In an ironic twist, and through divine foresight, such opposition becomes the means of furthering the divine purpose (Acts 2.24-36; cf. Acts 8:1, 4).²¹⁷

²¹⁴ Given Josephus supplies the verb here with αὐτόν, his meaning is clear. Luke’s syntax is not clear.

²¹⁵ Note that the dative can function differently from the explicit κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον (Lk 22.22) frequently cited as a parallel.

²¹⁶ As I have argued throughout this chapter, elsewhere in Luke/Acts, prediction and planning can normally be distinguished. Wallace likewise suggests on the basis of syntax that the set plan and foreknowledge in 2.23 should be separated (Wallace 1997:288). However, he also readily admits that he makes further decisions about the relationship between the terms and the meaning of ἔκδοτος based not on syntax but on his interpretation of general themes about the divine plan, which he cites from Bock (p.288).

²¹⁷ Although he does not present this interpretation of Acts 2.23, Tannehill focuses on the ironic fulfilment of the divine plan despite opposition in a similar way (Tannehill 1986-1990:1.37; Tannehill 1985:74, 77). This follows the similar pattern identified in Bovon’s interpretation of Lk 9.22 (Bovon 2002-2013:1.363).

Jesus' assent to the path that is known in advance to lead to suffering again fits with a notion of internal necessity—that suffering is necessary in order to fulfil his mission. Such virtue features in other texts. It is reminiscent of Valerius's positive portrayal of Gracchus discussed above.²¹⁸ Luke's portrayal of Paul's assent to suffering, also a response despite a prophetic warning (Acts 21.12-13), is in some ways parallel.

4.2.3 Acts 16.6-10 and 21.4-14

Paul's discernment of his ministry direction and assent to suffering in Jerusalem involves elements of divine intervention and prophecy that interpreters have found perplexing. Paul receives several prophetic insights related to his journey, even including exhortations to *avoid* the direction he then goes on to take. In Acts 16.6-10, the reader is told baldly that the Holy Spirit and then the Spirit of Jesus²¹⁹ simply prohibit two courses of action before Paul dreams of a third, which “we” interpret as a divine call to Macedonia (vv.8-9).²²⁰ Elsewhere, Paul receives prophetic dreams that he must stand before Caesar in Rome (27.24), and the Spirit testifies to him that suffering awaits him in Jerusalem (20.23). The contrast between the prophecies about Rome and Jerusalem is

²¹⁸ Given Luke does not portray the divine plan in an inflexible model akin to fate, as discussed above, assenting to the divine plan remains different from Stoic understandings of assenting to fate, though these were prevalent ideas also. See p.170n.110 and p.230n.45.

²¹⁹ On these titles, which indicate the same sense of spiritual guidance, see Stählin 1973:232-4.

²²⁰ Miller argues that this scene portrays the disciples grappling to interpret the divine call, and the opposite end of the spectrum to the transparent divine direction in the scene with Philip (Acts 8:26-40; Miller 2007:233-34). Although Miller's reflections are helpful, the key human element in this story remains the choice to accept, not the capacity to interpret, the divine invitation.

such that Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger claim, certainly in the Bezan text but also with evidence in the Alexandrian text, that Luke portrays a conflict between Paul's planning (βούλομαι) and the divine θέλημα. They suggest that the theological discomfort that arises from the implication that Paul's journey to Jerusalem conflicts with the divine will inhibits most interpreters from correct exegesis of these passages.²²¹

Acts 21.4b offers a particularly difficult phrase, declaring the disciples in Tyre speak "through the Spirit" when they tell Paul not to go to Jerusalem. Commentators seek various ways around the phrase, normally either by postulating divergent sources behind the passage or distinguishing an accurate prophetic insight (Paul will suffer in Jerusalem) from the disciples' exhortation (a result of their own distress at the prophecy, and not the Spirit's directive).²²² However, there is no sense of this distinction in the biblical text, which is rather couched as a genuine prophetic utterance, confirmed by: the identical formula (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος)²²³ for Agabus's earlier (accurate) prophecy (11.28) and the positive treatment of prophecy throughout Luke's narrative.²²⁴ Although it is possible for the Spirit to intervene directly in Paul's travels elsewhere (cf. Acts 16.6-7), Acts 21 combines the Spirit's wish that Paul not suffer with an openness that enables Paul

²²¹ Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger 2004-2009:4.152.

²²² Alternative proposals include the assumption that the verse must be secondary (cf. discussion in Haenchen 1971, 603-4), expressed wrongly (Fitzmyer 1998:685; Pervo 2009:535), or reflect the disciples' in Tyre's (incorrect) interpretation (Conzelmann 1987:178).

²²³ This is the only other use of the full phrase. Acts 1.2 and 4.25 also give διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, both describing prophetic inspiration.

²²⁴ Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger 2004-2009:162n.108.

nonetheless to assent to the foretold suffering in the service of his mission. Further features, such as the parallel with Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, endorse the choice.

This is consistent with the open way other characters accept divine invitation rather than being forced to go, such as Philip's dream (Acts 8.26; 16.9). Both Paul's dream in 16.9 and the inspired exhortation in 21.4b serve to underscore the importance of *human* action, which is confirmed in Paul's climactic acceptance of Agabus's prophecy just prior to his entry into Jerusalem.²²⁵ The result is an emphasis on Paul's virtue in *nonetheless choosing* to go to Jerusalem.²²⁶

5. Conclusion

In Luke/Acts, history unfolds in a way that God (and God's prophets) are able to foresee, and under divine guidance that ensures the remaining events promised as part of the end of history will certainly be fulfilled. The above exploration of determinism and divine guidance in the study's key texts fills out the range of perspectives which illuminate Luke/Acts, and counters some of the findings each of Conzelmann and Squires offered through their different approaches.

²²⁵ This dynamic is also present in later rabbinic sayings, such as *Pirke Aboth* 3.19, "All is foreknown but freedom of choice is given."

²²⁶ Similarly Paul resolves in the Spirit to go to Jerusalem (Acts 19.21; cf. parallels with Jesus, such as Lk 9.51; Green 1996:299; Pervo 2009:533-34).

Importantly, the analysis confirms that, by focusing on divine guidance of history, a writer does not necessarily turn attention away from the events of the end of history. Writers of texts such as the War Scroll, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and even Josephus portray divine guidance over the whole teleological course of history. In contrast to Conzelmann's assumptions, Luke likewise asserts the divine βουλή extends to the events of the end; it undergirds God's action to raise Jesus (Acts 2.24; 3.14-21), which simultaneously confirms the final judgement (17.31).

This chapter also demonstrates that Luke's understanding of divine guidance of the course of history is not best understood as an adaptation of the kinds of ideas found in Graeco-Roman historiographies. Even among and within Graeco-Roman texts, I have noted, divine forces such as τύχη/*fortuna* or εἰμαρμένη/*fatum* can be portrayed quite differently. However, not only is Luke's divine plan more than a rhetorical device (contra Rothschild), in contrast to the assumptions underlying Squires's approach, Luke generally does not use any of the characteristic language or related concepts for divine personal and impersonal forces. Moreover, even Josephus, whose use of this terminology is striking, adapts the terms to his own account of divine involvement in, and guidance of, the entire teleological course of history.

As Luke likewise emphasises divine guidance over the whole course of history and its end, he demonstrates continuity with the Jewish writers of this study, rather than the writers

of Graeco-Roman texts with whom he is normally compared. However, this does not lead to a rigid sense of determinism, which might be associated with either apocalyptic determinism or explanations involving εἰμαρμένη/*fatum*. Luke distinguishes between the divine βουλή and the outworking of δεῖ and, contrary to Squires's assertions, there is no equivalent force to fate in Luke's account. By contrast, Diodorus's discomfort with inflexible forces, in the way he omits εἰμαρμένη and "diminishes the power" of ἀνάγκη by associating it with τύχη and πρόνοια,²²⁷ suggest aspects of flexibility in his understanding of determinism and divine guidance of history which may indicate a point of connection to Luke.²²⁸ Similarly, Luke's βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ requires human participation, as Diodorus's divine πρόνοια makes use of human servants (1.1.3).

But the teleological setting of Luke's claims about the inexorable movement of the divine βουλή shapes both the assurance and the challenge provided by the invitation to participate in divine purposes. Luke's presentation of the events of his narrative as the fulfilment of prophecy confirms that even the apparently disastrous events of the recent past were foreseen by God, and so too has the divine plan adapted accordingly. Indeed, the same divine actor who foresaw these events has nonetheless still made a sure promise of the end.

²²⁷ Squires 1993:160.

²²⁸ Despite the different vocabulary, Sterling notes similarity between Luke's use of the βουλή of God and Josephus's understanding of πρόνοια (Sterling 1991:357-363).

Chapter 5: Human culpability and freedom

“For myself, I shudder at recounting the works of God to unworthy ears; yet listen, that you may learn that you are warring not against the Romans only, but also against God.”

—Josephus, J.W. 5.378

Reflecting on these things one will find that God has a care for ἄνθρωποι, and by all kinds of premonitory signs shows His people the way of salvation, while they owe their destruction to folly and calamities of their own choosing.

—J.W. 6.310

1. Introduction: interactions of divine and human agency

The previous chapter demonstrated that for the writers of this study’s key texts, determinism in history can confirm hope, endorse existing authorities, or underscore the futility of human resistance. It also showed that these writers can portray divine forces either driving the course of history as part of a larger plan, or simply reacting in the moment. In this chapter I consider how the writers depict interactions between divine and human agency, in order to illuminate how Luke apportions *human* responsibility for the events of the past and for action in the present and future. In particular, I consider how they explain the actions of opponents and protagonists alongside hope for the future. In doing so, I respond to some enduring assumptions about Luke/Acts, stemming from the post-war contributions of Käsemann and Conzelmann. I also draw on a series of recent

studies, centred on the work of John Barclay, which consider divine and human agency in Second Temple Judaism.

Understandings of the interaction between divine and human agency play a central role in long-standing controversies in Lukan scholarship, such as in the questions about Luke's approach to suffering or politics. As set out in Chapter 1, these concerns have been (rightly) associated with eschatological questions. But particular assumptions about Luke's eschatology have diverted interpreters' conclusions. Drawing on polemical contrasts with Pauline literature and assumptions about a trajectory of early catholicism, Käsemann denounced Luke's alleged *theologia gloriae*, with implications for interpreting Luke's approach to suffering, the cross, and politics in the extended period before the delayed parousia.¹ Conzelmann likewise had already introduced questions of suffering and politics.² From a different perspective, Oscar Cullmann considered questions of agency and suffering, but instead argued (beginning with claims about a general NT theology which he then applied to Luke/Acts) that God's decisive action in Christ meant that evil was constrained as though on a rope in the period between history's 'mid-point' and the end; thus the power of opposing forces, "is only an apparent power."³ Here Cullmann's otherwise insightful account of salvation history overlooked the ways opposing human

¹ Käsemann 1954:143; Käsemann 1957:21.

² Conzelmann 1960:98-99, 137-49.

³ Cullmann 1962:198.

agents and other forces exert a real impact on human experience in the past and present in Luke/Acts. In their different ways, each of these interpreters failed to attend to the significant connections between Luke's understanding of human agency and his understanding of history and its end.

In this study's key texts, writers balance the (potentially competing) concerns of the sovereignty or freedom of divine and human agents in relation to questions of these agents' culpability.⁴ For instance, those who affirm divine sovereignty over history face implications of divine *blameworthiness* for negative events, which they resolve in various ways. For many, human responsibility emerges as an important way of explaining historical events without blaming God. Importantly, attributions about divine and human agency are not necessarily independent of each other—for instance, events can be portrayed as both divinely determined *and* caused by human failings.⁵ The writers frequently approach conflicts between divine and human agency differently depending on the retrospective or prospective focus of their texts, as set out in more detail below. This distinction has been largely overlooked in recent studies of divine and human agency in

⁴ In this chapter I use 'sovereignty' to describe aspects of divine agency, but 'freedom' for similar elements of human agency. The writers generally do not portray human agency in an equivalent way to the sovereignty divine agents can attain in some accounts. Similarly, although some writers in my key texts challenge divine responsibility for negative events in history, divine responsibility does not attain the culpability these writers can attribute to human agents or other malevolent forces. See below on the divine as opponent (§3.2).

⁵ The discussion of determinism and divine guidance in Chapter 4 has already discussed some interaction between divine and human responsibility in the key texts of this study, including, historians contributing to the work of τύχη (Polybius) or divine πρόνοια (Diodorus).

Second Temple Judaism, although these questions of temporality highlight further consequences for writers' eschatological emphases.

Several recent studies have explored divine and human agency in Second Temple Judaism as part of responding to the emphases of the 'New Perspective on Paul.'⁶ The studies reconceptualise Pauline themes traditionally interpreted as a distinction between 'grace' and 'works' as a dynamic between divine and human agency. Set against Sanders's covenantal nomism (summarised as distinguishing the stages of "'getting in' and 'staying in,'" the former involving grace, the latter obedience or works),⁷ they argue that the diverse Jewish literature contemporary with Paul shows a greater appreciation for human agency than the New Perspective acknowledges. John Barclay helpfully delineates three contemporary theoretical models⁸ for the relationship between divine and human agency in ancient texts, which are also taken up by Jason Maston and Kyle Wells.⁹

⁶ Coined by James Dunn in 1982, this title refers to a strand of Pauline interpretation generally traced back to E.P. Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Sanders 1977). Several studies have emerged from Durham in recent years, building on Barclay's contribution to a collection of essays (Barclay 2008), such as that by Maston, doctoral student of Watson (Maston 2010), and Wells, doctoral student of Barclay (Wells 2014). Divine and human agency remains a central theme in Barclay's own recent publication (Barclay 2015:72, 166-75).

⁷ Maston 2010:3; Barclay 2015:157. Barclay addresses Sanders throughout his 2015 publication, but see especially pp.151-8.

⁸ Contemporary theoretical work that seeks to categorise different patterns of thought evident in ancient texts is an aid to analysis, though Bobzien focuses on dealing with ancient Stoic thought with its own terms rather than making connections to modern philosophical categories (Bobzien 1998:1, 14).

⁹ Maston compares Sirach, the Hodayot, and Romans 7-8 (Maston 2010); Wells examines biblical and non-biblical Jewish treatments of divine and human agency in order to illuminate Paul (Wells 2014).

First, Barclay sets out a “competitive” model: if humans have agency then the divine must not and vice versa.¹⁰ Barclay argues contemporary scholars commonly presume this model, leading to anachronistic interpretations of ancient texts.¹¹ The second, he dubs a “kinship” model: like branches on a tree, humans are “‘fragments’ of God,” and both act in concert. Here, as humans exercise freedom, they nonetheless express a common will and purpose with the divine.¹² The third model, which is described as “non-contrastive transcendence,” draws on the systematic theology of Kathryn Tanner.¹³ Here, the divine creates the space to allow for human freedom. Thus, divine and human agencies are necessarily unequal: human freedom relies upon divine action to facilitate that freedom. Barclay also argues that the ‘vertical’ dependence upon divine sovereignty creates a freedom “which may be ‘horizontally’ independent of other created agencies ... Other agents may *affect* human agency, but it is God who *effects* it.”¹⁴

¹⁰ Barclay 2008:6; cf. Maston 2010:17; Wells 2014:17-19. Engberg-Pedersen similarly argues against such an approach in ancient texts, advocating instead for an “overlap” of divine and human agency in Epictetus and Paul (Engberg-Pedersen 2010:106-9). This also contributes to Engberg-Pedersen’s larger project of arguing against a conflict between “apocalypticism” and “philosophy” (suggesting Pauline scholars who stress the former overemphasise divine agency at the expense of human freedom (p.107).

¹¹ Barclay proposes that contemporary scholars should actively retain a sense of his models two and three, to ward off unhelpful tendencies to presume a competitive relationship (Barclay 2008:7). Maston suggests that Josephus follows the competitive model in his description of the Pharisees’ beliefs in *Ant.* 13.172, but in *J.W.* 2.162 he presents the agencies interacting, akin to Barclay’s third model below (Maston 2010:14-15).

¹² Barclay 2008:6-7.

¹³ Barclay 2008:7. For full discussion of Tanner’s understanding of tyranny and divine control of history, see Tanner 1988:42-46.

¹⁴ Barclay 2008:7.

Barclay's framework offers valuable new angles for tackling entrenched difficulties in Pauline scholarship. However, an approach to divine and human agency in which the frame of reference is not only Paul but, implicitly, Pauline *soteriology*, is limited in the types of questions to which it can be applied. The framework omits issues raised by ancient writers who do not seek principally to account for divine and human *participation in the mechanisms of salvation*, but rather *responsibility for the events of history*. Barclay deliberately brackets out the role of further spiritual forces, such as the demonic or the power of sin, while acknowledging that these may be factors in Paul.¹⁵ More broadly, Barclay, Maston, and Wells do not consider questions of *culpability*—either for 'protagonist' characters (e.g. Israel), or 'opponent' groups (e.g., paradigmatically, Babylon)—or the implications of claims about the freedom or otherwise 'opponents' exercise when they act in history.

I suggest two elements will extend Barclay's framework so as to help it to accommodate agency in these other settings. The first is temporality—namely, attending to the consequences of the inherently retrospective orientation of explanations of past events, and the prospective character of hope for the future. Importantly, a mismatch emerges in studies which treat these different considerations uniformly. For instance, Maston begins his discussion with the references to fate, God, and human responsibility in Josephus's

¹⁵ Barclay 2008:5. Similarly, Maston 2010:18, (though he recognises that the presence of these forces will alter the portrayals of divine and human agency). For a treatment of such forces in Pauline theology, with an apocalyptic lens, see Martyn 1997:62-65.

descriptions of the Jewish sects (*J.W.* 2.119-66; *Ant.* 13.171-73; 18.12-22), as a way of setting out the diversity of views on divine and human agency in Second Temple Judaism.¹⁶ However, the kinds of questions Maston then seeks to raise about divine and human agency relate to prospective interests, such as agents' contributions to a salvific process and the capacity for human faithfulness.¹⁷ But Josephus's interests in the philosophical school passages relate to questions of divine providential care and human responsibility for the events of history. These issues incorporate a retrospective, explanatory character.¹⁸

Josephus's passages on the Jewish sects do not address human or divine participation in effecting salvation and piety, and, I suggest, do not straightforwardly map onto Pauline soteriology in the way Maston presumes. Josephus's stance is important, and the similarities between his portrayal of the Pharisees and his analysis of the causes of the destruction of Jerusalem later in *Jewish War* (*J.W.* 6.305-13; cf. 2.162-3) suggest these

¹⁶ Maston carefully asserts that he uses these descriptions as examples of the kind of diversity present in Second Temple Judaism, and not as historically accurate accounts of these Jewish groups—though Josephus's distinctions form the basis of Maston's focus on Sirach and the Hodayot, as representatives of the views Josephus attributes to the Sadducees and Essenes respectively (Maston 2010:10-19).

¹⁷ Maston describes Josephus setting out the relationships between "fate" and "human volition" (Maston 2010:15), but I suggest the overriding question in these passages is one of *responsibility*.

¹⁸ Such explanations can still underscore exhortation for readers to learn from the past as they act in the present and future. But as this chapter will go on to demonstrate, writers also frequently give quite different responses about the human capacity to act differently in the future, as a result of divine assistance (without implicating the divine in the failure to avert disasters that have already taken place).

passages illuminate his own views. Josephus exemplifies the way writers can explain the events of history through apparently contradictory causes arising from the mix of retrospect and prospect in the explanation. For Josephus, absolute divine sovereignty secures the future, evidence for which he also finds in divine determinism throughout history,¹⁹ but human culpability explains the calamities of the recent past.

Secondly, rather than a homogenised account of divine and human agency, writers frequently treat different types of characters differently in terms of the agency attributed to them, especially in the case of opponent and protagonist groups. Opponents can be passive divine instruments or absolutely culpable, whereas protagonists might be promised divine assistance to enable piety in the future. The distinction between treatments of opponents and protagonists' agency does not necessarily conflict with Barclay's framework, but highlights ways his models might be combined within the same text.

This chapter explores the ways in which the writers of the key texts portray divine sovereignty and responsibility and human freedom and culpability in explanations of the past and expectations about the future. It demonstrates a variety of ways writers of this period balance these concerns. By filling out these additional facets of divine and human agency, I propose ways of extending Barclay's helpful framework for divine and human

¹⁹ See Chapter 4.

agency through an appreciation for temporal orientation, which will in turn illuminate these themes in Luke/Acts. In particular, attending to the retrospective orientations in many of the study's texts leads to a greater appreciation for the role of horizontal relationships (or other malevolent forces) in explaining the events of history, and the ways writers accommodate seemingly overt incoherence, by aligning divine sovereignty with human culpability.²⁰

Turning to Luke/Acts, I consider how retrospective and prospective orientations affect Luke's portrayal of divine and human agency. For Luke, the events of the past show that suffering can be caused both by the unscrupulous actions of other humans or by accident (Lk 13.1-5). Θεομάχοι can and do oppose the divine plan (Lk 22.6; 23.12; Acts 1.16-20; 5.38-9; 8.1-3; 12.1-4, 20-23), and human rejection of divine initiative leads to tragic consequences (Lk 19.41-4; Acts 3.13-15; 28.24-28). But even opposition is turned to divine purposes (Acts 2.36; 3.14-15; 8.4; 11.19-21). Looking to the future, as argued in Chapter 4 above, the divine βουλή governs the course of history and cannot be stopped. Nonetheless, set among the comparison texts, Luke's narrative displays a notable focus on *human* action. Human freedom and culpability are important for Luke's explanation of the past, and his challenge to positive human response in the present and imminent future.

²⁰ The differences between retrospective and prospective orientations also allow for a divine capacity to *adapt* to incorporate human opposition or a conflict between human and divine intention within the divine plan. For instance, of the events that led him to Egypt, Joseph tells his brothers: "even though you intended to do harm to me, God intended it for good" (Gen 50.20).

2. Divine and human responsibility in Jewish texts

Jewish texts of this period reflect various responses to Deuteronomistic approaches to these questions, which I will outline first before turning to the key texts that extend these themes. I then discuss two further types of opponents in the Jewish texts of this study: other spiritual forces and humans who are depicted through the literary type θεομάχοι.

2.1 Deuteronomistic approaches

This significant strand of OT theology provides theological reflection on the exile,²¹ and a basis from which later Jewish texts build their theological interpretations of experience. Deuteronomistic explanations for the events of history affirm divine sovereignty. YHWH declares: “There is no god beside me. I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal; and no one can deliver from my hand” (Deut 32.39). The writers of these texts reject the power of any other people or forces (whether the Babylonians or their divinities), by interpreting suffering as YHWH’s punishment (cf. 32.41). Like Pauline theology in Sanders’s

²¹ The adjective ‘Deuteronomic’ refers to elements identified directly in Deuteronomy. This discussion will use ‘Deuteronomistic’ to refer to theology modelled on the pattern found in Deuteronomy but also evident through other parts of the OT, including the texts Noth labelled the “Deuteronomistic History” (Josh-2 Kgs; Noth 1981). I focus on the characteristic theological explanations in these texts, without entering the detailed debates about the relationship between OT texts that display this theology, or the historicity of Israel’s past in texts from Deuteronomy and the canonical historiographies. On the former, see von Rad 1962-1965; von Rad 2005; Noth 1981; Perlitt 1994. On the latter, sceptical views about the historical basis for the biblical historiographies are provided by Lemche 1998; Grabbe 2007; Davies 1992. Compelling critique of this position can be found in Barr 2000, esp. pp.59-72.

interpretation,²² the reasoning works backwards from solution to plight: given Israel suffers, punishment must have been necessary.

Psalm 1 exemplifies the connections between prosperity and righteousness, and suffering and sinfulness, upon which such interpretations of experience rely. The psalmist claims of the righteous, “in all that they do, they prosper” (v.3), and concludes “for the Lord watches over the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked will perish” (vv.4, 6).²³

In Deuteronomy, the description of the wickedness of the previous occupants of the promised land and ensuing dispossession as divine punishment analogously interprets Israel’s later exile. Set in an account of Israel’s past, the explanation functions like the retrospective ‘predictions’ offered by *vaticinia ex eventu*, providing an authoritative theological commentary on the events of the implied reader’s own time.²⁴ Thus, Deuteronomy’s Moses emphasises divine sovereignty and human culpability, within a framework of reward and punishment through the events of history:

If you do forget the Lord your God and follow other gods to serve and worship them, I solemnly warn you today that you shall surely perish. Like the nations that the Lord is destroying before you... (Deut 8.18-19)

²² Sanders’s focus is Paul’s interpretation of the salvific work of Christ, which is a ‘solution’ which Paul takes to indicate that law was inadequate for achieving this purpose (Sanders 1977:442-44, 481-85, 497-501; cf. Sanders 2007:85).

²³ Brueggemann suggests Psalm 1 represents a central strain of OT thought, against which other texts provide counter-testimony (Brueggemann 1997:385).

²⁴ Chapters 4 and 6 deal with this phenomenon in more detail.

The gift of the land emphasises divine sovereignty, both in punishing the other nations and in honouring the promises made in electing Israel (cf. Deut 7.7-8).²⁵ Having displayed stubbornness in the wilderness, Israel is portrayed as the *undeserving* beneficiary of the divine punishment of the other nations and should not congratulate itself (9.4-8, 12-14, 22-24).²⁶ But the writer also interprets the events of the historical (as opposed to literary) present to confirm Israel's privileged status. The exile is explained as benevolent divine discipline (8.5).²⁷ Current experiences of suffering are not a *direct* result of poor human choices,²⁸ but a consequence mediated by sovereign action to inflict divine punishment and prompt correction, ultimately in Israel's interest.

When considering the future, the writer describes Israel continuing to enjoy a privileged status. YHWH will not only act to bring the suffering which constitutes punishment to an end, but will grant Israel's capacity to maintain its side of the covenant. As Moshe Weinfeld notes, it is essential to Deuteronomistic theology that suffering is temporary and leads to restoration.²⁹ Speaking to the core concerns of Deuteronomy's historical setting,

²⁵ See Barclay's discussion of "incongruity" to illuminate the importance of undeserved divine benevolence as one of the "perfections" of grace (Barclay 2015:166-75). I discuss the contrast between writers' interests in protagonist and opponent groups below.

²⁶ Satterthwaite and McConville 2007:122.

²⁷ See Weinfeld on temporary suffering in the interests of "a good end" (Weinfeld 1972:317).

²⁸ As argued in Chapter 4, in some texts negative events flow directly from the consequences of poor choices.

²⁹ Weinfeld 1972:316-19.

Moses goes on to promise:

Even if you are exiled to the ends of the world, from there the Lord your God will gather you, and from there he will bring you back ... Moreover, the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, so that you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, in order that you may live.” (Deut 30.1-6; cf. 2 Kgs 24.20; 25.11; 1 Chr 9.1)³⁰

Thus, for the protagonists, divine discipline and human culpability explain the past.³¹

Israel, though undeserving of its original prosperity and election, has exercised unfettered freedom by straying from its covenant responsibilities. Conversely, for the future, although the people must be reformed and love the Lord, divine activity will also make such faithfulness possible. Thus the elements of Deuteronomistic theology that are orientated towards the protagonist group’s future reflect Barclay’s third model above. YHWH will give Israel the ability to be faithful and Israel will choose to be obedient and be restored to prosperity.

For opponents, by contrast, the prospective orientation in Deuteronomistic theology

³⁰ This is a fraught area of interpretation, with varied views on whether Deut 30.1-10 accents the priority of human action in turning to YHWH and YHWH then circumcising the heart facilitating further faithfulness, or YHWH’s initiative in circumcising the heart that then enables human response. Kyle Wells provides a compelling account of syntactical, structural, and literary/thematic justifications for a divine priority reading (Wells 2014:31-39). He convincingly makes his case, not that this is the only possible reading of Deuteronomy 30, but that it is a highly plausible reading that interpreters, including Paul, could have taken up (p.39).

³¹ This is not to deny the importance of this theology to these texts. As Sanders points out, although NT scholars are tempted to say these writers simply attribute punishment after the fact, this “would underestimate the degree to which *people believed* in God’s providence, or fate, or destiny” (Sanders 2007:91). Similarly for Graeco-Roman texts: Gottlieb claims “It would be a mistake if we understood these elements of Roman religion as superficial ... the gods are guarantors of victory and are jointly responsible for every public success” (Gottlieb 1998:22-23).

suggests a less favourable outcome. Opponents like Babylon enjoy no agency of their own, as they have acted merely as instruments of divine punishment (2 Kgs 2.17; 24.20; 1 Chr 9.11; cf. Jer 21.7-10). But within strands of the OT, Babylon also remains culpable and will be punished in the future as part of Israel's restoration (Isa 13.19; 14.22; 21.9; 48.14-20; Jer 25.11-12).³²

Already within the OT, this theology develops in various directions.³³ Jeremiah meditates upon the divine initiative of writing the law on hearts so that the people may be faithful (Jer 31.33)—a theme which Paul's NT letters will also take up (Rom 2.15, 29; cf. Heb 8.8-12; 10.16-17; though, by contrast, Acts 7.51). Inverting Psalm 1, Psalm 73 troubles over the lived experience not only of the righteous suffering, but the wicked prospering. It almost causes the Psalmist to stumble (73.1-3).³⁴ In other texts, like Job and Proverbs, the writers likewise contemplate justice when the wicked prosper.³⁵ These preoccupations continue in later texts, which extend or challenge Deuteronomistic themes to resolve the balance

³² It could be, of course, that this serves both purposes (as in Deut 8.18-9.3)—that is, that Babylon is independently deserving of punishment, though this doesn't really justify their prosperity during exile. Second Baruch takes an approach along these lines. By contrast, *Jewish War* emphasises Rome's piety. See below.

³³ As set out by Brueggemann, see also for instance, Jer 12.1-4, and complaint psalms (Brueggemann 1997:385-6). On Job (see pp.386-93), Ecclesiastes (pp.393-98), and Ps 88 (pp.398-99).

³⁴ The psalm concludes by affirming a later judgement will befall the wicked (vv.27-28).

³⁵ Brueggemann defines OT theodicy in terms of "counter-testimony" as protest, and asserts that, "Israel has no interest in justifying an unjust world in making excuses for Yahweh," (Brueggemann 1997:739). However, as many of this study's key texts and various strands of the OT noted above demonstrate, numerous writers do manage to hold together protest and self-accusation to explain the events of history.

between divine sovereignty and responsibility and human freedom and culpability in different ways.

2.2 Extensions of Deuteronomistic themes in late Second Temple texts

Among the texts of this study, Deuteronomistic themes are extended in 2 Maccabees, Josephus's *Jewish War*, and 2 Baruch. They are also presumed, but in many ways challenged, in 4 Ezra.

2.2.1 2 Maccabees

Second Maccabees presents an approach very similar to Deuteronomistic texts,³⁶ but some attention to post-mortem reward extends the pattern. Events in 2 Maccabees also are identified as punishment within history (7.18, 38; cf. 4.38; 8.11) or, correspondingly in relation to success, divine restoration within history (12.15-16). Importantly, the latter becomes possible once divine anger, which was only “for a little while,” has abated (5.17, 20; 7.33; cf. 8.5). In a narrative aside that frames the martyrdom stories which follow, 6.12-17 explains that readers should not lose heart because “these punishments were designed not to destroy but to discipline our people” (v.12; cf. Deut 8.5). The potential benefits of suffering as discipline are not understood as an ascetic or Stoic virtue in assenting to

³⁶ In his study of Second Temple receptions of Deuteronomy, Lincicum notes that 2 Maccabees cites Deuteronomy's text less than Lincicum's other focus texts, but claims especially the pattern of Deut 32 remains in the background (Lincicum 2010:88-9).

suffering itself. Rather, the benefit lies in satisfying the need for punishment, and reforming behaviour, before it is too late. Being punished “immediately” constitutes “a sign of great kindness” for favoured people (v.13), rather than “the case of the other nations,” in which, as noted in Chapter 3 above, “the Lord waits patiently to punish them until they have reached the full measure of their sins” (v.14).³⁷ This similarly implies potential incoherence arising from retrospective and prospective interests: Antiochus IV acts as a divine instrument in meting out this deserved punishment (2 Macc 6-7),³⁸ yet the text asserts that he will receive his own punishment for this divinely-orchestrated behaviour (7.17, 19, 31), in turn identified with his later demise (9.4-28).³⁹

In addition to these elements shared with Deuteronomistic texts, the writer of 2 Maccabees affirms post-mortem restoration. The mother of the seven martyred sons in 2 Macc 7 links her trust in post-mortem restoration with the mysterious divine activity of creation in the womb, concluding: “therefore the Creator of the world, who shaped the beginning of humankind and devised the origin of all things, will in his mercy give life and breath back to you” (7.23, 28-29; cf. 7.9, 14). Although guaranteed for pious martyrs, post-mortem restoration remains uncertain for the soldiers whose deaths are identified with divine

³⁷ See Chapters 3 and 6 in this study, for further discussion of this passage and its relationship to 2 Maccabees’ portrayal of the end of history. See also other texts with a motif of delayed punishment, such as Valerius Maximus on the Carthaginians below (§3.2).

³⁸ See §2.4 for discussion of Antiochus’s hubris.

³⁹ There is a complex interaction between these themes in the case of Antiochus, about which the writer is not particularly concerned. He is a divine instrument, but also an archetypal θεομάχος (2 Macc 4.17; 5.17-20). See below.

punishment for wearing amulets: “it became clear to all that this was the reason these men had fallen” (12.40), though as noted in Chapter 3, Judas arranges a sin offering to seek post-mortem mercy on the group’s behalf (vv.43-45).⁴⁰ Furthermore, although Judas acts as a divine agent in battle, he also appears to maintain his own agency, even when the narration equates Judas’s presence with the presence of God (15.27). Judas acts genuinely as an extension of the divine purpose, with his own will directly aligned with the will of God, as in Barclay’s second model.

Thus, in 2 Maccabees, those aligned with non-Hellenising forces suffer through benevolent discipline (6.12-17) and may be restored from sinfulness even after death (12.43-45).⁴¹ Conversely, opponents, even when their actions constitute divine imperatives, enjoy no hope of restoration beyond the punishment within history which inevitably still emerges for them (7.14).

2.2.2 Josephus’s Jewish War

Josephus also maintains a strong emphasis on Deuteronomistic interpretations of events. He explains the past in terms of human culpability and divine punishment—Jerusalem’s destruction constitutes just punishment for the Jewish people (*J.W.* 3.52-54; 5.378, 395-6,

⁴⁰ Cf. 4 Ezra 7.102-15, which deals not with intercessions for those who have died, but the prospect of intercession at the time of eschatological judgement (a possibility Uriel entirely rules out).

⁴¹ Ego distinguishes between the “measure for measure principle,” which governs how opponents are dealt with in 2 Maccabees, and benevolent discipline of the protagonists (Ego 2007:153-54).

412), who have compromised the sanctuary (4.204-5; 5.18, 364, 401-2),⁴² been beguiled by the revolutionaries (5.407; 6.285), and engaged in revolution instead of allowing God to come to their defence (5.377-8, 399-400).⁴³ Indeed, in his own speech in Book 5, Josephus shapes his account of Israel's history to show that God has always provided assistance when Israel was in need of defence, but not when they have taken matters into their own hands (5.377, 399-400).⁴⁴ In Josephus's reckoning, and in keeping with this censure of revolutionary activity, such *human action itself* represents a failure of virtue and leads to becoming opponents of God: "in short, there is no instance of our forefathers having triumphed by arms or failed of success without them when they committed their cause to God: if they sat still they conquered, as it pleased their Judge, if they fought they were invariably defeated" (J.W. 5.390).⁴⁵

Josephus also makes his own adjustments to Deuteronomistic theology: he portrays the instruments of divine punishment positively and takes a different approach to divine and human agency in relation to hope for the future. Josephus takes pains to show the

⁴² Regev 2011:280-83.

⁴³ On the impact of Deuteronomistic theology upon Josephus's retrospective interpretation of Jerusalem's destruction, see Crabbe 2015:23-6.

⁴⁴ Josephus sets out "the main lesson to be learnt from this history" in the introduction to *Antiquities*: that prosperity emerges for those who follow the divine will, and "things (else) practicable become impracticable" leading to "irretrievable disasters" for those who do not (*Ant.* 1.1.14-15). Connections to Psalm 1 are obvious.

⁴⁵ Sanders compares to ancient Stoicism, noting in such a framework: "a person was free to accept willingly his or her place in the causal nexus, or not. Rejection of destiny would not alter events, but only damage one's inner virtue" (Sanders 2007:89).

superior piety of the Romans (5.363, 372-3). They are instruments of divine punishment of the Jewish people (6.110), but unlike the Babylonians or Antiochus IV in the texts above, they are not culpable. They are more respectful of the sanctuary than the Jewish people themselves (5.363), benevolent in mercy (5.372-74), and studiously devoid of responsibility at the moment of the fire at the temple (6.252), especially Titus (254-56, 266).⁴⁶ Indeed, when he exhorts repentance, a response entirely consistent with Deuteronomistic theology, Josephus incorporates not only repentance to God (5.415), but to Rome (5.372-3).

However, in Josephus's adapted account of hope for the future, the events of the end of history are not about a restoration resulting from repentance, so much as divine sovereign action in which humans play no role. Although Rome will inevitably fall as part of the sequence of kingdoms (*J.W.* 5.367; *Ant.* 10.210, 276; see Chapter 3), Josephus does not identify Rome's decline as punishment for its treatment of the Jewish people. Moreover, as noted in Chapter 4 above, Josephus portrays the destruction of Jerusalem as predetermined (6.305-13). From his retrospective vantage point, he sees no incoherence between this determinism and human culpability for the events that led to divine punishment.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Here the destruction is also portrayed as an act of purification (*J.W.* 4.323, 388; 5.19, 416-8; Regev 2011:283-84).

⁴⁷ Although Sanders observes some possible awareness of Stoic thought in Josephus (*Life* 12; *Ag.Ap.* 2.168; and perhaps *Ant.* 10.277), he argues rightly that Josephus does not deal directly with these kinds of compatibility problems: "He simply asserts both that God chose to back the Romans and to destroy Jerusalem, and that this came as the consequence of the Jews' transgressions, which they could have avoided" (Sanders 2007:90). Beginning with Josephus's philosophical school passages, Klawans argues Josephus demonstrates two kinds of compatibilism as he portrays fate and free will with respect to the Pharisees' position. But Klawans emphasises that these views relate to Jewish philosophies seen also in later rabbinic texts, not Stoic compatibilism (Klawans 2009:76-81).

In *Jewish War*, as in several of the texts of this study, *who* has freedom is an important question for understanding what Josephus is doing in explaining the past and offering hope for the future. Even his positively portrayed Roman opponents do not appear to enjoy very much agency.⁴⁸ But the protagonist Jewish groups freely went astray and prompted the need for divine punishment, and they may also repent now. Nonetheless, having relied on Deuteronomistic interpretations of past events and the present call for repentance, when Josephus turns to consider the events of the end of history, he emphasises only divine sovereignty—this provides hope (and it also avoids uncomfortable political implications in the present).⁴⁹

2.2.3 2 Baruch

Second Baruch offers a view deeply shaped by these OT patterns⁵⁰ and yet marked by apocalyptic extensions. In the words of Matthias Henze, “this is Deuteronomic theology propelled to its eschatological extreme.”⁵¹ Consistent with its pseudonymous attribution to Jeremiah’s scribe, Baruch, the text particularly draws on Jeremiah’s themes (2 Bar 35.1-4). It describes the destruction of Jerusalem as divine punishment for impiety (13.4-5; 33.2;

⁴⁸ As noted above, Josephus considers the Romans to be pious, which is a characteristic that may indicate a measure of agency, though certainly when it comes to events like the destruction of the temple, they are disempowered.

⁴⁹ Rajak 2002b:89. See also Chapter 6 below.

⁵⁰ See direct citations of Deuteronomy, such as in 2 Bar 19.1 (Deut 30.19).

⁵¹ Henze 2008:206.

77.3-4; 79.2-4; cf. 84.2), though culpability lies with individuals. Baruch reflects: “Adam is, therefore, not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become our own Adam” (54.19; cf. 54.15).⁵² Access to the law gives understanding, through which the people should have avoided sin (15.5-7). Opponents are divine instruments: the seer’s Lord declares, “the enemy... shall serve the Judge for a time” (5.3). Baruch names Babylonian captivity a “sentence” (33.2).⁵³ Again, this reflects benevolent discipline for the covenant people; the present suffering is “for your good so that you may not be condemned at the end and be tormented” (78.6). As in 2 Maccabees, the other nations will also be punished, but by then their situation will be more dire (13.6-12).

But the writer simultaneously depicts history as utterly planned (14.1; 23.46; 27.1; 40.2; 54.1; 56.2; 69.2);⁵⁴ things are unfolding exactly as intended (9.1-2; 10.6-19). As a result of this mix of determinism and punishment, 2 Baruch’s reader is caught between culpability and powerlessness. There is no scope within this account for questioning divine faithfulness for creating a situation in which divine planning leads inevitably to punishment (unlike key themes in 4 Ezra discussed below). Prospectively, 2 Baruch’s writer asserts that restoration is also determined but, rather than an event within history

⁵² The exception, according to Baruch, is the sinless Zion who suffers as a result of the sins of others (2 Bar 76.8-9; 77.10). Like 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra reflects upon Adam’s sin brought by Adam, but laments Adam’s birth or wishes he had been “restrained” from sinning (7.116-19). Rather than 2 Baruch’s claim that all became their own Adam, in 4 Ezra all share the consequence of Adam’s sin, though this also manifests as individual sinning.

⁵³ See Chapter 6 on the effects of 2 Baruch’s literary setting.

⁵⁴ See Chapter 4.

as in Deuteronomy or Jeremiah, this restoration is now emphatically placed at the end (6.8-9; 15.7-8). Maintaining piety is an appropriate human response in the present (32.2; 44.2-3; 45.1-2; 46.5-7; 51.3; 76.5; 84.5-11; 85.4, 9), which also elicits eschatological consequences (83.8). But even the capacity for piety is determined (cf. 52.1-7; 84.6).

Again, incoherence exists for enemies, who are divine instruments but also will be punished (12.4; 14.2), now as part of an eschatological judgement (42.1-2; 44.11-15; 48.29, 40-1, 43, 47; cf. Baruch's words at 54.14-22). The writer affirms absolute divine sovereignty, without concern about its potential incoherence with attributions of human culpability. It is as though the determinism simply reflects a deeper knowledge of how all people would respond anyway.⁵⁵ Such an approach seemingly eliminates moral accountability. And yet, given the disclosures shared with the reader, the assumption appears to be that readers should consider themselves a part of the privileged group. Buoyed by believing compliance is already determined, readers should embrace the responsibility to keep the law. Rather than concerns about the plight of other groups, questions of justice in 2 Baruch revolve around the promise that opponents (even if divine instruments) will ultimately be punished and the people vindicated, by God's sovereign action.

⁵⁵ Perhaps this is akin to the wicked shepherds in *Animal Apocalypse* (now generally understood to be human and not angelic figures, cf. Tiller 1993:51-52; Olson 2013:190n.1), whom God appoints for a particular purpose in a highly deterministic setting, but they also, inevitably, overstep their authority. This may also be the best explanation for the portrayal of Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees—he enacts divine punishment, but is predictably hubristic and culpable in his own way.

2.2.4 4 Ezra

Finally, the writer of 4 Ezra shares many Deuteronomistic assumptions about history's events—for instance, by viewing Jerusalem's destruction as a punishment for sin (3.25-36; 6.55-59; 7.19-25, 72)—but *challenges the justice* of such a reality. As in 2 Baruch, the current situation certainly reflects judgement, but eschatological extensions of this pattern of sin and punishment intensify concerns about present events.⁵⁶ In the dialogues, Ezra challenges Uriel regarding God's responsibility for creating a situation in which judgement and punishment were inevitable, given humans are not capable of living faithfully.⁵⁷ Ezra laments in the third dialogue:

Who among the living is there that has not sinned, or who is there among mortals that has not transgressed your covenant? And now I see that the world to come will bring delight to few, but torments to many. For an evil heart has grown up in us, which has alienated us from God, and has brought us into corruption and the ways of death. (7.46-8)

Uriel's response, that rare stones are more precious than the plentiful and thus the rare faithful person will prompt rejoicing (7.52-61; cf. 8.2-3; 9.21), does not console Ezra (7.67-8). He returns several times to the theme (cf. 8.34-35; 9.14). The problem, it seems to Ezra, lies

⁵⁶ These themes draw on multiple layers in 4 Ezra's text. Judgement is highlighted in: the literary present (post-587 BCE), the historical present (post-70 CE), and the end of history. Divine and human responsibility and the consequences of such judgement are important in each layer.

⁵⁷ So Harnisch on 4 Ezra's understanding of the evil heart as excluding human freedom (Harnisch 1969), though this overlooks other elements of the text, particularly future response from the protagonist groups. See below.

in the way people have been created and the conditions in which they exist.⁵⁸ Uriel illustrates the rareness of human faithfulness with the image of a farmer's seeds—not all seeds which are planted will grow (8.41). But Ezra retorts: “if the farmer's seed does not come up, because it has not received your rain in due season, or if it has been ruined by too much rain, it perishes” (v.43). The implication is incisive: providing the conditions for flourishing remains a divine responsibility. Here, questions of divine responsibility arise precisely *because* humans are culpable. God, the sovereign Creator (v.44-45; cf. v.15) and provider of the law (3.19; 7.12) and of understanding (8.62), should have arranged things differently.⁵⁹

As in all interpretation of 4 Ezra, the relationship between the voices of Ezra and Uriel, and between the seven episodes, remains central.⁶⁰ Although the text across the episodes comes to affirm Uriel's position—or, more precisely, Uriel's prospective orientation—Ezra's complaint ensures essential concerns about the present are canvassed.

Importantly, the third dialogue offers a conflicted image of freedom for different human subjects. As the dialogue continues, Uriel attempts to move Ezra from his interest in the

⁵⁸ Ezra's reference to “an evil heart” does not blame God for its emergence (7.48), see Barclay 2015: 287, 302. Nor does 4 Ezra blame other spiritual forces. On the intrinsic evil tendency of the human heart in 4 Ezra, see Nitzan 2014:24-25.

⁵⁹ Here Ezra does not distinguish between divine action in creating opposition or permitting opponents to exercise freedom, or even creating opponents to act in their own characteristic manner.

⁶⁰ See Chapter 2.

many created (who will perish) to the few who will be saved (8.55; cf. 9.13, 21-2).⁶¹ He asserts that those who are perishing have exercised freedom in straying from the law (8.56-8; cf. 9.11), though he assures Ezra that, “the root of evil is sealed up from you” (8.53; cf. 2 Bar 31.5-32.2; 54.15-16). Thus, whereas Ezra points out that all mortals who have been born have sinned (8.34) and flourishing requires divinely granted conditions (8.43), Uriel argues that “the many” have made their own choices freely (8.56-8), while those like Ezra have been protected from going astray (8.53; cf. 9.21-2).

Here the writer of 4 Ezra, like the writers discussed above, treats ‘opponents’ and the groups whose interests lie at the heart of the text differently (cf. 8.47). The passion behind the distinction is perhaps exemplified in Uriel’s indictment of those who “have even trampled upon his righteous ones” (8.57). As it explains the past, 4 Ezra attributes freedom and culpability to opponents, even when they have implemented divine punishment (3.27-8; 8.56-61). However, Ezra and those like him enjoy different potential.⁶²

Also in keeping with the texts discussed above, 4 Ezra reflects significant differences between retrospective and prospective orientations in the text. The third dialogue makes this explicit, as Uriel challenges Ezra’s focus on mortality, “why have you not considered in

⁶¹ On debates about universalism and particularism, and Ezra and Uriel’s voices, see Longenecker 1991; Hogan 2008:32-33.

⁶² 4 Ezra 8.59-60 claims God did not intend to destroy, rather people created that situation through sin. Though, given determinism (cf. 7.42), sin and Jerusalem’s destruction are inevitable.

your mind what is to come, rather than what is now present?" (7.16; cf. 6.34).⁶³ The shift evident in the visions of episodes four to seven turns on these types of questions. Indeed, while Deuteronomistic theology is found in the earlier dialogues, the conversation between Ezra and Uriel serves to challenge the *limits* of these kinds of interpretations of suffering. Without refuting the interpretations' accuracy, 4 Ezra ultimately expands the perspective of history in which the present is set,⁶⁴ in order to emphasise instead future promise and divine sovereignty throughout history.⁶⁵

While retrospective and prospective orientations shape many of the representations of divine and human agency discussed in this study (sometimes incorporating incoherence, as discussed above), 4 Ezra's author stands out as one who demonstrates *awareness of the tensions this creates*. Other writers similarly stress divine sovereignty. But 4 Ezra's dialogues provide a penetrating recognition of some of the costs of this emphasis. If the future is ultimately assured by divine sovereignty which governs all of history, then God remains responsible. Moreover, unlike for instance the vision of the forest and the vine in 2 Bar 23-30, where the vine declares that the evil cedar will be destroyed at the end

⁶³ Barclay suggests this is a movement towards being able to see from the perspective of the future (Barclay 2015:287, 302). Thus, in his later work and specifically in relation to 4 Ezra, Barclay notes some aspects of this retrospective/prospective view.

⁶⁴ See Chapters 3 and 6. As rightly asserted by Bachmann: "Ezra's understanding of history (cf. 3.4-27) ... is rather enlarged than revised in 4 Ezra" (Bachmann 2014:7).

⁶⁵ Hogan argues that neither Uriel nor Ezra present the author's view, but the text builds towards affirming the perspective of the visions, which in some respects conflict with both voices (Hogan 2008:2). As above, I suggest the visions expand the perspective, but do not overturn the earlier views.

without stating its origins, in 4 Ezra's fifth episode, the lion addresses the eagle (representing Rome) to claim responsibility for having created the empires (11.39).⁶⁶ The writer of 4 Ezra bites an important bullet: if God is absolutely sovereign, then even the oppressive empires must have been created by God. However, as in other texts which emphasise divine sovereignty in prospective orientation, the vision is directed towards the future as a way of focusing, not on divine responsibility for the suffering caused by Rome as in the earlier dialogues, but on divine power over Rome and thus the pre-planned endpoint to its rule.⁶⁷

Finally, in 4 Ezra divine sovereignty ultimately guarantees not only the promised end, but the divine capacity to produce human faithfulness. Uriel indicates that, though the existence of an elect is determined, its *membership* at the end remains in question.⁶⁸ By the time of Ezra's address to the people after the final episode, the evil heart about which he was worried (7.48) has become a possibility of transformation. He exhorts the people to discipline their hearts and to seek righteousness through Torah observance so they might

⁶⁶ See also Chapter 4 above.

⁶⁷ Hogan argues that the visions emphasise apocalyptic divine action which overturns the wisdom perspectives of the earlier dialogues (Hogan 2008:39). I suggest, however, that the retrospective and prospective orientations remain important distinctions for explaining these different emphases in 4 Ezra.

⁶⁸ Rowland describes determinism in apocalypses through the image of a play comprising multiple scenes that have all been written in advance, but have not yet all been acted out on stage (Rowland 2002:144; Wright's image of salvation history unfolding over five acts is quite different, see Wright 1991:19). To continue Rowland's image, in texts like 4 Ezra, although the events are all set, it remains unclear which actors will play which roles (cf. 14.34-35).

be included among the few at the end (14.34-35; cf. 8.3; 14.13-15, 22).⁶⁹ Despite Ezra's concerns about inevitable failures of virtue that led to divine punishment, protagonist characters still enjoy the freedom to act virtuously—exercised through divine facilitation (as in Barclay's third model). Looking to the future, readers may be assured that divine sovereignty has not only secured the end, but made human piety possible, thereby exempting a select group from the inevitable culpability and punishment that arises when humans are left to their own devices.⁷⁰

2.3 Other spiritual forces in late Second Temple texts

Attributing responsibility to other spiritual forces can eliminate culpability of *either* humans or the divine. The writers of Jewish texts such as the War Scroll or 2 Baruch describe spiritual forces as opponents. In the battles set out in the **War Scroll**, the human sons of darkness are supported by the host of Belial.⁷¹ The language in 1QM 1 describes a final showdown involving, “the assembly of the gods and the congregation of men” (1.10-11); the action involves flurried battles amid “the shout of gods and of men” (1.11). While the text differentiates the singular God of Israel (thus “God's might” in 1.11, **לגבורת אל**), it nonetheless presumes numerous gods engaging in the battle alongside their human

⁶⁹ Najman argues 4 Ezra is about a renewal of faithful Torah practice, made possible in the aftermath of the loss of the temple (Najman 2014:152-58).

⁷⁰ Willett compares 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra, arguing there are no new answers in 2 Baruch, and no new answers on theodicy in 4 Ezra, except that 4 Ezra discards the idea of a rational answer, like Job, and instead brings together the ends of the spectrum, including religious experience (Willett 1989:125).

⁷¹ See Rowland 2002:40.

counterparts.⁷² The writer does not downplay the strength of the enemy or the severity of the battles and, as noted in Chapter 4, portrays the sides as evenly matched until Israel's God tips the balance.⁷³ Nonetheless, the overall outcome is assured. Philip Alexander suggests that the War Scroll reflects the interests of a community preparing for war in a manner approaching that of the zealots.⁷⁴ In such a view, the account of divine and human agency reflects Barclay's second model above—humans act in concert with God, exercising freedom but as divine instruments. The community's experiences may suggest to them that an empire of Belial is at work in history, and the anticipated eschatological war may involve such forces, but the War Scroll's emphasis on the God of Israel's sovereignty (see Chapter 4), ensures that when looking to the future, these other spiritual forces will certainly be overcome.

Second Baruch's vision of the dark and bright waters (2 Bar 53-76) explicitly attributes past negative events to other spiritual forces. Although blackness is said to enter with Adam, the vision employs the tradition of the Watchers to explain further corruption. Rameal's explanation of the vision clarifies that these fallen spiritual beings "possessed freedom in that time" (56.11). Moreover, innumerable other angels "restrained

⁷² Rowland emphasises that the War Scroll implies that this battle takes place within history, in which the sons of light are to participate in the divine action of defeating evil. Rather than the quietism of Daniel, this portrays expectations closer to those of the zealots (Rowland 2002:41).

⁷³ Vermes 1997:163.

⁷⁴ Alexander 2003:31; cf. Rowland 2002:41-42. Alexander argues that, though the war cycle texts come from earlier traditions, it is likely that they were "revived" in the build up to the revolt against Rome (p.31).

themselves,” permitting the Watchers to wreak their havoc without opposition, resulting in the need for the flood (56.14-15).⁷⁵ The historical review thus draws on themes found elsewhere.⁷⁶ But the freedom *granted* to the Watchers, including permission to act unchecked, highlights not only the (partial) agency granted to them, but its time-limited nature. Divine sovereignty prohibits such forces from affecting the divine plan for the future.

Second Baruch does not raise the question of divine responsibility for having granted these forces agency in the first place. Opposing spiritual forces’ origins are not addressed. Consequently, the writer avoids implications of either the divine responsibility or—the potential flipside—a challenge to divine sovereignty if these forces exist independently of divine will.⁷⁷

As noted above, Barclay consciously excludes these forces from his framework for divine and human agency.⁷⁸ Certainly texts of Second Temple Judaism do not portray such forces with the agency to influence events of *soteriological* significance, and thus they may

⁷⁵ The War Scroll is presented as a challenging battle between opposing forces; similarly 2 Baruch does not negate the power of the Watchers, though they were restrained from exercising that power.

⁷⁶ See VanderKam 2010:264, 268; Rowland 2002:93-94.

⁷⁷ Jewish texts emphasise *creation ex nihilo* in some cases in order to ensure no effects can be attributed to other forces. On this, see Bockmuehl, who in a similar vein also notes the War Scroll claim that God created Belial (Bockmuehl 2012:262). On Paul’s understanding of the power of other forces such as sin and apocalyptic accounts which disempower human response, see Martyn 1997:111-13, 120-22, 143-47, and related analysis in Campbell 2009:191-92.

⁷⁸ Barclay 2008:6-7.

reasonably fall outside Barclay's area of interest. However, these forces do exist in some texts. Their activities may instead explain negative events. Again, temporal orientation shapes the way these forces are described: looking back, writers may exclude both divine and human responsibility by assigning agency to other forces. But looking forward, divine sovereignty will render these forces impotent.

2.4 Θεομάχοι in Jewish texts

Finally, for some writers, suffering comes as a result of the behaviours of other humans, who are not in the first instance fulfilling a divine purpose but opposing God. Such attempts to fight God are frequently portrayed with a paradigmatic combination of hubris and dramatic downfalls. In the shorter term, their actions may explain events without attributing divine responsibility, but ultimately God will always win out.

Archetypal examples of θεομάχοι in Hellenistic Jewish texts include Pharaoh, Goliath, Nebuchadnezzar, and Antiochus IV,⁷⁹ who are portrayed through a literary type found in Graeco-Roman tragedy. The term θεομαχέω first appears in Euripides, but it reflects earlier traditions.⁸⁰ Non-Jewish Graeco-Roman writers in this tradition detail the tragic consequences of human attempts to fight against the divine. They can variously highlight

⁷⁹ Wolter 2009:247.

⁸⁰ See Kamerbeek 1948:274.

the justice of Zeus or the doomed valour of the hero.⁸¹ However, Jewish writers especially emphasise the arrogance and certain failure inherent in any attempt to fight God. Hellenistic Jewish writers draw on this literary type through a constellation of ideas such as hubris and blasphemy, even when the terms θεομάχοι/θεομαχέω are not employed.⁸²

In *Antiquities*, **Josephus** brands characters opponents of God by emphasising their hubris and dramatic fall. Without employing θεομαχία terminology in either *Antiquities* or *Jewish War*,⁸³ Josephus draws on the concepts associated with this literary tradition. Moses rescues the Hebrews from “Egyptian hubris (ὕβρεως)” (*Ant.* 2.268, cf. 2.261; 4.3, 243; 6.89),⁸⁴ and warns Pharaoh that by “hindering them, he should unwittingly have but himself to blame for suffering such a fate as was like to befall him who opposed the commands of God,” including “dread calamities” (2.291-92).⁸⁵ Indeed, Josephus suggests that Pharaoh, being “less fool than knave, though alive to the cause of it all [the plagues], was matching himself against God” (*Ant.* 2.307).⁸⁶ Similarly, Josephus has David declare that Goliath has “insulted our army and blasphemed our God, who will deliver him into my hands” (*Ant.* 6.183, cf.

⁸¹ Kamerbeek 1948:276, 283. See also Speyer 1981:996-1043.

⁸² Wolter 2009:247.

⁸³ However, he frequently employs a full phrase to describe opposing God (e.g. *Ant.* 2.307). See also *Ag. Ap.* 1.246 and 1.263, which use θεομαχέω in the context of the military decisions of a character who did *not* want to fight God.

⁸⁴ Rothschild 2004:158.

⁸⁵ Many dramatic incidents in *Antiquities* are expressed in terms of hubris (cf. 1.60). For a collective representation of opponents of God, see the account of Babel incident (*Ant.* 1.113-21).

⁸⁶ Rajak also explores the significance of anger in the portrayal of tyrants, as a failure to control the emotions, such as in the contrast between Pharaoh’s rage and Moses’s superior self control in *Ant.* 2.284-302 (Rajak 2007:115-16).

186-192, 210); the ensuing downfall contrasts Goliath's arrogance with the humility of David, whose power comes from God (6.181, 186-91). And Josephus's Daniel reflects on Nebuchadnezzar's punishment as a result of his insolence (ὕβρις).⁸⁷ Gruesome deaths, normally attributed to divine πρόνοια (*Ant.* 2.286, 330, 344), likewise fulfil the literary type and assert ultimate divine sovereignty.

Likewise, **2 Maccabees** confirms Antiochus IV and Nicanor as opponents of the divine in both their arrogance and their gruesome ends (4.17, 38; 5.12-17, 21; 9.4). The sixth son's words to Antiochus incorporate the only use of θεομάχος/θεομαχέω terminology in the LXX: "but do not think that you will go unpunished for having tried to fight against God (θεομαχεῖν)!" (7.19). This statement ensures these earlier events are read in light of the end to which they lead: Antiochus's death as a θεομάχος (9.4-28, esp. vv.11-12).⁸⁸ In addition to highlighting this literary tradition for Antiochus, the writer of 2 Maccabees simultaneously portrays Antiochus as a disempowered divine instrument (7.8), as discussed above. Part of the arrogance for which Antiochus is punished is believing that he inflicts suffering through his own agency (5.17-8; cf. 2 Bar 7.1).⁸⁹ Although θεομάχος/θεομαχέω is not used of Nicanor, he fits the tradition: his arrogance leads him to

⁸⁷ Second Baruch's historical review also says Nebuchadnezzar in the eleventh black water period will be arrogant and then fall (67.7-8; Cf. 82.9).

⁸⁸ Rajak observes that 4 Maccabees' adaptation of the stories of 2 Maccabees 6-7 particularly accentuates Antiochus's failure to control his excess of emotions, thus drawing on Greek censure of immoderation (Rajak 2007:120).

⁸⁹ Here Antiochus's behaviour is possible because God has abandoned the people and allowed it; similarly, see *J.W.* 5.412.

suppose he can sway the Jewish people from faithful practice (cf. 2 Macc 15.1, 6), and his death at the (divinely empowered) hand of Judas is celebrated with a grizzly parade through town with his severed head (15.3-7).

One further example of fighting God warrants mention. In **Josephus's** *Jewish War* the people as a whole are “warring not against the Romans only, but also against God” (*J.W.* 5.378).⁹⁰ Although this differs from the characterisation of individuals as θεομάχοι, in many ways Josephus connects to similar themes.⁹¹ The people have displayed foolish arrogance to consider themselves capable of victory against Rome (5.365-7; cf. 2.345-401). Moreover, given the might of Rome, they ought to have recognised Rome's divine support (5.368) and “how mighty an Ally you have outraged” (5.377). For Josephus, the events of history so strongly indicate divine purposes that, on the basis of the rule “yield to the stronger” (5.368), the Jewish people ought immediately to have interpreted Rome's dominance over them as divine will.⁹²

⁹⁰ For further discussion, see Crabbe 2015:27n.18.

⁹¹ These issues of individual and corporate sin and punishment are significant throughout the OT (see especially Ezekiel), and texts like the Psalms of Solomon. On Ezekiel see Joyce 2007:79-87; for a more general discussion of individual and corporate aspects of agency, punishment and salvation, see Boccaccini 2008:17-18.

⁹² Cf. *Ant.* 1.1.14.

3. Divine and human responsibility in non-Jewish texts

The non-Jewish writers of this study also offer accounts of divine action which constitutes punishment, as well as accounts in which the gods themselves are portrayed as the opponents of human projects.

3.1 Graeco-Roman treatments of human culpability and divine action

Writers like Diodorus Siculus, Valerius Maximus, and Tacitus also associate the events of history with divine punishment or reward. Sometimes this can lead to the sense that humans are not ultimately in control but are nonetheless responsible, or events whose causes include a mix of both “divine wrath and human madness.”⁹³ As discussed in Chapter 4, these writers may recognise a role for personal and impersonal divine forces in history’s events, but other priorities, such as moral instruction, lead frequently to attributions of human responsibility.

Diodorus Siculus, for instance, identifies the events of the Third Sacred War (16.61-64) as “just retribution from the deity” (16.64.1).⁹⁴ This includes a lightning strike that prompts a “divine fire,” destroying siege machinery and mercenaries (16.63.3), as well as divine control of events in which humans play a greater role—from being defeated in war by Antipater (16.64.1) to the personal decline of the commanders’ wives (16.64.2) and Philip’s

⁹³ As Griffin observes of Tacitus (Griffin 2009:170).

⁹⁴ On Diodorus’s sources for, and possible contradictions within, Book 16, see Hau 2009:175.

success (16.64.3).⁹⁵ Admittedly, assumptions about divine retribution may be more salient in this setting, where the causes lie in sacrilege.⁹⁶ Diodorus portrays the deity as just and the punishment deserved.⁹⁷

Valerius Maximus similarly identifies calamitous events as punishments for religion neglected,⁹⁸ as well as positive events flowing from correction of religious practice (1.1.16-21, ext.1-4). He also describes gods refraining from intervention. In a sentence not shared with other accounts of these events that might be Valerius's sources,⁹⁹ he reflects, "doubtless the immortal gods could have mitigated [Carthaginian] inhuman savagery, but to shed more lustre on Atilius' glory they let the Carthaginians act after their fashion: only to exact just vengeance ... in the Third Punic War" (1.1.14).¹⁰⁰ However, as he reflects on the piety of "the senate of our community," Valerius offers a mixed portrayal of the gods' disposition. When senate policy shortened the period of mourning to ensure continuity of religious service, he notes "by such resolution in the maintenance of religion the heavenly beings were made much ashamed to wreak further cruelty upon a nation which could not be scared away from their worship even by harshness of injuries" (1.1.15). Here, then,

⁹⁵ On themes of hubris and downfall in Diodorus's portrayal of Philip in 16.95.1, see Hau 2009:182-83.

⁹⁶ Sacks suggests that the focus on divine retribution in Book 16 is consistent with the narrative focus on recounting the Sack of Delphi from the Third Sacred War here (Sacks 1990:36-37n.56).

⁹⁷ For discussion of other examples in Diodorus on this theme, see Sacks 1990:36-37.

⁹⁸ These assessments often include the hesitation "it was believed" (e.g. *Doings* 1.1.16).

⁹⁹ On Valerius's sources here, see Wardle 1998:111-12.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. the sentiment in 2 Macc 6.14 discussed above, of allowing the sins of the other nations to accumulate before punishment. This was not an uncommon idea (cf. Wardle 1998:112).

human agents *manage* the behaviour of the gods, who may themselves be characterised negatively.¹⁰¹

Tacitus incorporates events identified as divine punishment and accounts of humans acting as divine instruments. In introducing his *Histories*, Tacitus notes signs and portents particularly related to the year 69 CE, asserting: “for never was it more fully proved by awful disasters of the Roman people or by indubitable signs that the gods care not for our safety, but for our punishment” (1.3). This observation frames the tumultuous story which follows. And yet, when *Histories* later reaches the burning of the Capitol, the gods are favourably predisposed and the disaster results from *human* folly. Amid political strife, Tacitus claims it is not even clear which group—the besiegers or besieged—started the fire (3.71),¹⁰² indicating shared responsibility: “so the Capitol burned with its doors closed; none defended it, none pillaged it” (3.71). The ‘opponents’ here are internal: “Rome had no foreign foe; the gods were ready to be propitious if our characters had allowed; and yet the home of Jupiter Optimus Maximus ... was the shrine that the mad fury of emperors destroyed!” (3.72).¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Even if Wardle’s point (overagainst Wensky) is taken in relation to translation here (that *iniurias* takes a broader meaning, whereas Wensky emended to *miserias* [Wardle 2000:114]), divinities who are unable to continue punishing the people still reflects a management strategy and depicts the gods rather negatively.

¹⁰² Although Tacitus later notes that Atticus took responsibility, for which Vitellius, whom Tacitus implies is actually culpable, is grateful (*Hist.* 3.75).

¹⁰³ Tacitus’s description of Nero in *Ann.* 14.22.4 offers a further example of human behaviour which is portrayed as eliciting divine anger and punishment (Griffin 2009:169-70).

In *Annals*, Tacitus disempowers human opponents as divine instruments, perhaps not unlike the portrayal of Babylon or Antiochus IV in texts discussed above. For instance, in Book 4 Sejanus comes to control Tiberius—“less by subtlety (in fact, he was beaten in the end by the selfsame arts) than by the anger of Heaven (*deum ira*) against the Roman realm for whose equal damnation he flourished and fell” (*Ann.* 4.1; cf. 1.24). Here Tacitus’s negative assessment shines through also in the ensuing description of Sejanus (esp. 4.1-4.3; cf. 4.1).

By contrast, for **Polybius**, the focus in the interaction between divine and human agency rests on the importance of human action and skill, evident particularly in his portrayal of positive characters.¹⁰⁴ He criticises other historians who deal with great figures by attributing their successes to θεοί or τύχη rather than *human* foresight (πρόνοια) and skills (10.9.2-3; cf. 10.2.6; 10.5.8-10). In comparing human foresight and good fortune, Polybius is clear: “one of the two things deserves praise and the other only congratulation” (10.2.7).¹⁰⁵ Humans may act within the parameters of divine forces, as in τύχη’s ability to act as an

¹⁰⁴ Although not a major focus, on change effected by τύχη as a direct punishment, see 15.20.5 (Walbank 2007:351).

¹⁰⁵ Eckstein emphasises this is a key theme in Polybius’s treatment of Scipio (3.47.6-3.48.12; 10.5.9; Eckstein 1995:276).

umpire in determining the scope of the 'match' (1.58.1)¹⁰⁶ but human skill and virtue are the focus, as elements over which his readers have control.¹⁰⁷

Unlike the Deuteronomistic texts above, these Graeco-Roman texts remain for the most part in retrospective mode when explaining divine and human agency in historical events. There is no equivalent transition from retrospectively identifying, for instance, Babylon as a powerless divine instrument, to prospectively asserting Babylon's culpability and future punishment. As discussed in Chapter 4, without a teleological view of history, these writers' portrayals of the future remain different. For instance, any implications for the future Diodorus offers simply reflect a generalised moralism derived from warnings about preparing for possible changes of fortune and the obligations of moral agents.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, in many cases the negative events these writers describe flow directly from the poor choices of the human agents, without any need for direct divine action. Teresa Morgan similarly observes the centrality of this kind of thinking in popular ethical material, such as the gnomic saying: "evil is its own reward."¹⁰⁹ Here failures of virtue prompt problematic situations which inevitably lead to disasters, without requiring divine intervention to orchestrate a downfall.

¹⁰⁶ See Chapter 4 above.

¹⁰⁷ Walbank 2007:350-1, 355; Eckstein 1995:281-82.

¹⁰⁸ See Chapter 6.

¹⁰⁹ Morgan 2007:241.

3.2 The divine as the opponent in Graeco-Roman texts

The writers portray divine responsibility for opponents or adverse conditions in a range of ways, not simply within the framework of justified punishment (where, though enacted through divine will, the cause lies in human sin or hubris). Some texts display gods deliberately invoking hardship, though for a greater benefit. Others portray divine forces themselves as opponents, pitted against human protagonists.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Virgil's depiction of a golden age shifts between his earlier and later work. Rather than the extravagant decadence of the age of Saturn (8.324-35; cf. 4 *Ecl.* 4-10), *Aeneid* focuses on a new age of Jupiter, attained through striving (6.793). Jupiter, though acting with the Trojan's interests at heart, imposes obstacles that give new meaning to this era as an achievement.

However, not all depictions of divine opposition maintain a sense of divine nobility. Conflict between the gods, often paralleling conflict between the humans to whom the gods are patrons, can also explain the events of history.¹¹⁰ In *Aeneid*, characters like Juno may not ultimately be sovereign, but do need to be managed.¹¹¹ Jupiter keeps her ignorant

¹¹⁰ See the battle of the gods set out in *Iliad* 20-21, described in terms like a Titanomachy, but involving the divinities from Olympus (Edwards 1991:287).

¹¹¹ Such management, however, takes place between the gods. See *Aen.* 1.20; 12.791-842, and West's discussion of the way Jupiter manages Juno (West 1998:303-4). Braund contends, "despite arguments to the contrary, humans seem to be entirely submit to divine will" and cites, for instance, 4.196-280, and the interactions between Jupiter, Mercury, and Aeneas (Braund 1997:211-12).

of his plans, although throughout the epic it is clear that Jupiter's superior power¹¹² will ensure that he (and thus also the Trojans) will not be foiled.¹¹³

Valerius's anecdote above, in which humans manage the gods' somewhat petty instincts (1.1.15), also intimates divine opposition without noble purpose. From Homer's characterisation of the gods in *Iliad* 20-21, writers knew a model of epic in which divine characters could be unscrupulous. Though even here, the focus lies in the "contrast with the serious, heroic and tragic human characters."¹¹⁴ Attic writers such as Xenophanes censured Homer's depiction as exploiting the worst human attributes in an inaccurate portrayal of the gods.¹¹⁵ But various writers continued to depict the gods negatively in this tradition, whether to focus on human valour in the face of impossible odds, or to draw out more ironic assessments, such as Ovid's portrayal of unlikeable, petty, and despotic gods (*Metam.* 1.166, 588-600; cf. *Aen.* 1.148-53).¹¹⁶

Impersonal divine forces may also be capricious and unfair. As noted in Chapter 4, Valerius cites examples of *fortuna's* fickleness, and for Diodorus the unpredictability of τύχη can create difficulties for human projects. Tacitus also observes that *fortuna* had

¹¹² The inevitability of *fatum* (cf. 1.262-304) also ensures this (see Chapter 4).

¹¹³ See West 1998:303-4.

¹¹⁴ Kearns 2004:68.

¹¹⁵ See also discussion of Heraclitus's criticism of Homer in Kamerbeek 1948:284. Similarly, the reception of Homer is discussed in Lamberton 1986:10.

¹¹⁶ Hejduk 2009:50-53.

“disturbed the peace” (*Ann.* 1.1.1). However, *fortuna* fulfils the role of opponent most clearly when aligned with imperial forces.¹¹⁷ It is in this sense, as noted in Chapter 4, that Stoic writers like Seneca can come to describe human life as striving against *fortuna*.¹¹⁸

4. Summary: divine and human agency in the key texts

In a range of ways, these writers explain the events of the past through the behaviour of opponents. Such opponents may serve divine purposes, as in the texts which draw on various applications of Deuteronomistic theology, or follow their own interests in fighting against the divine, as θεομάχοι or other humans or spiritual forces which have a tangible impact on the lives of the characters with whom the reader is invited to identify.

It is clear from this discussion, however, that many writers treat attributions about divine and human agency for the events of the future, including those of soteriological significance, differently. Prospective interests more closely align with Barclay’s framework discussed above, but this discussion highlights the need for a model which accounts for the impact of temporal orientation on the different types of explanations texts offer, and the ways writers can mix these ideas within explanations of the same events. In retrospective mode, writers allow not only for direct opposition between divine and human agents (both have agency as they fight each other, even if victory is only likely

¹¹⁷ Regarding Lucan’s *Civil War* on this, see Braund 1992:xxiii.

¹¹⁸ Matthews 2012:6.

for one), but a greater appreciation for ways in which horizontal relationships and malevolent other forces can impact upon the experiences of the people at the heart of the text. Indeed, many of these writers present completely different potentials for protagonist and opponent characters.

Finally, several of these writers emphasise divine initiative in facilitating positive human response in the present and future (at least for protagonist groups), such as the divine gifts which enable piety before the imminent end in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. By contrast, the non-Jewish Graeco-Roman writers give no sense that the future will be any different in terms of the human *capacity* to live a virtuous life. Indeed, for a writer like Polybius, even though humans work within divine parameters, the accent remains on human skill and virtue, without divine assistance. As the following demonstrates, in Luke/Acts the universal divine invitation and gift of repentance draw no distinction between ‘opponent’ and ‘protagonist’ groups. But human freedom leads to tragic consequences which are shot through with pressing eschatological concerns.

5. Interactions between divine and human agency in Luke/Acts

As in the texts examined above, in Luke/Acts divine and human agency also interact. Chapter 4 has already noted Luke’s emphasis on divine guidance of history, in which characters can oppose the divine plan, but it cannot be stopped. The following analysis of

Luke/Acts demonstrates three things. (1) Unlike the Deuteronomistic interpretations of the past discussed above, Luke's emphasis on divine sovereignty does not lead to claims that the negative events of the past constituted divine punishment. Luke has other ways of explaining such events, as either the direct result of other humans' culpable behaviour or random accident. (2) Like Josephus and the writer of 2 Maccabees, Luke incorporates the constellation of literary ideas surrounding θεομάχοι, hubris, and downfall, to demonstrate the impossibility of fighting God. He uses the trope to provide assurance that the fledgling discipleship movement is demonstrably supported by God and cannot be stopped. (3) Finally, Luke's emphasis on divine invitation to positive human response leads to important outcomes in three directions: tragic opposition results in a very human reversal; humans contribute significantly to the implementation of divine purposes; and God continues to make positive human response possible.

5.1 The role of culpability in explanations of the past

Unlike Psalm 1, Luke/Acts does not suggest a relationship between suffering and sin. Suffering is not divine punishment, benevolent discipline, or caused by direct divine opposition. Nonetheless, some sections of Luke's text do draw on apparently Deuteronomistic views. In a key passage of historical review, Stephen's speech (Acts 7.2-53) traces the history of Israel through the lens of characteristically unfaithful behaviour: the people of Israel have been consistently stiff-necked, culminating in an almost hubristic

attempt to build a temple. The building project is portrayed as a form of idolatry, stemming from a failure to recognise that God had no use for such a dwelling place made “by human hands” (Acts 7.48; cf. 17.24, 29-31; 19.26).¹¹⁹ Though the speech includes a citation from Amos 5.25-27, which recalls the divine decision to remove the people “beyond Babylon” (Acts 7.43), its emphasis remains on Israel’s consistent culpability, not the divine punishment or even restoration.¹²⁰ Similarly, the times of ignorance, though now drawn to a close (Acts 3.17; 14.16; 17.30), do not lead to explanations of the events of history as punishment for culpable ignorance.

Most passages in Luke/Acts do not rely on Deuteronomistic interpretations of suffering.¹²¹ Luke’s most striking engagement with questions of responsibility for suffering comes in Luke 13.1-9.¹²² In this passage, unique to Luke, characters ask Jesus his view on “Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices” (v.1). Jesus roundly rejects the unspoken implication that the suffering of these Galileans, or of those killed by the falling tower of Siloam, were associated with sin.¹²³ However, after overturning the notion that

¹¹⁹ Rowland 2007:473-75.

¹²⁰ Deuteronomistic overtones are potentially present in Peter’s speech in Acts 3.19, where repentance is exhorted so that the times of refreshing might come.

¹²¹ Contra Sterling, who sees the Deuteronomistic history as a major influence in light of Luke’s understanding of divine providence (Sterling 1991:358-59).

¹²² Lk 13.1-9 represents arguably one of only two Gospel passages that deal so explicitly with these questions—the other being John 9.

¹²³ For the view that Jesus tacitly assumes the traditional association of suffering and sin here, see Fitzmyer 1981-1985:2.1008; Nolland 1989-1993:2.718; and Johnson 1991:211. While I disagree with this view of this passage, some passages Luke takes from the synoptic tradition do seem to imply a traditional view of the relationship between sin and suffering, in the context of healing and

suffering (by either atrocity or accident) represents divine punishment (vv.2, 4), Jesus unexpectedly introduces repentance and final judgement: “No, I tell you; but unless you repent, you will all perish just as they did.” (v.5; cf. v.3).¹²⁴ The rebuff seems to confirm the characters were raising idle questions or gossiping (not unlike the unhelpful theorising of Job’s ‘friends’).

Most importantly, however, Jesus severs the inquirers’ presumed relationship between suffering and sin. Through his rhetorical questions—“do you think that they were worse offenders than all the others...?” (v.4, cf. 2)—Jesus not only vindicates these groups of sufferers, but challenges his listeners. The most pressing issue is not whether these people were sinners, but that the *absence* of calamity does not indicate blamelessness or that repentance is unnecessary (cf. Acts 14.15-17; 17.30).¹²⁵ In the parable of the fig tree which follows (vv.6-9), the emphasis may fall on a further opportunity for fruitfulness and the vinedresser’s attempt to create the ideal circumstances for growth, but the sense of urgency remains just below the surface: this tree is already into borrowed time for bearing fruit and the moment is short for turning things around.¹²⁶

forgiveness (eg. 5.17-26)—though, as throughout Luke/Acts, the emphasis remains on all people’s need for forgiveness (cf. Lk 13.1-9).

¹²⁴ Here the plight becomes an insight into eschatological judgement. See Emmrich 2013:118.

¹²⁵ Talbert 1982:145.

¹²⁶ See Chapter 6 for further discussion of urgency and the events of the end of history in Luke/Acts.

5.2 Θεομάχοι in Luke/Acts

Given Luke's separation of suffering from sin, it may seem uncharacteristic that his narrative includes some graphic accounts of calamities that befall characters as punishments. Unlike Judas's remorseful return of the thirty pieces of silver and later suicide in Matthew 27,¹²⁷ in Acts (the only other NT account of Judas's death)¹²⁸ Judas falls forward¹²⁹ as he is spontaneously disembowelled (1.18). Similarly, Ananias and Sapphira fall to the ground struck dead (5.1-11), and Herod Agrippa I suddenly dies and is eaten by worms (12.20-23; cf. 2 Macc 9.9).¹³⁰ Agrippa I brings together key themes about fighting God: his extraordinary rage leads to murdering James and threatening Peter, and he exhibits extreme hubris as he basks in the crowd's mistaken praise of him as a god and then dies (cf. Josephus's complementary portrayal of Agrippa I's hubris as he was lauded as "more than mortal" and then dies at the hands of divine πρόνοια, *Ant.* 19.345-51).¹³¹

¹²⁷ It is unhelpful to attempt harmonisation of these stories (Fitzmyer 1998:224); Luke's use of the literary trope seeks to make a different point, as also may Matthew's portrayal of Judas's suicide.

¹²⁸ Papias provides another account. Later stories are clearly influenced by Luke/Acts (Pervo 2009:52).

¹²⁹ Cf. Wisdom 4.19 (Fitzmyer 1998:224).

¹³⁰ The sense of opposition to divine purposes is also evident in Luke's portrayal of other Herodian characters. Dicken argues that the various different historical figures named as 'Herod' in Luke/Acts are portrayed in the narrative as a "composite" character, whose is established as a key opponent (Dicken 2014:71-131). For Dicken this includes 'Herod' at Lk 1.5; Lk 3.1-Acts 4.27, and Acts 12, but not Agrippa II in Acts 26.

¹³¹ The account of Agrippa I's death in *J.W.* 2.219 is not dramatic. The firm friendship established between Pilate and Herod at Jesus' death, unique to Luke, also builds the sense of tyrants who contribute to the opposition to Jesus' kingship. Although by their friendship, to an extent Luke presents both as opponents (Lk 23.12; cf. Acts 4.27), but interestingly he does not also portray Pilate (and his death) in the same literary tradition. Richardson explores historical questions about the friendship (Richardson 1999:311-2), though the key issue here is literary.

As in the accounts of characters like Antiochus IV or Nebuchadnezzar provided by Josephus and the writer of 2 Maccabees, these passages in Luke/Acts portray the fitting end of θεομάχοι. Commentators often note a “punitive miracle” form in these passages,¹³² but the Lukan passages go further in drawing on the literary type, already established in Hellenistic Jewish texts, of θεομάχοι.¹³³ Opposition to the divine takes the form of hubris and blasphemy, and results in inevitable (and dramatic) downfall for the characters who attempt the impossible: fighting God.

Gamaliel’s words in Acts 5.38-9 also function as a heuristic for interpreting the other passages and a commentary on how opposing God will play out across the text. Gamaliel’s use of the term θεομάχοι (a NT *hapax legomenon*) removes any doubt about the literary tradition in play here. As set out in Chapter 4, Gamaliel’s advice to the Sanhedrin, advocating judicious fence-sitting in case “this βουλή is of God,” (v.39) ironically confirms for the reader that the discipleship community and its proclamation cannot be stopped. By structuring Gamaliel’s advice around the risks of being found θεομάχοι, Luke also highlights that the dramatic incidents involving Judas, Ananias and Sapphira, Agrippa I,

¹³² First highlighted by Gerd Theissen, as miracles which enforce religious boundaries (Theissen 1983). In contrast to words or actions that immediately heal someone, here the miraculous moment confers a punishment.

¹³³ MacDonald finds numerous parallels between Euripides’s *Bacchae* and Luke/Acts; see particularly his discussion of θεομάχοι (MacDonald 2014:34-56). I suggest Luke follows in the tradition of the Jewish Hellenistic writers above who make use of the θεομάχοι theme, rather than suggesting direct dependence up Euripides. See also Wolter 2009:274.

and—to an extent—even Paul and the magician Bar-Jesus/Elymas¹³⁴ should also be understood through the lens of opposition to divine purposes that cannot be successful.¹³⁵

When Ananias and Sapphira sell property and give only part to the discipleship community (in contrast to Barnabas’s positive example of resource sharing immediately preceding), they attempt to deceive the other members of the community. Moreover, Pervo rightly notes that Peter’s observation that they lied to the Holy Spirit and “put the Spirit of the Lord to the test” (5.3, 9; cf. 7.51), suggests their behaviour is tantamount to *θεομαχία*.¹³⁶ The close proximity of the following pericope involving Gamaliel also makes this salient. Commentators who are swift to suggest the text condemns only the deception itself¹³⁷ overlook not only the centrality of Luke’s concern about attachment to possessions¹³⁸ but also the significance of his portrayal of opposing divine purposes. Likewise commentators who worry about what kind of image of God this incident provides—a divine figure who would strike wrongdoers down so swiftly—have missed the form-critical point.¹³⁹ As

¹³⁴ Fitzmyer also calls the incident with Elymas/Bar-Jesus (13.6-12) another punitive miracle (Fitzmyer 1998:499, 503). Not all examples of opposition receive these types of punitive responses (cf. Lk 9.52-56; 19:13-17, contra Pervo on interpreting the destruction of Jerusalem in Luke/Acts in this way, Pervo 2009:52).

¹³⁵ As also in Josephus’s descriptions discussed above, which do not use *θεομάχος/θεομαχέω* language, but nonetheless draw clearly on the literary type.

¹³⁶ Pervo 2009:133.

¹³⁷ Fitzmyer 1998:316.

¹³⁸ See Hays 2010:264-69; Karris 1978:112-25; Donahue 1989:129-44.

¹³⁹ Fitzmyer’s interest in questions of historicity, although he himself is not arguing for historical detail, is not quite the right slant (Fitzmyer 1998:317-320). Here the literary trope does not *counter* Luke’s theology, as in my criticism above of rhetoric which contradicts content, but it nonetheless signals a specific theological belief, namely that the divine purpose cannot be opposed.

always in this literary trope, the punishment confirms the crime. This approach to punishment through events within history is atypical of Luke/Acts. But by employing a literary type from elsewhere, Luke does not purport to illuminate the divine character, but the impossibility of opposing God's purpose. The overriding message is that Ananias and Sapphira have opposed God and such behaviour never ultimately succeeds.

In some cases, characters who oppose the divine purpose are subject to a "punitive miracle" which is temporary rather than final, and enjoys rehabilitative possibilities. Paul is turned around through a period of blindness (9.8-9), which is perhaps also the model for the blindness of Bar-Jesus later (13.11). In many ways, Paul's zeal prior to his encounter on the Damascus road demonstrates traits of one going into battle against God—he breathes "threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord" (9.1, not unlike Herod's θυμομαχῶν in 12.20), approves of the murder of Stephen, and attempts to stamp out the apostles' missionary efforts. And, although the blindness is temporary, the divine intervention confirms the nature of Paul's earlier opposition. In the third of his three accounts of Paul's Damascus road experience, Luke employs a stock phrase from Euripides related to θεομαχία. Following "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?" the Lord says, "It hurts you (σκληρόν σοι) to kick against the goads" (Acts 26.14; cf. Euripides *Bacchae* 794.5).¹⁴⁰ The

¹⁴⁰ Kamerbeek 1948:279.

phrase, illustrating the impossibility of going against the grain of divine will (cf. *Ant.* 1.1.14), underscores that Paul's persecution was a form of fighting God.¹⁴¹

Θεομάχοι in Luke/Acts also connect in important ways to Luke's portrayal of the devil/Satan as an opponent of God and actor in the events of the narrative. After challenging Jesus in Luke 4, asserting in particular his reign over all the kingdoms of the world, ὁ διάβολος then departs "until an opportune time" (Lk 4.13).¹⁴² But when ὁ διάβολος/σατανᾶς does appear again, it is to enter Judas (Lk 22.3) and to fill Ananias's heart (thus prompting his opposition to the Holy Spirit, Acts 5.3), or to mislead through the magic of Bar-Jesus (13.10).¹⁴³ In the few passages which deal with Satan in Luke/Acts, he is a force holding back the release and acceptance Jesus is bringing (Lk 8.12/pars; 13.16; Acts 26.18). As part of his description of his call to stop attempting to "kick against the goads" by persecuting the Lord, Paul identifies his vocation as proclamation so that people may no longer be kept in darkness by Satan but rather be released into the light which leads to forgiveness (Acts 26.18; cf. 10.38). These references to Satan and the devil indicate forces which act in opposition to the divine βουλή, and are integrated particularly into the

¹⁴¹ Wolter 2009:246-49.

¹⁴² See the emphasis Conzelmann places on this, as part of his periodisation of Jesus' ministry (Conzelmann 1960:28).

¹⁴³ The opposition to the divine βουλή set out in Luke/Acts does relate in some way to spiritual forces. Contra Dicken, however, the claim of διάβολος in Lk 4.5-6 (the archetypal 'liar'), does not indicate the devil has divinely granted authority over all the nations of the world (Dicken 2014:143).

dramatic passages which portray human opposition in the constellation of ideas associated with θεομάχοι.

But, most importantly, for both the human θεομάχοι and the associated spiritual forces, Luke reassures that this opposition will not be successful. In this sense, Luke is consistent with the prospective interests of other texts above which deal with malevolent forces. Satan is, in a crucial sense, already a defeated force, whom Jesus reports having seen fall from heaven (Lk 10.18), even though (contra Cullmann's claims discussed above)¹⁴⁴ Satan continues to act in some form.¹⁴⁵ Summary passages which confirm the unabated growth of the witness to the word of God frequently follow straight after these events related to θεομάχοι: Ananias and Sapphira's deaths lead into a continued account of people coming to faith (Acts 5.12-16); the persecution surrounding Stephen's martyrdom ironically furthers the spread of the gospel (8.1-4); and Acts 12, which describes the extreme persecution meted out by Agrippa I, culminates in a sudden summary about continued growth (12.24). The attempts at opposition certainly lead to suffering and even martyrdom, but they are unable ultimately to impede the dynamic βουλή of God.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Cullmann 1962:198.

¹⁴⁵ Talbert 1982:117 links this verse with the claim that Satan's power is already broken. Dicken (rightly) observes that Satan's fall "is not a final blow" given his ongoing activity in Luke and Acts (Dicken 2014:143). Dicken also puts aside questions about the timing of this fall (p.143n.64), however, I suggest questions of timing do remain important as evidence that Satan's power has already been fundamentally fractured.

5.3 Human response and reversal in Luke/Acts

Most characters in Luke/Acts, however, are not archetypal θεομάχοι. Rather, people are faced with choices about how they will respond to divine initiative, which have real consequences not only in how Luke suggests these choices have shaped the events of the past, but in how things will unfold for various characters into the future. Characters in Luke/Acts respond diversely, which draws out the tragedy of humans rejecting the divine purpose or simply failing to appreciate the gravity and urgency of a positive response.¹⁴⁶ Other responses disclose the important roles that people play in contributing positively to the unfolding of the divine plan.

5.3.1 Tragic opposition to the divine plan and reversal

As rightly highlighted by Robert Tannehill, the reception of Jesus' proclamation in Luke/Acts is imbued with tragedy, foreshadowed even from the infancy narratives.¹⁴⁷ Jesus is a sign who will be opposed (Lk 2.34).¹⁴⁸ Simeon's prophecy, as discussed in Chapter 4, declares that this infant, who is "a light for revelation (ἀποκάλυψιν) to the gentiles" (v.32), is set to prompt the falling and rising of many in Israel and will reveal the thoughts of many, and establishes the overtone of tragedy that will result in not only a sword piercing

¹⁴⁶ For instance, the so-called 'positive' or disinterested Roman characters. See below.

¹⁴⁷ Tannehill 1986-1990:9, 261; Tannehill 1985:171-74.

¹⁴⁸ Those who follow him have the same effect. For instance, Paul is opposed (ἀντιτασσομένων) and shakes dust off feet in Macedonia (Acts 18.6).

Mary's soul (v.35), but Jesus' own lament over the obduracy of his people (13.34;¹⁴⁹ 19.41-44). The narrative is a tragic account of the ways in which characters who ought to have been keenly attuned to divine activity failed to "recognise the time of their visitation" and "the things that make for peace" (19.42, 44), with the result that they even "killed the author of life" (Acts 3.15; cf. 13.27).

Luke underscores the importance of positive human response to divine initiative with one of his narrative's central motifs: reversal. Reversal of fortune is a common theme in many of this study's texts.¹⁵⁰ For writers like Diodorus or Valerius, the constant possibility of a reversal of fortune stems from the understanding that human freedom exists within divine limits, and a human agent's status is always provisional because of unpredictable (and sometimes vindictive) forces like *τύχη/fortuna*. In Luke/Acts, however, reversal emerges as a direct result of the varied ways in which humans respond to divine initiative.¹⁵¹

In Luke/Acts, divine initiative itself is expressed in terms of divine favour, which is neither fickle nor changeable. The angels' tidings to the shepherds affirm peace on earth and good will among all whom God favours (*ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*, Lk 2.14), and at Nazareth Jesus

¹⁴⁹ Also paralleled in Mt 23.37.

¹⁵⁰ See also Chapter 4.

¹⁵¹ Luke's theme of reversal differs from the complaint in Thessalonica that these people have been "turning the world upside down" (Acts 17.6). The upset there reflects the political priority of Jesus' Lordship over the worldly authorities (see Rowe 2009:95-99), which does not conflict with other types of reversal, but also does not equate with it. See Chapter 6.

confirms divine favour or acceptance, drawing on Isaiah 61.1-2 to declare “the year of the Lord’s favour” (δεκτόν, Lk 4.19).¹⁵² Peter’s later realisation in light of his experience with Cornelius’s household encapsulates the breadth of the divine invitation: “I truly understand that God shows no partiality (προσωπολήπτως), but in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable (δεκτός) to him” (Acts 10.34-5). Emphasising that this indiscriminate acceptance stems first from divine initiative, when Peter reports the incident to the disciples in Judea, they respond joyfully: “God has given (ἔδωκεν) even to the gentiles the repentance that leads to life” (11.18). I touch more on repentance as a divine gift below.

Those who reject the good news bring about, in direct and concrete ways, the “falling and rising of many” and opposition foretold by Simeon (Lk 2.34): by failing to respond positively¹⁵³ some characters exclude themselves.¹⁵⁴ Material unique to Luke/Acts makes this dynamic particularly plain. In addition to the infancy narratives and inauguration at Nazareth, these themes run throughout the Lukan Jesus’ teaching material. The parables in Luke 14-16 take reversal as a central theme. In the parable of the great banquet, the

¹⁵² Luke notably omits the following verse about the day of God’s vengeance (Byrne 2000:50).

¹⁵³ Jervell notes that negative human action in Luke/Acts is only possible through divine permission (Jervell 1996:106-7).

¹⁵⁴ Emmrich argues Wisdom themes run through Luke’s approach to reversal, such as that those who humble themselves will be exalted, but failures of humility lead to characters being brought down (Emmrich 2013:102). Emmrich is less clear here whether divine action causes the reversal, though later states in relation to responding positively to divine invitation, “Failure to do so will bring its own consequences” (p.122). He also emphasises that this reversal is intrinsic to Jesus’ passion and resurrection (p.123).

diners in a good social position reject the invitation and exclude themselves (14.16-24; cf. 7.36-50; 15.25-32).¹⁵⁵ Despite ample opportunity, the rich man failed to act in response to Lazarus's need and finds himself eschatologically excluded from the company of Abraham,¹⁵⁶ in whose bosom the one the rich man had rejected now rests (16.19-31). Indeed, even Luke's blessings and woes (Lk 6.20-26) describe the practical outworking of the self-reliance of those who are rich, full, laughing, or spoken well of now (Lk 6.24-26; cf. 14.11; 18.14).

Characters in Luke/Acts who do not know their need fail to respond positively to divine initiative (cf. 7.36-50). And seemingly innocuous characters like Gamaliel fail to recognise the eschatological urgency of their response.¹⁵⁷ All who fail to recognise the significance of the divine invitation are warned that, having counted themselves among the first, they may suddenly find themselves last. This might dovetail with the idea of hubris and downfall found in Graeco-Roman texts, but Luke's reversal does not generally rely on divine retribution, nor suggest the workings of a cosmic pendulum. Rather, though it is certainly good news for the poor and humble who will be exalted (Lk 1.52-53), Luke's

¹⁵⁵ Braun 1995:88-97; Sanders 1974:258-59 (who sees Lk 14.15-35 as a "subversion" of Deuteronomistic theology and interpretations of election; cf. Ballard 1972:350).

¹⁵⁶ Jeffrey is concerned to emphasise, following Wright, continuities between the welcome of the prodigal and of Lazarus, to temper the judgement in this parable (Jeffrey 2012:202-5). While correct to note the ongoing possibility of the brothers' repentance, the rich man's judgement is set (cf. Acts 10.43; 17.31), even if features of the 'afterlife' presented are symbolic and not intended to be accurate (cf. Maddox 1982:103).

¹⁵⁷ Crabbe 2015:36-39.

reversal is primarily a natural consequence of all the things that get in the way of accepting divine invitation—a false self-sufficiency that might also be manifest in attachment to possessions or popularity¹⁵⁸—and thus prompt characters to exclude themselves.¹⁵⁹ Such reversals reflect a tragedy of human culpability *despite* divine initiative.

5.3.2 Human contributions to the divine plan

Conversely, many characters in Luke/Acts respond positively to divine initiative, and they make crucial contributions to the unfolding divine plan (unlike, for instance, the Romans' function in Josephus's *Jewish War*, who remain passive [if virtuous] instruments of the divine purpose). This underscores again the importance of human freedom as it interacts with divine action: in Luke/Acts the divine plan cannot be stopped, humans choose to participate positively, and yet the plan itself *relies on humans assenting to it*. In an exemplary passage, Mary receives the extraordinary news from Gabriel which ends with the assertion, “for nothing will be impossible with God” (Lk 1.37). Gabriel has spoken with assurance; the pregnancy will unfold as he has indicated.¹⁶⁰ But Mary's response confirms her free participation in the plan: “let it be for me according to your word” (v.38). By contrast, Zechariah fails to embrace the announcement to him and, though this does not change the

¹⁵⁸ See Chapter 4 on Gamaliel's popularity, and also Crabbe 2015:32-33; cf. Mason 2007a:37-38.

¹⁵⁹ Though Luke does include the synoptic tradition about the Son of Man being ashamed of those who are ashamed of Jesus (Lk 9.26), which might imply a stronger sense of divine action to prompt the reversal as a punishment.

¹⁶⁰ See Chapter 4 on reliable prophecies within the text of Luke/Acts.

events which proceed, it leads to a period of silence (perhaps not unlike Paul or Bar-Jesus' blindness) until he is ready to affirm God's activity at John's birth (1.63-64).

Other characters in Luke/Acts likewise assent to making a positive contribution to divine purposes. As noted in Chapter 4, various characters respond to a positive invitation in the form of a dream or other prophetic insight, and become significant participants in the unfolding plan (Acts 8.26-39; 9.10-19; 10.19-24; 16.9-10; 21.3-14 cf. Lk 9.51). Some other characters, such as Gamaliel (5.38-9), Gallio (18.14), the town clerk in Ephesus (19.35), or even Festus and Agrippa (25.13-27; 26.30-2), also serve the divine purpose, but in these cases it is entirely ironic—they do not assent, but without realising it become party to the divine βουλή that cannot be stopped (cf. 13.27).¹⁶¹

Although the divine plan will definitely unfold, humans are able to respond and align themselves with “deeds consistent with repentance” (Acts 26.20). The exhortation to do so in Luke/Acts in some ways reflects Ezra's exhortation to the people: “discipline your hearts,” in the face of urgent eschatological circumstances (4 Ezra 14.34). However, 4 Ezra's exclusive focus on the one over the many differs importantly from Luke/Acts. Luke's *universal* invitation also emerges as a central challenge within his narrative, as he looks towards the future.

¹⁶¹ Even here, the characters choose their own course of action—but ironically what they choose also furthers the divine plan. See Chapter 4 on irony in Acts 5.

5.3.3 Looking ahead: divine initiative and challenge

While humans (or, sometimes, random events)¹⁶² rather than God are responsible for negative events of the past in Luke/Acts, humans also remain active agents in the present and future. Nonetheless, divine action is not simply divine initiative (as in the declaration of favour), but God continues to act to make positive human response possible. As people are exhorted to repent, they are also, through the gracious exercise of divine action, *made able to do so* (Acts 2.37-9; 3.17-21, 26). Similarly, Luke affirms humans are made able to cast aside ignorance (Acts 3.17; 17.30) and to stand up straight in the face of God’s redemptive activity (Lk 13.12-13, 16; 21.28).

Indeed, according to Luke, repentance itself is a gift. As he addresses the Sanhedrin, including Gamaliel, Peter proclaims that God raised Jesus, “that he might give repentance (δοῦναι μετάνοιαν) to Israel and forgiveness of sins” (5.31; cf. v.32). And, as noted above, the Judean disciples recognise that the gentiles also have been *given* the repentance that leads to life (Acts 11.18). As in Barclay’s third model, divine initiative provides the scope for positive human response, but the people must still freely choose to participate. In Luke/Acts, repentance is a key way of understanding positive human action—it is the appropriate response to Jesus’ resurrection (as discussed in Chapter 6 below), and is bound

¹⁶² Cf. Lk 13.1-5.

up in decisions for participation through the *deeds* of repentance (Acts 3.8; 26.20; cf. Lk 3.8/Mt 3.8).

But the most challenging passage regarding divine and human agency in Luke/Acts comes at its end: Acts 28.17-28.¹⁶³ The enigmatic finale has prompted much debate, including in relation to whether this constitutes the original ending of Acts (or Luke-Acts).¹⁶⁴ Questions of divine sovereignty and responsibility and human freedom and culpability arise particularly from the citation from Isa 6.9-10 LXX.¹⁶⁵ Luke describes Paul's reception by the Jewish characters in Rome, saying they:

disagreed with each other; and as they were leaving, Paul made one further statement: "The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your ancestors through the prophet Isaiah,

"Go to this people and say,
You will indeed listen, but never understand,
and you will indeed look, but never perceive.
For this people's heart has grown dull (ἐπαχύνθη),
and their ears are hard of hearing,
and they have shut (ἐκάμυσαν) their eyes;
so that they might not look with their eyes,

¹⁶³ See Metzger on v.29, which is a later addition (Metzger 1994:444).

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Johnson 1992:474-5. It may seem surprising that the build-up to Rome leads to a dispute with Jewish characters, but the encounter mirrors themes from the beginning of Luke in important ways (cf. Alexander 2007:226-29). Johnson argues that the reliability of prophecy throughout Luke/Acts suggests readers should simply presume Paul's moment before Caesar has taken place (Johnson 1992:475). Furthermore, I suggest the contrasts between Luke/Acts and, for instance, Virgil's portrayal of Rome as the end of history, reveal the *importance* of Luke's decision to conclude his narrative here rather than before Caesar. Rome is not the goal of the mission, the "end of the earth" (Acts 1.8; Ellis 2001:58; cf. Barreto 2010:120), or the end of history. See discussion of the political implications of Virgil and Luke's portrayals of the end of history in Chapter 6.

¹⁶⁵ For Evans, Isa 6.9-10 and its early Jewish and Christian reception reflects fundamental tensions that emerge as writers seek to explain all experience in light of monotheistic divine sovereignty (Evans 1989:16), which relates to the key themes across this chapter.

and listen with their ears,
and understand with their heart and turn—
and I would heal them.” (Acts 28.25-27)

Luke has reserved the full citation until this climactic moment.¹⁶⁶ Building on Dupont’s distinction between the scene in Rome (28.17-28) and a final summary (vv.30-31), Loveday Alexander highlights that the last two verses have a prospective orientation, whereas the scene in verses 17-28 looks backwards.¹⁶⁷ This retrospective focus is particularly important for the citation from Isaiah; Luke uses the scriptural passage to interpret events that have unfolded throughout the narrative.¹⁶⁸

While in the MT, the verbs in Isa 6.10 suggest a divine intention to make hearts fat and close eyes so that the people will not respond, the LXX translator makes the verbs indicatives, which describe an existing situation: they closed their eyes (ἐκάμυσαν, Isa 6.10 LXX; Acts 28.27).¹⁶⁹ Luke cites the LXX directly without significant changes.¹⁷⁰ Indeed,

¹⁶⁶ Luke keeps Isa 6 in the explanation of the parable of the sower (Lk 8.10), but makes the reference shorter (cf. Mk 4.12; Mt 13.14-15; cf. also Mk 8.17-18; Jn 12.39-40). The possibility that Luke deliberately retained the full citation until the conclusion of his *dopplewerk* plays a key role in discussions about whether Luke planned Acts when writing the first volume (see Alexander 2007:216).

¹⁶⁷ Alexander 2007:214.

¹⁶⁸ Alexander notes that the interrelationships of themes in the prologue to Luke (chapters 1-4) and Acts 28, made salient by reading Luke/Acts from the perspective of the end, support claims to a literary unity of the two volumes from the author’s perspective (though not, she argues, a prospective unity from the perspective of the reader; Alexander 2007:24). Links between the infancy narratives and Acts 28 are also set out in Tannehill 1985:71-74.

¹⁶⁹ Evans observes that interpretation of Isa 6.9-10 shifted in Second Temple Judaism, away from focusing on prophetic accusation, as in the Hebrew text, to accenting the promise of restoration when the people turn and are healed. This shift is already in evidence in the LXX (Evans 1989:163-64).

¹⁷⁰ Mallen 2008:95.

Johnson suggests v.27, (Isa 6.10), introduces a sense of wilfulness.¹⁷¹ This is not an account of divine *intention* to stop up the ears and hearts to ensure the people do not respond and receive forgiveness—after all, Jesus declared a time of favour (Lk 4.16-18) and Peter observed that God shows no partiality (Acts 10.34-35)—but a reflection on what has *already happened* throughout. Some characters have not been able to turn and be forgiven, because they have been unable to hear, see, or allow their hearts to be moved.¹⁷²

However, the reader knows that not all Jewish characters have rejected the proclamation.¹⁷³ Many have responded positively and become crucial participants in the unfolding divine plan, or benefited from the reversal caused by differing responses to divine initiative. Whatever opportunities are now closed off, Luke/Acts does not portray a blanket rejection by Jewish people. Even in this final scene, “some were convinced by what

¹⁷¹ Johnson 1992:472. Evans argues that the shift from the Hebrew *hiphil* to the Greek passive alters the LXX so that the prophet’s preaching no longer “causes the heart to be fat, but the prophet preaches *because* (γάρ) the heart is already fat” (Evans 1989:63). In both Isa 6.10 LXX and Acts 28.27, the verbs escalate in their sense of human culpability: the people’s heart has become dull (in the passive, ἐπαχύνθη), their ears heard with difficulty (βαρέως), whereas their eyes they have closed (in the aorist, ἐκάρμυσαν).

¹⁷² As also Johnson 1992:476. Barrett argues Luke sees the rejection as part of “God’s intention” (Barrett 1994-1998:2.1245), though elsewhere suggests the people reject wilfully—and that Luke does not offer sophisticated theological reflection on the topic (p.2.1246).

¹⁷³ Jervell 2002:42, 46. Tannehill divides the final scene into two parts (vv.17-22, 23-28), and argues that the first makes Luke’s core point: Paul and his mission have not been opposed to the Jewish people (cf. esp.v.20; Tannehill 1986-1990:2.344-45). Mallen argues the two parts of this scene mirror those elsewhere, where proclamation is first received in a “polite interchange,” and then opposed in the second part of the scene (Mallen 2008:94; cf. Lk 4.16-30).

[Paul] said,¹⁷⁴ but others disbelieved” (28.24). And, in fact, their departure following Paul’s citation from Isaiah 6 and chilling announcement that the proclamation will go to the gentiles¹⁷⁵ comes as they disagree among themselves!

Luke does not treat the potential of different groups or individuals differently.¹⁷⁶ Unlike Josephus and the writers of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and many further texts, Luke makes no division between ‘opponent’ and ‘protagonist’ groups in the sense of their opportunity for positive response. The comparison between Lk 2 and Acts 28 exposes a contrast between gentiles (whom Simeon says will receive revelation, Lk 2.32,¹⁷⁷ and Paul says will listen, Acts 28.28), and characters in Israel (many of whom will fall and rise, Lk 2.34, some of whom will ultimately fail to listen, Acts 28.26-27).¹⁷⁸ Nonetheless, in Luke/Acts, all have received the same invitation. But characters make different choices.

¹⁷⁴ Tannehill emphasises the imperfect here, to suggest they were simply in the “process of being persuaded” (Tannehill 1986-1990:2.347), arguing Luke intends that such persuasion remains an ongoing possibility (p.2.347).

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Acts 13.45-47; 18.6; Tannehill 1986-1990:2.346.

¹⁷⁶ Contra Nave, who suggests that, despite Luke’s emphasis on “universal salvation” the response expected of Jewish and gentile characters is different (Nave 2002:224). In analysing the role of repentance in Luke/Acts, Nave also emphasises the importance of decision to change one’s life (and attitude to Jesus, for Jewish characters), but without attending to the interaction between the divine gift of repentance or the eschatological setting, both of which shape Luke’s understanding of repentance in important ways.

¹⁷⁷ Alexander notes Simeon also foresees Jesus bringing ‘glory’ for Israel, and that the hymn here supplies a positive portrait, though Simeon’s further words immediately foreshadow struggle (Alexander 2007:220).

¹⁷⁸ See Tannehill’s more detailed comparison of the infancy narratives and Acts 28 (Tannehill 1986-1990:2.349-50). Also Alexander 2007:221-22.

The prospective elements of Acts 28 leave the challenge in the air, alongside the sense of urgency. Verses 17-28 explain past rejection. But with its open, seemingly unfinished ending, account of mixed reception, and challenging proclamation—and the final summary’s claim that Paul still “welcomed all who came to him” (v.30)¹⁷⁹—a *prospective* challenge remains. While the options may be closed for these characters whose story has come to a conclusion, the challenge for positive response transfers to the reader, whether insider or outsider, Jew or gentile. Nonetheless, Paul’s words remain an ominous warning: time is running short. The very openness of Acts’ ending underscores the unknown nature of the culmination of history, though the events begun in the resurrection of Jesus guarantee that the date for judgement has been set (Acts 17.31).¹⁸⁰ The decision to exercise human freedom through positive response to divine initiative is urgent.

6. Conclusion: Human response in Luke/Acts

In all of this study’s texts, the writers presume some interaction between divine and human agency, and thus confirm Barclay’s claim that ancient texts reflect more complex understandings of agency than a simple “competitive” model. In contrast to Käsemann’s criticism that Luke was a proponent of *theologia gloriae*, or Cullmann’s suggestion that NT writers including Luke portrayed the divine action in the Christ event as so decisive that evil no longer has an effect, Luke recognises the reality of suffering. He attributes negative

¹⁷⁹ Tannehill notes this is striking given the preceding verses (Tannehill 1986-1990:2.351).

¹⁸⁰ See Chapter 6.

events within history to the action of human agents, malevolent forces, or random accident, but—unlike those texts which draw on Deuteronomistic theology—generally not divine punishment. Moreover, unlike the anguished exploration in 4 Ezra, Luke's explanations of the past do not lead him to anxieties about divine responsibility for allowing or creating the conditions that have prompted suffering. In Luke/Acts, all opposition leads into a strong sense of tragedy.

When he looks to the future, Luke emphasises both the impossibility of impeding the divine βουλή (as set out in Chapter 4) and an ongoing role for human action. Unlike writers who portray divine benevolence for protagonist groups differently to divine attitudes towards opponents, Luke's universal focus emphasises not only divine sovereignty but human responsibility to respond to the divine initiative. As Luke explains the past and provides assurance for the future, his focus on human freedom ensures a sense of urgency governs his exhortation for appropriate human response in the present. As it draws to a close, Luke/Acts continues to challenge readers to accept divine invitation urgently. Luke's understanding of the present time in relation to the end, as explored in Chapter 6, underscores that response remains possible for a limited time.

Chapter 6: The present and the end of history

“Measure carefully in your mind, and when you see that a certain part of the predicted signs are past, then you will know that it is the very time when the Most High is about to visit the world which he has made. So when there shall appear in the world earthquakes, tumult of peoples, intrigues of nations, wavering of leaders, confusion of princes, then you will know that it was of these that the Most High spoke from the days that were of old, from the beginning...”

—Uriel, 4 Ezra 9.1-2

1. Introduction

In this chapter I examine the ways in which the present time and the end of history are characterised in the study’s key texts, in order to illuminate Lukan eschatology. In addition to their particular expectations about the end and views about the significance of the present, writers’ understandings of the *relationship between these two moments* shape how eschatology functions in their texts. To illustrate with more recent examples, though Hegel, Marx, and Fukuyama speak of different things when they consider the end of history, their treatments are all affected in fundamental ways by their understandings of the relationship between the present time and the end of history. Hegel’s dialectical account of history¹ inspires Marx’s dialectical materialism,² which *anticipates* the dictatorship of the proletariat that will result in communism at history’s end. By contrast, Fukuyama proposes that the practical and philosophical achievements of liberal

¹ Hegel 2011:118-9, 133-68, (esp. pp.166-68).

² Marx 1967:249-59, 285-7; Marx 1974; cf. Williams 1997:557.

democracy indicate that the end of history has *already* been realised where liberal democracies flourish.³ These ideologies evoke important distinctions that are also evident in ancient texts: not only do writers' teleological conceptions of history shape their texts, but significant implications also arise from the extent to which the writers consider the end to have been achieved in the present.

Thus, in this chapter I build on the conclusions of Chapter 3, about the essential connection between history and its end in Luke's periodised, teleological schema of history, to address the fraught topic of Luke's expectations about the *imminence* of the end. Chapters 4 and 5 highlighted the ways in which retrospective and prospective interests shaped writers' portrayals of divine and human agency, including responsibility for negative events in the past and present. This chapter demonstrates that a writer's understanding of the relationship between the present and the end of history similarly draws out important consequences for his or her portrait of hope and of appropriate political orientation in the present. As noted in Chapter 1, these elements of Luke/Acts

³ Here Fukuyama, not unlike some ancient writers, was affected by the mood of his time. After an initial essay published on the brink of the changes in Europe in 1989, Fukuyama's 1992 publication also reflected his enthusiasm about an increasing dominance of liberal democracy (Fukuyama 1992:xiii-xxiii, 276-86, 341-54). Critiques have challenged both Fukuyama's teleological conception of history and the role he ascribed to liberal democracy within it (see discussion in Elliott 2008:34-63, including Fukuyama's subsequent revisions). My interest here is not in Fukuyama's specific theoretical claims, but the contrast between views, based on beliefs about the extent to which the end of history has already been achieved.

have been vigorously debated, in part as an effect of the claims made about Luke's eschatology.

This chapter particularly draws on research into understandings of history in late Second Temple Jewish texts, exemplified by recent studies by Loren Stuckenbruck.⁴ As noted in Chapter 1, Stuckenbruck analyses the understandings of time in Pauline literature, contemporaneous Jewish texts, and some of the beliefs attributed to Jesus by historical Jesus researchers.⁵ He sets up the problem as one in which understandings of time are integrally connected to making sense of evil, arguing, "the way time is understood within both the NT and its Jewish environment has important implications for how a faith perspective, which interprets the past and anticipates the future, can be understood as an effective means to negotiate evil in the present."⁶ Stuckenbruck argues that there are core similarities in the structuring of time in early Jewish and NT texts, including the way in which decisive events of the past provide assurance for future victory, and thereby also shape identity and experience in the present.⁷

⁴ Stuckenbruck 2014a:320-26; Stuckenbruck 2014b:240-56. On ways of securing continuity, rather than rupture, in history in light of the exile, see Mermelstein 2014:11-15. Similarly, in relation to the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, including ways of reinterpreting the past as a resource for making sense of the present, see Najman 2014:27-33, 62-67, 153-58.

⁵ Stuckenbruck 2016:145-52.

⁶ Stuckenbruck 2016:143.

⁷ Stuckenbruck 2016:161, 165.

Stuckenbruck's account offers welcome nuance to the way in which late Second Temple Jewish texts are employed in comparisons with NT texts.⁸ This type of analysis also offers a helpful response to the difficulty I have identified in Oscar Cullmann's otherwise illuminating concept of the "redemptive line of history," in which Cullmann fails to take sufficient account of ongoing experiences of suffering in the period beyond God's decisive action in Christ at history's 'mid-point.'⁹ In Chapter 5 I noted that Cullmann had overlooked Luke's recognition of evil and the tragic consequences brought about by continued opposition to the (nonetheless unstoppable) divine βουλή. But the same difficulty likewise relates to the ways Cullmann failed to account adequately for the tension between the present time (already—I agree with Cullmann—positioned within the ultimate period of history), and its culmination on the date set for judgement (cf. Acts 17.31).

I seek in this chapter to build on Stuckenbruck's insights in my treatment of Luke/Acts, demonstrating the range of similarities, and some key differences, between the placement of the present in relation to the pattern of events expected as part of the end of history in this study's Jewish texts and in Luke's account. Moreover, I suggest this approach to the ways in which ancient writers structure history also exposes fundamental *differences* in the

⁸ Stuckenbruck 2014b:243-49.

⁹ Cf. Cullmann 1962:198, and my Chapter 5 above.

understanding of history in Virgil's *Aeneid*, despite Virgil's apparent similarities to Luke in identifying the end of history to some extent with the present.

In examining characterisations of the present (including any sense of the broader significance of this moment in history), and its relationship to understandings of the future or end of history, I consider the study's key texts in three groups: those which, as demonstrated in Chapter 3, depict history continuing through unending ages, where the *future* rather than *end* plays a key role; Virgil's teleological schema of history in *Aeneid*, which portrays the goal of history as having been achieved (and is represented as continuing statically *sine fine*); and the Jewish texts, which all anticipate the end of history though they identify the historical present in relation to the events of the end in diverse ways. The conclusions illuminate the treatment of Luke/Acts which follows.

The analysis in this chapter draws out four key points. (1) The structure of history in this study's Jewish texts and Luke/Acts are in many ways very similar. As noted in Chapters 4 and 5, these texts all draw on claims about faithful divine action in the past as part of providing assurance for the future. With respect to the location of the present time in relation to the pattern of the events of the end, the texts are diverse; Luke/Acts (as also other NT texts) may be considered on the same spectrum. (2) Nonetheless, Luke/Acts remains to one extreme of this spectrum. For Luke, the decisive divine action which has already taken place in the past and constitutes assurance of the end (God's action in raising

Jesus) is qualitatively different. Luke asserts that the ultimate period of history *has already begun*. I argue this is particularly evident in his treatment of Jesus' resurrection, Jesus' post-ascension position at the right of God, and the presence of the Spirit. (3) In conceptualising the relationship between the present and the end (or future), the extent to which this relationship is dynamic, allowing further movement in the present time, also contributes importantly to the effects of the eschatology evident in these texts. Even the writers who give no sense of an endpoint to history nonetheless account for the possibility of change. As a result, the future affects experience in the present in tangible ways, either as comfort or challenge. But the static alignment of present and end in *Aeneid* brings about crucial differences in the effects of Virgil's understanding of the end of history. (4) Finally, not only do the texts with which Luke/Acts shares greatest generic similarity again share minimal features relevant to these core themes in Luke's account, but previous studies of related themes, such as Luke's politics, frequently omit significant features from their frames of reference by failing to appreciate the central role played by Luke's understanding of the present in relation to the end of history. By exploring the extent to which the end of history is already realised in the present, and the static or dynamic character of the present, this chapter demonstrates that *both* of these elements are essential for understanding how eschatology functions in Luke/Acts.

2. The present and the future in non-teleological texts

Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Valerius Maximus, and Tacitus do not incorporate the sense of an endpoint within the scope of their schemas of history.¹⁰ As argued in Chapter 3, these writers all suppose that empires rise and fall,¹¹ each in turn indefinitely replaced by the next, and this feature ultimately establishes the non-teleological shape of their histories. Nonetheless, expectations about the *future* still affect the present in these texts, as also the writers' varied attributions of significance to the present time shape their texts in important ways. The present can constitute the climax within the section of history considered or simply the current in a series of equally commonplace historical moments.

For **Polybius**, the present moment is imbued with universal significance. Polybius praises the period “since these times¹² (ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων τῶν καιρῶν)”—that is, the ‘now’ represented by the rise of Rome. As set out in Chapter 3, Polybius describes the former times of disparate events (which were “held together by no unity of initiative, results, or locality”) as having been replaced, by τύχη bringing together the entire world into one “organic whole” (1.3.3-4; cf. 1.4.1-3; 8.2.2-3).¹³ But, as will be clear from earlier chapters of this thesis, this in itself is an intriguing element of Polybius’s historiography. Elsewhere

¹⁰ See Chapter 3 for discussion about the impact of a writer’s “scope” or “scale” of history on the overall depiction of the shape and direction of history underlying a text.

¹¹ For Tacitus, regime change involves transitions between different Roman regimes. See Chapter 3.

¹² LCL translates, “but ever since this date” (1.3.3).

¹³ See Walbank 1957:44.

his attention to progress in history emphasises the value of future generations learning from the mistakes of the past (1.35.6-10; see Chapter 3),¹⁴ his portrayal of τύχη is famously mixed, though frequently τύχη is sidelined in the interests of providing replicable causal explanations where possible (see Chapter 4), and he explicitly praises human skill as the more desirable attribute over good fortune (see Chapter 5). Although for Valerius current circumstances are subject to an element of provisionality given the unpredictability of fortune, for Polybius the future predominantly provides an opportunity for improving one's own skills, strategies, and circumstances.

Polybius's allusion to future rotation through empires seems particularly striking, given this emphasis on both Rome's extraordinary ascendancy and human competence. Nonetheless, Scipio's comment at the fall of Carthage (38.21-22), discussed in Chapter 3, intimates that the cause of such collapse—whether of Carthage or as predicted of Rome—lies only in the inevitable progression of one empire to another. Scipio's insight is portrayed as a virtue (38.21.2-3).¹⁵ Despite Polybius's affirmation of Rome, in the aftermath of his own homeland's fall he may proffer a subtle sense of dissent,¹⁶ implying some silver lining lies in the inevitable provisionality of the present time.

¹⁴ This development includes both military strategies and moral improvement (Eckstein 1995:281-82).

¹⁵ The virtue of responding to bad fortune positively is a major interest for Diodorus, but this also features in Polybius's reasoning (Eckstein 1995:277).

¹⁶ Gruen 2011:152-55.

Conversely, with the broad scope of his historiography from primordial times and in diverse geographical locations, **Diodorus Siculus** relativises the significance of the particular ‘moment’ in which he writes.¹⁷ As argued in Chapter 3, Diodorus affirms progress in history, including the sense that progress is intrinsically related to the purpose of writing and reading historiography, but this progress does not lead to any particular affirmation of achievement in the present time. Moreover, when individuals look towards the future, Diodorus’s advice is simply that everything can change (see Chapter 4). For Diodorus, changes in fortune provide the opportunity not only for those experiencing adverse fortune to look forward to possible improvement, but for those currently enjoying the spoils of good fortune to attain virtue. In the latter case, they may avoid arrogance, by acknowledging that such things do not last, and when things do change, they may practice the moral virtue of enduring changes of fortune well (cf. 12.1; 17.38.4-6; 18.60.1; 31.15.1; 38.41.6; 38.42.1).¹⁸ When Diodorus moves beyond individuals to the transitions between empires, he maintains that the continued pattern of rise and fall is inevitable—both because of the unpredictability of fortune, and because discipline over time seems impossible for those enjoying ruling power (14.46.4; 37.2-8).¹⁹

¹⁷ Sacks 1990:157.

¹⁸ Sacks 1990:39-41. Though Hau notes that Diodorus consistently raises questions about characters’ capacity (or incapacity) to achieve moderation and virtue during good fortune (Hau 2009:172).

¹⁹ Sacks 1990:52.

Conversely, **Tacitus's** account of the present moment and any expectations of the future again revolve around his picture of decline.²⁰ Although he may imply that the period under Trajan is more positive, as Scott argues, Tacitus's treatment of this time is ambiguous and impossible to separate from his own political situation in the present.²¹ Given Tacitus's persistent criticism of any conditions that compromise true liberty, it seems likely that not even a good *princeps* could offer a model to avoid his disappointment.²² For Tacitus, the present is part of a grim period of decline, although even this does not make the present period unique or especially significant. His attitude towards the future offers no further hope in relation to the political situation and the characteristic failures of autocratic rulers.

Finally, for **Valerius Maximus**, vulnerability to fortune simply reflects the nature of human existence. Given the great continuity of human circumstances in all times and places (see Chapter 3), Valerius suggests the 'now' in which he writes is the same as that of all other times.²³ Although, as argued above, this creates the sense that history itself remains always the same, nonetheless for individuals, the present is always governed by the potential for somewhat fickle changes of fortune in their lives in the future. In the

²⁰ See Chapter 3.

²¹ Scott argues that Tacitus's decision not to focus on a period that was considered a great time of expansion and development under Trajan is itself telling (Scott 1968:50).

²² Syme 1958, 1.208; Sailor 2008:191.

²³ Mueller 2002:176; Bloomer 1992:205.

context of his compilation of exempla, this serves more to provide entertainment at the expense of the victims of *fortuna* or *fatum* (cf. 1.6.7; 1.7.ext4),²⁴ though these constitute irresistible forces to which all must inevitably resign themselves (see Chapter 4). Such expectations about the future on the one hand, as for Diodorus, offer hope of change to those in difficulty, but on the other, given *fortuna*'s unpredictability, reduce the only viable human response in the present to a readiness to face the future as it comes.

Teresa Morgan's treatment of popular morality, in which she also engages with Valerius Maximus, highlights the importance of the dynamic relationship between the present and future in such texts. She observes, "time is the great ethical motivator for those who have few or no other resources. When no other aspect of life seems likely to improve one's situation, one can always hope that things will get better over time."²⁵ Where this popular material incorporates elements of divine justice, Morgan highlights the explicit provision for delay in that justice being realised. And recognising the tension between the present and the hope represented by possible changes in the future, she observes, "all human life is lived in the meantime."²⁶

²⁴ Bloomer notes Valerius's particular interest in "paradoxical" and complicated outcomes brought about by reversals of fortune (Bloomer 1992:17).

²⁵ Morgan 2007:246.

²⁶ Morgan 2007:241.

Thus, the scope for movement and change beyond the present time maintains in these texts an important dynamic tension between the present and the future. The circumstances of the present time are provisional. For Valerius the possible workings of *fortuna* in all times make it a fascinating, if sometimes frightening, force hanging over the future. Polybius portrays an insight into inevitable changes in the future which ascribes provisionality to the present, despite the significance of Rome's moment. For Diodorus, the future ought to motivate virtue and moderation in the present, even if on a communal level eventual failure and regime change is inevitable, whereas for Tacitus the gloomy present seems only likely to lead to further decline in the future.²⁷ Each of these writers offers no guarantees, except that the pattern of regime change will continue inevitably in due course.²⁸ In all cases, whether dealing with the lives of individuals or an entire empire, the historical present remains vulnerable to the future. This serves in some ways to explain the past, provide hope for the future, and identify appropriate human response in the present. But when writers deal not only with the *future* but an *end to history*, the consequences of the relationship between the present and the end become more pressing.

3. The historical present is the *telos*: Virgil's *Aeneid*

In *Aeneid*, Virgil not only stresses the significance of the present moment, but portrays it as the end and goal of history. Various features of the trajectory leading to this end

²⁷ Griffin 2009:172.

²⁸ See Chapter 3.

contribute to a sense of ambiguity. Nonetheless—as argued in Chapter 3 in relation to the teleological nature of Virgil’s schema of history in *Aeneid*, and set out in more detail below in terms of the significance and position of the present time—this ambiguity adds complexity to Virgil’s portrait of the past, but it does not ultimately compromise his assertions about the end. Importantly, unlike the other key texts of this study, Virgil’s alignment of the present with an eternally consistent future produces a static effect, with the result that his account of the end of history functions differently from that of the other writers.

3.1 Virgil’s portrait of the end

Virgil’s portrayal of the end of history emerges from Book 1. According to Jupiter’s prophecy, as discussed in Chapter 3, the course of events in which Aeneas is a participant leads to *imperium sine fine* (1.279; cf. 1.278, 287; 6.788-797). Jupiter’s speech confirms the Romans as the final empire of history. Aeneas prefigures later concord by his military conquests (1.264; cf. 6.889-890), indicating the peace secured through threat of military response embodied by the *pax Romana* (cf. 6.851-3).²⁹ For Tacitus, such a ‘peace’ is ultimately oppressive; for Virgil, though there may be elements of ambiguity in the course of achievements which have led to this end, this peace reflects, rather, the hard-won

²⁹ Galinsky 1996:149.

accomplishment of Jupiter's renewed age.³⁰ The end-time picture in the *Aeneid* is constituted by the inverse of those things which are overcome through the epic: war, homelessness, civic unrest, and uncertainty. No doubt readers who had lived through the civil war could identify the absence of these things as a positive historical development.³¹

Virgil does not elucidate metaphysical questions as part of his portrayal of the end. Although metaphysics related to post-mortem conditions are mentioned in Book 6 as part of the scene-setting for the underworld parade, they are not the focus there,³² and nor do such questions enter into Virgil's account of the end of history (aside from key figures who are promised *apotheosis*; cf. 1.290). At the conclusion of the epic, continued favour with Jupiter has led also to resolution with Juno, facilitating ongoing piety and Rome's uninterrupted wellbeing. As Gunther Gottlieb observes in relation to the concluding scene with Juno (12.791-842):

Jupiter finally succeeds in calming down the angry and grumbling Juno. There are no more obstacles to prevent the happy rise of the *res Romana* in Italy. The new generation growing up will surpass men and gods in piety and will honour even Juno as nobody else does. Vergil refers to the Capitoline triad with Juno as one of

³⁰ Aeneas killing Turnus in the epic's final moment (12.939-53) similarly reflects the complex role of struggle and violence in *Aeneid*: this paves the way to establishing Rome and fulfilling Jupiter's prophecy of unending rule and a renewed golden age, but the moment communicates the anguish and compromise this requires (Lyne 1990:338).

³¹ O'Hara 1990:163.

³² Horsfall 2013:1.xxv-xxvi; cf. Williams 1990:201-2. O'Hara suggests the inconsistency in metaphysical claims itself is the point (O'Hara 2007:94).

the three supreme gods, who in the time of Vergil's readers are the guarantors of Roman welfare and prosperity.³³

3.2 The significance of the 'now' in *Aeneid*

Virgil's portrait of the end of history thus also confirms the significance of the present. In *Aeneid*, the historical present is easily identified with Augustus's reign; the *vaticinia ex eventu* interpret the events of the past as well as facilitating readers' ability to identify their own historical present among the events of the historical review.³⁴ For instance, the closed gates of war (1.293-94) pinpoints the moment when the doors of the temple of Janus, traditionally closed during a time of peace, were closed by Octavian in 29 BCE, after standing open for more than 200 years.³⁵

For *vaticinia ex eventu* in apocalypses (see below),³⁶ the accuracy of the insights received by an earlier pseudepigraphal seer, which 'predict' events that lie in the *literary* future but *historical* past, serves to interpret history and to assure readers of the accuracy of the events predicted for time *beyond* the historical present.³⁷ In *Aeneid*, by contrast, the only elements beyond the historical present included are the expansive claims of *extension* of

³³ Gottlieb 1998:23.

³⁴ See Chapter 4.

³⁵ Ahl 2007:332; Fairclough and Goold 1999:1.282.

³⁶ See §4 and Chapter 4.

³⁷ VanderKam 1984:142.

the present, in Rome's unending rule (1.279; 6.793).³⁸ In Virgil's text these prophecies thus serve primarily to underscore the significance of the present.

In this way, the present is not only the moment readers will recognise in the unfolding prophecy, but the culmination of the entire historical process. The historical reviews in Books 6 and 8 merge this emphasis on the present moment with praise for Octavian. In his commentary on the underworld parade, Anchises calls out at the moment Octavian appears:

Turn hither now your two-eyed gaze, and behold this nation, the Romans that are yours. Here is Caesar and all the seed of Iulus destined to pass under heaven's spacious sphere. And this in truth is he whom you so often hear promised you, Augustus Caesar, son of a god (*divi genus*), who will again establish a golden age (*aurea condet saecula*)³⁹ in Latium amid fields once ruled by Saturn; he will advance his empire (*proferet imperium*) beyond the Garamants and Indians to a land which lies beyond our stars (6.788-797).

The moment is emphatic: this is the end to which the parade has been leading.⁴⁰ Octavian's early mention underscores his significance⁴¹ and allows him to appear next to divine

³⁸ Contra Feeney, who identifies a "genuinely forward-looking" element with the grief over Marcellus, as a thwarted future (Feeney 1986:15). As with the other accounts of struggle, the disaster with Marcellus belongs to the past; Augustus constitutes the present and end that overcomes the difficulties of the past.

³⁹ The LCL translation converts the plural "golden ages" in Latin into the singular in English. On Virgil's treatment of the Golden Age, see Chapter 3.

⁴⁰ The Latin gives a strong sense of emphasis in its repetition of demonstratives (cf. 788-792). Horsfall's translation maintains the emphasis in, "This, this is the man" (791; Horsfall 2013:1.55). Williams identifies the parade as the epic's most patriotic moment (Williams 1990:202).

⁴¹ Horsfall wonders if the identification of Octavian here should be slightly more controversial (Horsfall 2013:2.538).

figures.⁴² While the parade in the underworld asserts Octavian's centrality to the Roman empire, the *ekphrasis* of Book 8, in which Octavian presides at the centre of Aeneas's shield, presents him as the centre of a *cosmic* picture of history.⁴³ Octavian himself embodies something of Virgil's portrait of the end of history, and his reign in the present underscores to the reader that the promised *telos* has been achieved.

Virgil's *Aeneid* is therefore certainly Augustan panegyric, but not simplistically so.⁴⁴ The epic contains numerous ambiguous elements. Setbacks and delay appear to impede the promised events from unfolding, partially explained prophecies lead to surprising twists,⁴⁵ and, in the Book 6 review, identifications of some characters are vague, evidently in order to blur the meaning and allude to multiple historical figures.⁴⁶ It seems Virgil allows, indeed encourages, multiple meanings to coexist. D.C. Feeney considers each line of the underworld parade, assisted by Lucan's re-presentation of the scene in his *Civil War*, and highlights the various ways in which the grand presentation of individuals belies an

⁴² Ahl 2007:376.

⁴³ Hardie 1986:350-53.

⁴⁴ Galinsky notes that ideological concerns drove twentieth-century (especially post-war) interpretation (Galinsky 1996:3-5). Interpretations of *Aeneid*'s politics range from imperial propaganda to clever subversion, leading variously to the censure or agreement of the interpreter. See Harrison's overview of twentieth century interpretation, including his designation of "positive" and "pessimistic" accounts of *Aeneid* (Harrison 1990:3-6). See Chapters 2 and 3 on recent treatments of *Aeneid* as representing an anti-imperial thrust.

⁴⁵ See Chapter 4.

⁴⁶ Feeney identifies a list of ambiguous figures (Feeney 1986:5-6).

underwhelming reality in Virgil's own time; he notes the parade includes families fallen from grace and derelict cities.⁴⁷ Feeney argues that "riddles" qualify the whole review.⁴⁸

However, again, temporal elements remain key for interpreting the effect of Virgil's ambiguity. Virgil's "riddles" complicate the attributions he makes about past events. But from the implied reader's historical present, any ambiguity about identifying Rome as the *telos* of this trajectory has been resolved. Even Feeney, having posed the question in light of the first town of the list in the underworld review ("*Nomen-tum*" 6.773), "whether Vergil can conceive of a time when even Rome will be only a name," answers: "it hasn't happened yet."⁴⁹ The scene may confirm that it is possible for places once praised to become derelict, but this is not Rome's fate. Feeney likewise concludes that in this historical review Rome is "the τέλος of the way in which the world is ordered" and is "celebrated by the device," even if he also queries other ambiguities in the scene.⁵⁰ Indeed, one might add that, in fact, Virgil has framed his epic with a claim very far from the possibility of such obscurity, namely that Rome is fated to enjoy *imperium sine fine* across the breadth of the universe (1.279, 287).

⁴⁷ Feeney 1986:5, 7.

⁴⁸ Feeney 1986:6. The gates of sleep, through which the reader is told "delusive dreams issue upward" (6.896), and through which Aeneas exits the underworld, most likely are a device to explain Aeneas's failure to remember the content of the underworld disclosures in the second half of the epic (Fairclough and Goold 1999:1.597). See Chapter 4.

⁴⁹ Feeney 1986:8.

⁵⁰ For instance, Feeney considers whether Platonic interests qualify or make unclear the value of such achievement (Feeney 1986:15-16).

Similarly, O'Hara questions the epic's endpoint, suggesting Juno's acquiescence to Jupiter is merely a temporary truce (12.791-842), given that the Punic Wars remain in the future beyond the poem's conclusion.⁵¹ But, again, temporal considerations clarify the ambiguous elements of these interactions between the gods and their effects.⁵² From the perspective of the reader, the Punic Wars are already in the past⁵³ and, as argued above, the resolution between Juno and Jupiter not only stands but confirms the favour Rome enjoys from both. Moreover, Turnus's death, however Aeneas's moment of hesitation and then vengeance is to be interpreted, secures Roman supremacy (12.939-53).⁵⁴

Karl Galinsky rightly observes that Virgil's decision to write an "Aeneid" and not an "Augusteid" shapes the kind of story he presents.⁵⁵ In his *Aeneid*, Virgil offers a commentary on the present through the lens of mythic origins. As a drama played out in the past, *Aeneid* explores themes such as delay, nostalgia, and suffering, but its picture of the end of history is ultimately represented not by Saturn's golden age of the past, or

⁵¹ O'Hara 1990:142.

⁵² West 1998:303.

⁵³ Similarly, concerns that the civil wars undermine the positive picture of the Roman rule may be allayed by the text's identification of the highpoint in the progress of history in the Augustan era (*Aeneid* contains its own jokes about this, for instance in Carthage building stages in Book 1, on which plays will be performed in hundreds of years; Ahl 2007:340).

⁵⁴ Theodorakopoulos suggests the scene indicates a darker side that is nonetheless essential to the trajectory to Rome (Theodorakopoulos 1997:157), and Quint highlights the role of vengeance (Quint 1989:36). Williams argues that all hesitation ends in the underworld journey in Book 6, as Aeneas sees Octavian and what must and will be fulfilled (Williams 1990:203).

⁵⁵ Galinsky 1996:125.

thwarted hopes, but the reinterpreted golden age of Jupiter.⁵⁶ Readers live in the time of Octavian; the fact of his reign shows delay has been overcome and qualifies the struggles which Virgil depicts leading to the establishment of this new golden age.

The emphatic words of Anchises cut through the intervening time, underscoring the significance of this moment. His call of “now” in the parade resonates with the “now” of the reader: “Turn hither now... Here is Caesar” (6.791-2)!

3.3 The consequences of aligning the present with the end

As he compares accounts of the end of history in various ancient texts, Hubert Cancik dubs Jupiter’s prophecy in Book 1 of *Aeneid* “triumphant counterpropaganda” against Rome’s enemies and its own fears, which is “not uneschatological, but posteschatological.”⁵⁷ He makes an important point. Texts that do not include an endpoint to history such as those by Polybius, Valerius Maximus, or Diodorus Siculus discussed above, may perhaps be classed as *uneschatological*. They exclude the end of history from their scope, but as noted above, there may still be some benefit in the historical present derived from an appreciation for the future, such as consolation in light of the possibility of change or the ability to attain moral virtue by bearing changes of fortune well. In *Aeneid*, however, the

⁵⁶ Galinsky 1996:95. Also see Clark 2010:168.

⁵⁷ Cancik 1998:119.

scope extends infinitely, but its character is described in complete continuity with the present. This invites no opportunity for change.

Whereas the relationship between present realities and the future provides a source of consolation in a broad range of other texts of this study, from Valerius's exempla and Diodorus's *Library* to 4 Ezra, the way in which Virgil collapses these categories limits this possibility.⁵⁸ Any reader suffering in the historical present might find in *Aeneid* a message of sacrifice that leads to hard-won conquest, as well as some space for pathos and grief, in its portrayal of *past* events. But a depiction of the present as the attainment of history's goal eliminates the possibility for change required in order for the future to represent a source of hope.⁵⁹ Karl Mannheim offers a contrast between 'ideology,' a view in which the end of history has been realised already in current political structures, and 'utopia,' which anticipates an end beyond those structures.⁶⁰ I return to this distinction in relation to the comparison to Luke/Acts below. Here the distinction exposes the impact of Virgil's identification of the end with the present: in Mannheim's terms, Virgil's treatment of the end of history represents 'ideology.' Coinciding with the end of history, the present is simply static. As a result, the conception of a progressing, teleological trajectory to an end

⁵⁸ O'Hara argues that Virgil presents himself as a prophet-poet (7.41) in order to indicate that he is being less than truthful, and so to provide consolation, "putting on a brave face for the lie" as O'Hara argues Jupiter did in consoling Venus in Book 1 (O'Hara 1990:176, 184).

⁵⁹ Cancik observes, "Rome has its demise behind it," (Cancik 1998:119) and so the new era becomes something different and invulnerable.

⁶⁰ Mannheim 1960:36.

of history already realised in the Augustan empire, which underlies *Aeneid*, overlooks any ongoing experiences of suffering, and portrays a setting in which the possibility of dissent from the ruling political authorities is excluded, both now, and in the eternally consistent future.

4. The present and the end of history in late Second Temple texts

By contrast, in the study's Jewish texts the writers play upon the dynamic between present experience and the altered circumstances promised for the end of history. Notwithstanding the diversity across these texts, there is considerable continuity in the writers' accounts of the structure of history and their expectations of the end, thus supporting key features of Stuckenbruck's argument noted above.⁶¹ In Chapter 3, I concluded that the writer of each of these texts depicts a teleological schema of history, although they accent different moments or features of the schema. Here I examine the significance and placement of the present time in relation to the events of the end. Some writers provide only hints of an anticipated end or simply place the present generally within the penultimate period of history before an unending divine reign. For others, current events are already set among the woes which signify the beginning of the events of the end.

⁶¹ Stuckenbruck 2016:161-68; Stuckenbruck 2014a:320-26.

4.1 The relationship between the present and the end

The writer of 2 Maccabees supplies minimal detail about the end. As set out in Chapter 3, eschatological expectations are evident in the summary statement about delayed judgement for the other nations (6.12-17) and in affirmations about resurrection in the martyrdom accounts of 2 Macc 6-7 and the future resurrection of the dead soldiers in 2 Macc 12.43-45. However, these hints do not lead into more systematic accounts of eschatological events. The writer does not outline messianic expectations; there is no reason to attribute messianic features to Judas, despite the moment in which he is identified with God's presence in the battle (12.22).⁶² Nor does the narrative interpret any of the sufferings described or anticipated as messianic woes.

Some elements of the battles recounted in later chapters could tempt readers to supply eschatological overtones. In Judas's vision of Jeremiah and the recently-martyred high priest Onias, Judas receives a golden sword (15.12-16), which then secures victory in the ensuing battle.⁶³ The sword itself is reminiscent of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 Enoch 91.12) and the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 90.19). In each of these 1 Enoch apocalypses, the Lord strikes the ground and bestows a sword with which the people are victorious in a battle which leads into the complete destruction of evil and installation of divine reign at the end

⁶² Goldstein 1987:88. Schwartz contrasts messianic longing for change to the world order in 1 Maccabees with the absence of these kinds of interests in 2 Maccabees (Schwartz 2009:127; cf. Collins 1987:106).

⁶³ See also Chapter 4 above.

of history.⁶⁴ Daniel 10-12 also supplies eschatological imagery for a battle. However, the writer does not suggest Judas's battles should be interpreted eschatologically. Divine assistance (10.38; 12.11, 28; 13.4, 13-14, 17; 15.21-24, 27), and even supernatural reinforcements (10.29-30), feature to Judas's advantage, but the texts to which 2 Maccabees alludes explicitly are *Joshua's* battle (2 Macc 12.15-16, cf. Josh 6.1-21) and the divine help supplied to Hezekiah (2 Macc 8.19; 15.22, cf. Isa 37.36; 2 Kgs 19.35). The battles in 2 Maccabees do not parallel the ultimate battle portrayed in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, *Animal Apocalypse*, Dan 10-12, or the War Scroll.

Rather, in 2 Maccabees the writer portrays a cycle of divine punishment⁶⁵ followed by divine rescue.⁶⁶ This cycle remains in the position of divine favour at the end of the narrative; the *literary* present constitutes a significant moment of divine vindication in the aftermath of Judas's victories and continued independence for the Hebrew people (15.37). But the prayers of "Maccabeus and his followers," petitioning that God might again punish them should this become necessary in the future (10.4; cf. 6.16; 7.33), and the epitomiser's somewhat apologetic reflections on his chosen endpoint for the narrative (15.37-39), suggest it is possible that experience in the *historical* present of the intended reader may

⁶⁴ Note also the debates in relation to interpretation of *Animal Apocalypse* and whether the ram with horn is to be interpreted as Judas Maccabeus. While it seems likely that it is (Stuckenbruck 2005:94), the writer does not associate the sword with this ram, nor is the ram to be identified with the messiah (contra Nickelsburg 1987:55).

⁶⁵ See Chapter 5.

⁶⁶ This feature leads Schwartz to identify a circular understanding of history in 2 Maccabees (Schwartz 2009:128), though I suggest the hints of an end do nonetheless affect experience in the present.

not remain as positive.⁶⁷ Both the continued cycle of divine punishment and rescue, and the hint of the end, shape experience in the present as it remains subject to future change.

Josephus engages more directly with a particular portrait of the end of history through his understanding of the succession of empires leading to divine reign. As noted in earlier chapters, Josephus explicitly affirms the five-kingdom framework in Dan 2 and 8 in *Ant.* 10.203-10, 266-81, which is paradigmatic for his understanding of history elsewhere (cf. *J.W.* 5.367).⁶⁸ Daniel particularly attracts Josephus's praise because, "he was not only wont to prophesy future things, as did the other prophets, but he also fixed the time at which these would come to pass" (*Ant.* 10.267). Indeed, as he applies Daniel's prophecies to his own historical context,⁶⁹ Josephus provides not only a broader schema of teleological history, but he identifies the present time. In the passage in which he discusses Dan 8, Josephus specifies the penultimate empire as Rome, though he does not focus on the regime's end here but rather moves into his affirmation of divine guidance of all of history (10.266-81).⁷⁰ By contrast, his account of Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dan 2

⁶⁷ Schwartz 2008:556. It is generally accepted that the epitomiser had access to further historical material. Doran suggests the narrative is structured around defence of the temple and the endpoint relates to drawing together festival themes (Doran 2012:10).

⁶⁸ Bilde 1998:47.

⁶⁹ Bilde highlights that Josephus's interpretation of Numbers 22-24 in *Ant.* 4.100-31 expands on the biblical text to identify the prophesied suffering with the events of his own recent past (Bilde 1998:52-53).

⁷⁰ See Chapter 4.

stresses the total destruction of the statue comprised of four materials⁷¹ that signifies the four empires (10.207).⁷² His reticence to spell out the consequences of this decisive and sudden transition to the ultimate reign (10.210; cf. 281) itself confirms his interpretation of the prophecy as the end of Rome's reign.⁷³ This understanding likewise illumines his claims in *Jewish War* about the divine favour that rests upon Italy "now" in *J.W.* 5.367, with concomitant implications for his view of the significance of the present time.

Thus, Josephus identifies the present in the period of the penultimate regime of Daniel's prophecy, but he is no more specific about how imminent the end of that reign is.⁷⁴ Similarly, in *Jewish War* the gruesome events of the recent past are significant as a demonstration of divine punishment of the Jewish people and favour for Rome, but Josephus does not identify them with messianic woes.

Indeed, for Josephus political dissent has no place in the present and, although the divine reign will be installed at the end of history, this will take place in God's own time and

⁷¹ In the biblical account the fourth material is itself a mixture (Dan 2.33), but Josephus describes the feet as simply iron (*Ant.* 10.206-7).

⁷² This sudden and total destruction in *Ant.* 10.207 is unlike the multi-stage destruction in the biblical account (Dan 2.34).

⁷³ In Chapter 3, I observed that Josephus's apocalyptic and eschatological interests are frequently overlooked in NT comparisons, though studies of Josephus do frequently highlight these topics.

⁷⁴ Although Josephus does not detail specific expectations about the end, his criticism of the Sadducees (*J.W.* 2.164-66) suggests he anticipates resurrection.

cannot be rushed.⁷⁵ The metric Josephus associates with the “rule of the stronger”—affirmed by both Agrippa (*J.W.* 2.345-401) and Josephus’s speeches (5.362-419)—continues in effect into the present. In this thinking, the stronger party must enjoy divine assistance and thus should not be opposed. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 3, if the Jewish people follow Josephus’s advice and repent to Rome, then they will discover that the remaining time of Rome’s reign can even be positive. Thus, although for Josephus history has a definite endpoint and Rome is the last political empire before it, he does not give any indication that the events of the end have already begun.

The War Scroll, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch provide more detailed accounts of end-time events. In addition to the central theme of the eschatological war, the **War Scroll’s** picture of the end encompasses elements such as enlightenment for a select group (17.8), divine judgement (6.5-6; 11.13-7), eternal destruction of the wicked (1.5-7; 9.5-6; 15.2, 12; 18.1), and vindication of Israel (1.8-8; 19.2-8).⁷⁶ The writer associates ultimate divine judgement with the events of the war itself. Judgement resounds through descriptions of battle shields, spears, and swords that are to be used “to fell the dead by the judgement of God and to humiliate the enemy line by God’s might, to pay the reward of their evil to every people of futility” (6.5; cf. 1.5-7; 11.13-17; 15.2; 18.1-4).

⁷⁵ Further stressing political conformity, Josephus takes pains to describe the positive attitude of the kings to Daniel, despite the bad news he supplies (10.242-44).

⁷⁶ The detail of the battle also implies that it is expected to extend for some time; instructions are provided for the tasks to be fulfilled by the different groups within the community, over days, weeks, seasons, and the whole course of years (1QM 2.5).

Though John Collins protests that the War Scroll's dependence on Dan 10-12 extends to Daniel's quietist emphasis on waiting upon God's action,⁷⁷ the narration of the war itself contains violent language in its exhortation to engage in the destruction of the enemy (12.10-15; cf. 19.2-8) and even pillaging of valuables (12.4; cf. 19.6-7).⁷⁸ As noted by Mattila, rather than an idyllic picture of peace and universal conversion to the way of Israel's Lord (as in 4Q426), in 1QM characters belong to either the camp of darkness or light, and all of the sons of darkness are utterly annihilated.⁷⁹

Some characters in the War Scroll are attributed key roles and titles but, as noted in Chapter 3, none are *explicitly* messianic.⁸⁰ One character's role appears clearer: column 17 refers to "the majestic angel, Michael" (17.6-7), sharing understandings of Michael's role as outlined in Dan 10.13, 21; 12.1.⁸¹ Rather than a messianic character, Michael is described as

⁷⁷ See animated discussion on aspects of these arguments as outlined by Collins 1975, and the response prompted by Philip Davies: Davies 1978b, Collins 1979b, and Davies 1980.

⁷⁸ The reference to a "peaceful return" on one of the trumpets in 3.11 does not relate to concern about the enemy, which will be utterly destroyed and humiliated—both the human sons of darkness and their supernatural counterparts (14.16; 18.1, 11).

⁷⁹ Mattila 1994:533, 538.

⁸⁰ See, for instance, the "Prince of the whole Congregation" (5.1), though the details of his role are not specified. Likewise, the "Hero of War" (12.9; though cf. more domestic use of hero at 19.2-5), the "Prince of Light" (13.10) and, in a Cave 4 fragment, the "Prince of the Battle" (4Q492; Vermes 1997:183). Davies argues there is no evidence of the Davidic messiah in 1QM and, given it describes events in which one may easily be expected (alternatively, he notes the reference to the messiah in 4Q285; Davies 2000b:968). By contrast, although none of these roles is clearly specified and cannot easily be attributed a messianic status, Collins argues for a Davidic messianic influence on 1QM, and suggests that the onus lies with those who would disagree to prove their case (Collins 1995:59).

⁸¹ Stuckenbruck 2006:128-9. See also 11QMelch; Rev 12.

the preeminent angelic commander. His presence confirms the eschatological significance of the war and imminence of the inauguration of divine reign, as in Dan 12.1.⁸²

Nonetheless, there is no sense that the writer considers the angelic figure Michael to be present in the community already, nor that final events involving judgement and vindication have begun. The so-called “sectarian” texts from Qumran⁸³ have frequently sparked questions about writers’ conceptions of the present time in relation to the events of the end.⁸⁴ The Habakkuk pesher (1QpHab) offers an important example.⁸⁵ In interpreting Habakkuk with insights attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness (7.1-4), the writer incorporates historical details of events from his or her own time, identifying these events as fulfilment of Habakkuk’s prophecy.⁸⁶ Notably, the pesher allows for flexibility in

⁸² Davies 1990:133. Connections elsewhere to the list of the just (Dan 12.1-2) and references to the Kittim evoke further traditions shared with Daniel (Stuckenbruck 2006:129). Vermes also uses the reference to the Kittim as the “masters of the world” to date the text (Vermes 1997:163). Later versions of Daniel also come to associate the Kittim with Rome (Collins 1993:7; See earlier discussion in Chapter 3). 1QpHab 3.11 also makes connections between the Kittim and an eagle (cf. 4 Ezra 11-12; Stone 1990:350).

⁸³ See Chapter 2 above for notes on the nature of the collection at Qumran. Texts that have been labelled “sectarian” in past scholarship are not necessarily from the same community and many scrolls appear to have been brought to the site from elsewhere (as confirmed by the Cairo Geniza copy of CD). Collins’ suggestion that it is “easy enough to arrive at a core group of sectarian texts” (Collins 1995:10) is no longer accepted so straightforwardly. This does not preclude considering beliefs potentially shared between various texts.

⁸⁴ See Stuckenbruck 2007:124-49; Collins 1995:105-6; Davies 1985:39, 48.

⁸⁵ Collins notes that the varied purposes of the texts work against mixing their presentations of the end (Collins 1995: 10).

⁸⁶ Stuckenbruck considers the use of perfect and imperfect verbs in 1QpHab, in an attempt to determine the extent to which the writer indicates the end has already arrived (Stuckenbruck 2007:124-49). See discussion of this phenomenon in relation to reinterpretations of Daniel’s prophecies below §4.2.

calculating the end and suggests some adaptation of the expectation as the period from the death of the Teacher extended.⁸⁷ Thus, although the text is profoundly eschatologically orientated and presents the decisive action at the end of history as certain, the end remains in the future. The writer thereby explains how the end can have been delayed (7.9-10), and yet remain imminently anticipated.

John Collins's study of the phrase "the end of days" similarly underscores the eschatological consciousness of the Qumran texts' writers. In the most explicit case, 4QMMT declares, "this is the end of days" (4QMMT C21=4Q398 f11-13.4).⁸⁸ However, even here, Collins argues, the writer stops short of suggesting that the community lives in the final period of history. Although the phrase "end of days" may include the woes leading up to the final period of history, the writer does not suggest the Messiah has already come.⁸⁹

In the War Scroll, although the end-time events, including the eschatological war itself, have not begun, some hints of present circumstances suggest they were anticipated imminently. The War Scroll allows only minimal reconstruction of its historical setting, but the allusions to internal division and betrayal in the "violators of the covenant" who

⁸⁷ Collins 1997:85. Davies makes a less convincing argument that the Teacher of Righteousness was "a pre-Qumran title for an eschatological figure" (Davies 1985:54).

⁸⁸ Collins 1995:106. 4QMMT indicates a time when the writer and their implied readers believed they were those who had been chosen in the seventh week of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (VanderKam 2010:266-67).

⁸⁹ On the presence of the messianic woes, Collins says "the language of the Scrolls is often ambiguous" (Collins 1997:80).

are assisting the Kittim of Ashur (1.2), coupled with the list of surrounding nations (1.1),⁹⁰ indicate present circumstances the writer longs to have reversed. Similarly, although the words come in the context of the Priests and Levites' praise at the defeat of enemies later in the text, the affirmation that "for the sake of your [co]venant [you have remo]ved our misery in your goodness towards us" (18.8) also invites the reader to identify in the present with such misery, which will be removed. And the connection between the kittim and Rome⁹¹ identifies concrete and present enemies who, along with the supernatural counterparts of the empire of Belial, will be participants in the war. The sense of animosity and conflict suggests the war is expected imminently.

Finally, some Qumran texts attribute additional significance to the present moment. Here the present is not merely nearer to or further from the events of the end temporally, but people in the present seek to *emulate* the end. Thus, as patterns of piety will continue unimpeded through the "eternal seasons" (14.17)⁹² after the decisive defeat of evil, practices in the present are also designed to mirror that end-time existence.⁹³ Correlations between 1QS and 1QSa (1QS 2.22; 5.23-4; 6.2; 1QSa 2.5-7; cf. 1QM 2.10),⁹⁴ in which liturgical

⁹⁰ The list of nations itself comes from Genesis; the historical reality behind these references suggests a more general sense of other nations as opponents (Alexander 2003:27).

⁹¹ See p.306n.82.

⁹² See Chapter 3.

⁹³ Michael Knibb claims that scholarly characterisations of the Dead Sea Scrolls tend to overemphasise eschatological elements at the expense of the texts' focus on proper observance of Torah (Knibb 2010:415), although frequently these come together.

⁹⁴ On the relationship between 1QSa and 1QM, see Schultz 2009:327-65.

and community practice continues essentially identically in the period before and after the end of days, with the exception of the presence of the Priestly and Davidic Messiahs, supports the hypothesis that the writers of the Qumran texts and their community/communities⁹⁵ understood current practice as an anticipation of the end. Texts such as the *Hodayot* also provide some sense in which present liturgical practices enable participation in heavenly realities.⁹⁶

Although all of the *War Scroll's* instructions relate to the time of the eschatological war, the strong focus on recounting faithful divine acts in the past may indicate a similar emphasis on this practice in the present. The reviews of God's saving acts in the past invite the reader to reflect on God's sovereignty, as demonstrated in creation and powerful acts in the past, and the favourable status of Israel (13.7-10; 14.4-5, 8-10; cf. 17.6-9; 18.7-9). This not only indicates pious practices that will be followed when the enemy has been defeated, but implies a hymnic model to be emulated in the present. Such a practice might also serve to provide assurance of the promised final events, in keeping with the reminders of divine faithfulness in the past.

⁹⁵ See p.306n.83.

⁹⁶ This spatial dimension does not remove a temporal element, but these liturgical practices bridge the two realities in the interim. *Jubilees*, a text which appears to have been important at Qumran, also reflects a sense of concurrent, even combined, worship in heavenly and earthly spheres. See discussion in Moore 2015:40-46.

The historical reviews in **4 Ezra** and **2 Baruch** set out very detailed expectations for the pattern of events at the end of history though, as noted in Chapter 3, various episodes present these expectations in slightly different ways within the same texts, depending on the focus of particular pericopes.⁹⁷ Each text includes references to messianic woes (4 Ezra 5.1-12; 6.21-24; 2 Bar 26-28; 70.7), special insight (4 Ezra 6.20; 12.36-38; 13.53-56; 14.26, 45-47; 2 Bar 27.15; 48.3, 33), the revelation of the messiah (4 Ezra 7.28; 12.32; 13.26, 52; 2 Bar 30.1),⁹⁸ judgement (4 Ezra 7.70; 9.18; 12.34; 13.58; 2 Bar 44.15), a messianic period (4 Ezra 7.29-31; cf. 2 Bar 29-30), resurrection (4 Ezra 7.32; 14.34-35; 2 Bar 30.1-2), and vindication for the righteous (4 Ezra 8.51-61; 2 Bar 15.2; 51.11-13; 54.15-16; 73.1-74.2). While some passages reflect a general interest in setting out the periods of history and answering metaphysical questions about, for instance, the eschatological status of those who die before the end (4 Ezra 7.26-44), others focus on the events which function as signs of the end and imminent divine action to defeat the current (final) worldly regime (4 Ezra 11-12; 13).

Indeed, in the quotation with which this chapter began, Uriel explicitly instructs Ezra how to attend to the events of history in such a way as to recognise the precursors to the end:

⁹⁷ This is particularly marked in the comparison between the metaphysical interests and account of the messianic period in 4 Ezra's third episode (6.35-9.25), and the focus in other episodes. See Stone's examination of "the end" in 4 Ezra (Stone 1983:295-312), and my further discussion in Chapter 3 above.

⁹⁸ Stone considers it significant that 4 Ezra does not associate royal features with the messiah (Stone 1990:42).

Measure carefully in your mind, and when you see that some of the predicted signs have occurred, then you will know that it is the very time when the Most High is about to visit the world that he has made. (4 Ezra 9.1)

Uriel's words explain how to read any *vaticinium ex eventu* and set the reader up for the later visions.⁹⁹ In the Eagle vision, the eagle is explicitly identified as the penultimate regime in Daniel's vision (12.11; cf. 11.40). The political events described in metaphor through the various wings of the eagle and its heads (which reflect various Roman rulers, the heads being associated with the Flavian emperors),¹⁰⁰ invite readers to recognise their own historical time. The tumult of the last two small wings of the eagle (12.2-3) clarifies the timing of the historical present, which is also the time of greatest affliction, and looks to the imminent destruction of the eagle and installation of a just divine reign.

In 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, the writers also make assertions about the present through their claims that only a privileged group will understand the significance of the times as they unfold. Given the revealed knowledge provided through the texts themselves, these apocalypses confirm that the communities to which the texts are addressed *are* this privileged group.¹⁰¹ Thus, in keeping with the events set out in the *vaticinia ex eventu*, they claim the current time is the 'now' in which they will receive enlightenment and the

⁹⁹ On reading *vaticinia ex eventu*, see Chapter 4. The method of interpreting the past, identifying the present, and thereby also offering hope for the future functions similarly in Deuteronomy's 'prediction' of the exile (Deut 30.1-5; see Chapter 5). See also discussion of Jesus' prophecy in Luke 21 (see §5.2.1 below and Chapter 4).

¹⁰⁰ Bizzarro 2014:34; Hogan 2008:199-200.

¹⁰¹ The writer of 4 Ezra asserts that God revealed the *temporum finis* to Abraham (4.26) and it is in this company that Ezra is listed as a seer enabled by God to recognise the current times (Stone 1990:100).

events of the end will begin.¹⁰² In 2 Baruch, the community's secret knowledge is also explained by claims such as, "those who live on the earth in those days will not understand that it is the end of times" (27.15), and people who continue living a peaceful life can do so because they do not realise that divine judgement "has come near" (48.33; cf. 48.3; 54.4-5; 4 Ezra 12.36-38; 13.53-56; 14.13, 20, 26, 45-48).¹⁰³

Significantly, these writers appear to identify present experiences as part of the eschatological woes. In 2 Baruch, the Lord tells Baruch, "and the time will come of which I spoke to you and that time is appearing which brings affliction" (2 Bar 48.31; cf. 25.2-3); the woes are already starting to appear. Likewise in 4 Ezra, the decline portrayed merges into the calamities of the eschatological woes and the nadir of history, which is both the sign and catalyst of imminent divine action. Uriel promises Ezra before the Eagle vision that he will see events to take place "in the last days" (4 Ezra 10.58-9; cf. 12.9), with which some elements of the vision are then identified, such as the death of the emperor represented by the third head of the eagle (12.28). Notably, the event corresponding to this imagery has

¹⁰² The traditional method of identifying the date of such a prophecy lies in noting the increasing detail during the writer's present, and the point at which further predictions become less specific (VanderKam 1984:142). However, claims to special insight may be viewed as a further confirmation of the position of the historical present in the review. Likewise, in *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 Enoch 93.10; 91.14); *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 90.9), Daniel 11.33, 4 Ezra 6.20, and 2 Baruch 28.1, the righteous receive enlightenment at a particular moment in the schema. 4 Ezra also places Ezra within the tradition of being given secret knowledge to record in sealed books 4 Ezra 14.1-6, 44-48, cf. Dan 12.9.

¹⁰³ See also Chapter 4 on the role of privileged insight in *vaticinia ex eventu* in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.

already taken place before the time of writing.¹⁰⁴ Similarly, the lion identified as the messiah speaks *before* the final tumultuous reign of the last two little wings, and already declares: “the Most High has looked at his times (*sua tempora*); now they have ended (*ecce finita sunt*), and his ages have reached completion (*saecula eius completa sunt*)” (11.44). The calamities caused by the eagle’s reign, which are already recognisable in the historical present, constitute the messianic woes themselves.¹⁰⁵

That the woes are already unfolding in both 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra underscores the imminence of the remaining events anticipated as part of the end, which each text also states outright. In 4 Ezra’s first episode Uriel reveals, “the world is hastening quickly to its end” (4.26), and in the sixth episode, “the days are coming when the Most High will deliver those who are on the earth” (13.29). Uriel confirms that the end cannot be delayed (to allow further time for repentance), just as a birth cannot be delayed when the time of labour arrives (4.40), and the events that can already be identified show that the unstoppable process towards the end is in train. The final episode underscores the imminence of the end by outlining the proportion of time that has already passed in Ezra’s time (14.11-12, 18).

¹⁰⁴ Stone 1990:368 (though Stone also notes some distinction between historical accuracy and popular belief about the events themselves).

¹⁰⁵ Stone 1990:251-52.

In 2 Baruch, the Lord expresses the acceleration towards the end, “therefore, behold, the days will come and the times will hasten, more than the former, and the periods will hasten more than those which are gone, and the years will pass more quickly than the present ones. Therefore I now took away Zion to visit the world in its own time more speedily” (20.1-2; cf. v.6; 23.7; 36.9). And the letter to the nine-and-a-half tribes at the end of 2 Baruch¹⁰⁶ reintroduces the imagery from the earlier discussion about the futility of beginnings that do not lead to an end, such as starting out on a sea voyage.¹⁰⁷ Thus also here, the writer asserts:

For the youth of this world has passed away, and the power of creation is already exhausted, and the coming of the times is very near and has passed by. And the pitcher is near the well, and the ship to the harbour, and the journey to the city, and life to its end. Further, prepare yourselves so that, when you sail and ascend from the ship, you may have rest and not be condemned when you have gone away. For behold, the Most High will cause all these things to come. There will not be an opportunity to repent anymore...” (85.10-12; cf. 83.1-2, 4)¹⁰⁸

Importantly, despite nostalgic features such as the return to manna from heaven during the messianic age (2 Bar 29.8), the schema of history in 2 Baruch remains linear, as discussed in Chapter 3. Some elements of the writer’s description of idyllic life draw on

¹⁰⁶ Henze highlights elements of the letter which draw out key features of 2 Baruch as a whole (rather than searching for a single theme in 2 Baruch): the focus on Torah and faithfulness, reflecting on the end as a source of hope in the present, Deuteronomistic theology, and the use of diverse intertextual imagery (Henze 2008:201-4).

¹⁰⁷ See Chapter 3.

¹⁰⁸ Henze argues the Deuteronomistic themes parallel Baruch with Moses, though the eschatological urgency highlights differences in the leadership Baruch will be called to exercise (Henze 2008:203).

earlier types, such as the reference to manna. But the end itself is a transition to a renewed version of these earlier types. It is on the brink of this reality that the writer suggests the reader lives.¹⁰⁹ In the vision of the dark and bright waters, the end is the period of *brightest* water (74.2-4). Baruch relates his insight to the people, having observed the passing nature of present things, “for there is a time that does not pass away. And that period is coming which will remain forever; and there is the new world which does not carry back to corruption those who enter into its beginning” (44.11).¹¹⁰

Thus each of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch identifies the present time as already at the beginning of the events of the end of history. Enlightenment for a privileged elect aligns with the beginning of these last events, and the decline in the present is already a part of the eschatological woes. However, neither suggests that the messiah has already acted (the lion in 4 Ezra’s Eagle vision provides commentary on the unfolding events, but does not act to destroy the eagle before the events associated with the historical present). Resurrection, judgement, and vindication of the righteous are still awaited. And, indeed, further

¹⁰⁹ Henze helpfully clarifies that the writer of 2 Baruch is interested in the future “in order to spell out how such knowledge about the End Time has an immediate effect on the Mean Time, i.e., the time of the author and his original audience” (Henze 2008:202). For an excellent discussion of the focus on the present in apocalypses, see Collins 2002:40-41.

¹¹⁰ Stuckenbruck refers to ways in which late Second Temple texts consider the end as in some sense a return to the beginning, in part while discussing the ways in which creation functions as assurance for the end (Stuckenbruck 2016:167). While I agree that creation provides this assurance (in relation to both divine will and capacity to create and thus also to restore), I do not think that this creates a circular section (“loops back,” p.167) in the structure of history. For these writers, whatever similarities there are between earlier periods and the end of history, it is crucial that the final end is different—it has moved, in the words of 2 Baruch, from corruptibility into incorruptibility.

exhortation to piety (notwithstanding, for instance, 2 Baruch's emphasis on determinism) remains in place; turning to right practice of the law is still possible in this period, though time is running short.

In sum, the writers of the Jewish key texts of this study each indicate some beliefs about the end of history. In 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, the events are set out in considerable detail (even if some features vary between passages). The War Scroll similarly describes the events leading up to and including the end of history, identifying eschatological judgement with the events of the war itself and anticipating an ongoing cycle of periods at the end, during which the sons of light will continue in piety unimpeded. Josephus and the writer of 2 Maccabees provide less detailed accounts of the end, though Josephus affirms Daniel's vision of the destruction of the final worldly political regime and installation of an unending divine reign. In each case, the ways in which these writers interpret the significance of the present time, and their expectations about the end, suggests some shared understandings about how time is structured. However, some important differences also arise regarding the consequences of how these writers portray the present in relation to the pattern of events of the end.

4.2 Consequences of the dynamic relationship between the present and the end

Each of the key Jewish texts of this study therefore reflects a dynamic relationship between the present and the end of history. Although the writers situate the present time in different positions in relation to the pattern of events of the end, in all cases some further change in conditions is anticipated. Their interpretations of past events are also used to confirm the reliability of claims made about divine action in the future. The dynamic relationship between the present and the end ensures that understandings of the end of history shape present experience in ways that are starkly different to Virgil's portrait in *Aeneid* discussed above, even though the writers of all of these texts portray history as teleological. Indeed, the ways in which expectations about the future shape experience in the present for the other Graeco-Roman writers discussed above may evoke more similar effects.

For instance, given the focus on cycles of divine punishment and rescue within history in **2 Maccabees**, the sense of provisionality in the present time functions similarly to the way it does for Diodorus or Valerius. The possibility of future punishment, or rescue, ensures that the future provides a constant warning or source of consolation. This consciousness shines through even in the narrative style, as the narrator makes intrusions into the text such as, in relation to Heliodorus: "It is no light thing to show irreverence to the divine laws—a fact that later events will make clear" (4.17). Or the observation that Nicanor acts

without realising “the judgment from the Almighty that was about to overtake him” (8.11; cf. 7.17). To the extent that the *end* of history affects experience in the present for the writer of 2 Maccabees, it acts as an explanation for the behaviour and possible success of opponents, and reassurance that this will be brought to an end (6.12-16). For readers experiencing further hardship, the exhortation to steadfast faith in the face of temptation to compromise, promise of post-mortem reward, and affirmation of divine sovereignty (2 Macc 6-7) may continue to offer consolation and encouragement. However, as the writer describes decisive divine action it is predominantly depicted in the arena of human history, as when God turns from wrath to mercy and acts in the interests of God’s people (8.5).

Josephus and the writers of the War Scroll, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch set up the dynamic between the present and the end of history in ways that are more similar to one another. Expectations about the end shape their interpretations of present experience, as they also reinterpret earlier prophecies to make sense in the present. For instance, each draws in significant ways on the visions in Daniel (1QM 1.2, 8; 17.6-7;¹¹¹ *Ant.* 10.205-210, 272-276; 4 Ezra 11-12; 2 Bar 35-40).¹¹² The writers reapply the earlier prophecy to their own settings. They continue to identify the present time with the penultimate empire of Daniel’s five-kingdom paradigm, but reinterpret the empire’s identity. Thus, what for Daniel initially

¹¹¹ Cf. Stuckenbruck 2006:128-29.

¹¹² Cf. *Animal Apocalypse*, which also includes a succession of four empires during the period from the exile until the eschatological war (Olson 2013:190).

described the Greek empire,¹¹³ for each of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and *Antiquities* has become Rome. In 4 Ezra's Eagle vision, the lion even acknowledges the adaptation, explaining: "the eagle that you saw coming up from the sea is the fourth kingdom that appeared in a vision to your brother Daniel. But it was not explained to him as I now explain to you or have explained it" (12.11-12). The revealed knowledge here has been updated, as also Daniel's prophecies had updated Jeremiah (Dan 9.2, 24-27; cf. Jer 25.11-12).¹¹⁴ In this way, the promises for the end can still be sustaining—even if there appears to be some delay. The structure of history remains the same and the end therefore still remains imminently expected.

While **Josephus** maintains a dynamic relationship between the present and the end, other elements elicit somewhat different effects, such as in the way his understanding of the end might shape his politics or interpretation of suffering in the present. Although Josephus's interpretation of Daniel places Rome's reign as the final empire before God's decisive action to end the succession of empires and install an eternal divine reign, his generally positive portrayal of Rome and emphasis on leaving all defence to God shapes the consequences of this view. For Josephus, flexibility in the present leaves the possibility of repentance open, but there is no sense of imminence to the end of Rome's reign. His

¹¹³ Collins 1993:36, 312. Collins also notes that in the Old Greek version of Daniel the translation into a new context has already been made, with the Kittim persistently referred to as Romans (p.7). For a fuller discussion of the various texts of Daniel and possible relationships between them, see Collins 1993:3-11.

¹¹⁴ Bizzarro 2014:35-37.

understanding of the end ultimately affects the present by encouraging amicable relationships with Rome in the interim, while passively awaiting the decisive action of the end in God's own time.

For the writers of the War Scroll, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch, the relationship between the present and the end remains similarly dynamic, given their expectations about future change. But the end affects the present in more urgent ways given its imminence and the difficult conditions of the present. Importantly, these writers draw on their interpretations of divine action in the past to provide assurance of the divine action promised in the future, as Stuckenbruck has highlighted is common in Jewish texts of this time.¹¹⁵ Stuckenbruck argues that NT theology which makes eschatological claims about the certainty—indeed partial fulfilment—of God's decisive action at the end of history on the basis of past events, reflects continuity with the kind of claims frequently made in late Second Temple texts about the certainty of the future on the basis of completed events in the past.¹¹⁶ These observations helpfully illuminate similarities in the way that writers' understandings of history function in their claims about the past and the future, and interpretations of experience in the present, and are taken up again in relation to Luke/Acts below. However, the *uniqueness* of certain eschatological events clarifies that these earlier events, though *characteristic* of divine action, are not the same as the decisive

¹¹⁵ Stuckenbruck 2014a:320-26; Stuckenbruck 2014b:240-56.

¹¹⁶ Stuckenbruck 2014a:320-26.

events described as part of the events of the end.¹¹⁷ This creates important distinctions between texts on the basis of where their writers place the present time in relation to the pattern of end-time events.

For instance, the **War Scroll** includes historical reviews of divine action in creation and covenant (1QM 10.11-16; 11.1-9; 14.4-18; 15.7-18), as well as claims about characteristic divine behaviour. In 1QM 11, the line “for the battle is yours!” is repeated several times in address to God (11.1, 2, 4), recounting archetypal victories, such as that over Goliath and the Philistines, and Pharaoh. The passage affirms, “by the hand of our kings, besides, you saved us many times” (11.3), which is mirrored also in the affirmation “You have opened for us many times the gates of salvation” (18.7). Stuckenbruck rightly observes that by making claims about the events of the past in this way writers demonstrate their beliefs about the way in which time is structured, and this understanding of time undergirds their portrayals of hope for the future. These events of the past become the model for God’s decisive (but notably still future) action: “You shall treat them like Pharaoh, like the officers of his chariots in the Red Sea” (11.9-10; cf. 11.13). In this context, the refrain “the battle is yours!” becomes not a temporal claim about the battle already having been

¹¹⁷ In an earlier article Stuckenbruck suggests that these earlier saving moments function similarly to the assurance provided in Pauline epistles by the death and resurrection of Jesus (Stuckenbruck 2014a:320-26). Particularly in his most recent publication, Stuckenbruck recognises the unique elements of the claims made in NT texts (Stuckenbruck 2016:167). I suggest that both the *similarities* in the structuring of history, and the *differences* in the kind of events NT writers claim have already taken place, are important in analysing these texts.

completed, but an affirmation of God's character and sovereignty in *all* contexts—the battle, though still in the future, is indeed as good as won.

However, the future divine action anticipated in the War Scroll, though consistent with, and assured by, God's action in the past, remains unique. The utter and final destruction of the sons of darkness, comprising not only human opponents but all the lot of Belial, indeed the *empire* of Belial (14.9), ensures that the promised events are not merely further cycles of divine rescue (as in the battles in 2 Maccabees) but a unique transition in history.¹¹⁸ As frequently noted of 1QS and 1QSa, despite their parallels between life in the present and the messianic age, there is no evidence in the text that the writer believes the messiah is already present in the life of the community. Similarly, I noted above that there is no hint in the War Scroll that key eschatological figures such as Michael have appeared in the community already. The present time falls earlier in the pattern of end-time events, and these decisive events are still awaited.

The writers of **4 Ezra** and **2 Baruch** also draw on their interpretations of the past in ways that affect experience in the present, but their expectations about the final events of history likewise still indicate a *unique* transition in history. In both texts, the writers provide consolation by overlaying the literary setting of the time following the destruction of the *first* temple in 586 BCE, onto the historical setting of the *second* temple's

¹¹⁸ See Chapter 3.

destruction.¹¹⁹ In 2 Baruch, a reminder about the fall of Nebuchadnezzar confirms that in this time also divine action will prevail (67.7-8). In 4 Ezra, the humiliation of Zion is laid out in terms recognisable to its readers. Ezra's response to the mourning woman in episode four calls to mind current experience:

For you see how our sanctuary has been laid waste, our altar thrown down, our temple destroyed... our holy things have been polluted, and the name by which we are called has been almost profaned... our Levites have gone into exile... our young men have been enslaved. (10.21-22)

This connection to the past destruction confirms the possibility of a future restoration of the temple. But the portrait of a glorious Zion (10.25-28) is powerfully juxtaposed against *both* the destruction of the earlier temple and the current circumstances, simultaneously asserting hope in a qualitatively different Zion, which has not been produced through human effort and therefore cannot be destroyed in such a way either.¹²⁰

As discussed above, for Stuckenbruck a key question that emerges from the structuring of time in late Second Temple Judaism lies in the extent to which these views provide the writers with resources to explain and deal with evil in the present.¹²¹ I have suggested that, unlike Virgil's static portrayal of the present and the end, the dynamic possibilities of

¹¹⁹ Najman argues that by aligning the present with the first destruction, the writer performs a "bold reboot," which skips over the second temple and emphasises instead hope in the "renewal of scripture" (Najman 2014:67, cf. pp.153-58).

¹²⁰ This portrait of the future is central to the exhortation to view the present from the perspective of the future, which addresses Ezra's concerns also from the earlier dialogue (Barclay 2015:287, 302).

¹²¹ Stuckenbruck 2016:143.

further change between the present and the end in these late Second Temple texts provide hope. Whereas in 2 Maccabees possible future changes in divine favour shape experience in the present, and for Josephus divine action at the end of history suggests readers should work for political stability in the present, for the writers of the War Scroll, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch, the end of history supplies hope in the present and an urgent exhortation to piety in the short time remaining. Luke likewise shares numerous similarities in his understanding of the structure of history, expectations of the end, and portrayal of a dynamic relationship between the present time and events of the end still anticipated. Nonetheless, in Luke/Acts the assurance for the future provided by the events of the recent past is amplified, because these events already constitute the decisive divine action of the end.

5. The present and the end of history in Luke/Acts

Turning now to Luke/Acts, a number of important features emerge in light of the discussion above. Various passages throughout Luke's narrative indicate underlying assumptions about events of the end of history which cohere with those evident in other Jewish texts, such as 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and 1QM. As argued above, although several of these texts point to saving moments in the past as assurance of God's action at the end of history (eg. 1QM, *Jewish War*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch),¹²² and even display such intense orientation

¹²² This common technique is seen across Second Temple texts and evident in the re-written Bible tradition. See Mermelstein on post-exilic writers retelling history from creation, rather than the

towards the future that current practices are modelled on the end, in all cases key events such as the appearance of the messiah¹²³ or resurrection remain in the future.¹²⁴ By contrast, Virgil's *Aeneid* situates the historical present at the end of history.

I argue that Luke/Acts also positions the historical present in the final period of history. The periodisation of Luke's history identified in Chapter 3 provides an essential insight for identifying the present time: following the periods of the past, Jesus' resurrection is portrayed as the point of transition into the *final* period of history. The period itself constitutes continued unfolding of end-time events, not simply a further period akin to those of the past.¹²⁵ The presence of the Spirit in the discipleship community and Jesus' presence at the right of the power of God confirm that this transition has taken place. However, Luke's characterisation of the present, as a time of both invitation to repentance and recognition of tribulation, avoids the triumphalism of *Aeneid* and maintains dynamic possibilities in the present which allows for human freedom to align oneself with divine

establishment of covenant with YHWH, in the face of crises that might be interpreted as signs of the end of the covenant (Mermelstein 2014:1-3).

¹²³ So also Rajak 2002a:165.

¹²⁴ Wright 2003:162-63.

¹²⁵ This counters not only Conzelmann's hypothesis that Luke inserted an extended period of the church before the distant end (Conzelmann 1960:135), but also contrasts with those who identify a separate historical period of soteriological value after Jesus, such as Wright's understanding of salvation history, with the church the next "act" in the "play" following the time of Israel (Wright 1991:19), or the approach of those who see the culmination of history in Luke/Acts as actively held off until the universal mission has been completed (Smith 1958; cf. Tannehill 1986-1990:1.258-61).

priorities. All of this underlines Luke's eschatological interest, with significant implications for understanding Luke's politics and explanation of suffering.

After outlining references to events anticipated as part of the end of history in Luke/Acts, I extrapolate on evidence of the final period of history in Luke's text and his characterisation of the present, before turning to some of the consequences of his treatment of the present and end of history to conclude.

5.1 The events of the end in Luke/Acts

In his assumptions about the events of the end of history, Luke shares many of the features spelt out systematically in apocalypses with historical reviews like 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, although common across many contemporaneous Jewish texts. The Lukan Jesus describes messianic woes, in both unique material (Lk 23.28-31) and that shared with Matthew and Mark (Lk 21.25-26).¹²⁶ Expectation of a messiah is present throughout,¹²⁷ not only when the narrative explicitly identifies Jesus as the messiah (Lk 2.11, 29-30; 4.41; 9.20; 24.26, 46; Acts 2.36; 3.18, 20; 5.42; 8.5; 9.22; 17.3; 18.5, 28; 26.23; cf. Lk 1.69), but as an expectation which Luke paints various characters holding independently of experience with Jesus and the

¹²⁶ Wolter rightly argues that, whatever other differences in eschatology interpreters claim to find in Luke/Acts, Luke expects the same end-time events as other NT writers (Wolter 2011:93).

¹²⁷ Many texts included in this dissertation refer to a divine agent with a key role within the unfolding of the divine plan for history, though messianic expectations in Jewish texts of this period are notoriously uncertain (Collins 1987:97-109).

apostles (Lk 2.26; 3.15; 22.67; Acts 2.31). This also serves his rhetorical purpose of claiming belief in Jesus to be consistent with Jewish heritage (cf. Lk 24.26-27; Acts 2.31; 26.22-23).¹²⁸

Luke refers to the resurrection of the dead, sometimes as an event anticipated for all and leading to judgement (Acts 24.15),¹²⁹ or at other times an event only for the righteous (Lk 20.27-38; cf. Lk 10.20; 21.19).¹³⁰ As in Mark and Matthew, Luke refers to a future day of judgement, over which Jesus will preside (Lk 22.30; cf. Mt 19.28-29; Lk 21.34-36; cf. Matt 24.43-51; 25.13; Mk 13.33-37;¹³¹ Acts 10.42; 17.31). The timing of this judgement will be unexpected, and is associated with the return of the Son of Man (Lk 12.35-40; Acts 1.7, 11). The judgement may represent a fearful prospect to the unprepared, but to the righteous it is a promise of vindication (Lk 21.28). Hospitality (Lk 14.14),¹³² following Jesus (Lk 18.28-30), and enduring persecution (Lk 21.19; Acts 14.22) lead to post-mortem reward.¹³³ This reflects also an implicit extension of Luke's emphasis on reversal.¹³⁴

¹²⁸ See discussion below in relation to Acts 26.22-23.

¹²⁹ Cf. Lk 11.31 (Mt 12.38-42; Mk 8.11-12), which presents the striking eschatological scene in relation to the sign of Jonah, in which resurrection relates to judgement.

¹³⁰ Note that the Lukan Jesus may here still mean that all are resurrected, then judged, and only the righteous enter into the new age.

¹³¹ See Maddox's redaction-critical comparisons (Maddox 1982:111-23).

¹³² Byrne 2000:123, cf. pp.4-5. See other instances of Luke's accounts of banquet scenes with eschatological and judgement overtones: Lk 5.27-32; 7.36-50; 11.37-52; 14.7-24 (Crabbe 2011: 250-51; Just Jr 1993:139).

¹³³ Cunningham 1997:14.

¹³⁴ Tannehill 1985; Kim-Rauchholz 2008:79-165; York 1991; Emmrich 2013. As reversal relates to Jesus' suffering and Luke's understanding of salvation, see Scheffler 1993:152, 158. See also Chapter 5 above.

In these various ways, Luke names expectations of events of the end found in other contemporaneous texts. Despite various differences, in all cases the picture of life at the culmination of history is characterised by the defeat of evil and ongoing life¹³⁵ under divine reign.

5.2 The placement of the present in Luke's schema of history

Importantly, as for other texts that draw on teleological understandings of history, the relationship between the historical present and history's end shapes Luke's account. As noted, of the texts discussed above, only *Aeneid* situates the present time at the end, although 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch appear to equate present experience with the eschatological woes on the cusp of the events of the end. However, in Luke/Acts, the kind of events that have already taken place suggest that, for Luke, God's decisive action in inaugurating the final period of history is no longer anticipated, but already in the past, demonstrated through the resurrection, descent of the Spirit, and placement of Jesus.

5.2.1 Resurrection as the turning point and confirmation of Jesus as Messiah

In Acts, Jesus' resurrection confirms the transition to the new era. In ten speeches or shorter statements, his resurrection forms the key content of the apostles' witness (Acts

¹³⁵ On the War Scroll's expectations of Israel's ongoing existence, and individuals' "long life," see Chapter 3 above.

1.22; 2.24, 29-32; 3.15; 5.29-32; 10.39-41; 13.26-37; 17.30-31; 23.6;¹³⁶ 24.15-21; 26.6-8, 23).¹³⁷

This belief causes the greatest controversy, and is revealed as the radical element of the apostles' proclamation.

Paul's speech to Agrippa in Acts 26 confirms the radical nature of claims regarding Jesus' resurrection. The question is not *whether* God raises the dead, but the significance of claims that in Jesus *God has already done so*. Here Luke's Paul claims to draw upon existing beliefs about resurrection, highlighting that it is strange that people who understand, or even participate in, relevant Jewish traditions should hold these beliefs and yet find it "incredible...that God raises the dead" (Acts 26.8). As the speech progresses, recounting his own story of conversion and call, Paul asserts: "So I stand here, testifying to both small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would take place: that the Messiah would suffer,¹³⁸ and that, by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to our people and to the Gentiles" (vv.22-23).

These verses contain the key to Paul's speech here and support the significance of testimony regarding the resurrection across Acts. Here Luke approaches the kind of 'first

¹³⁶ In this pericope, part of the function of the references to resurrection is likely polemical and strategic; Paul may be presented as raising questions of resurrection in order to arouse sectarian disagreement deliberately.

¹³⁷ Cf. also Acts 17.3, 18, 32 and 25.19, in which the centrality of resurrection to the apostles' witness is confirmed by other characters or the narrator.

¹³⁸ This is the NRSV, with a change only to the English verb (from the adjective παθητός) from "must suffer" to "would suffer," see discussion below.

fruits' theology found in the Pauline epistles, in which Jesus is the first to be raised from the dead as part of a new era of resurrection (cf. 1 Cor. 15.12-24; 2 Cor. 4.14).¹³⁹ The verse presents some difficulties for translation.¹⁴⁰ By rendering the phrase as "that the Christ/Messiah must suffer," the ESV and NRSV unhelpfully obscure the Greek behind what looks like a translation of one of Luke's δεῖ clauses.¹⁴¹ However, the translation comes instead from the combined use of εἰ with παθητός, here translated as "must suffer,"¹⁴² but tied to the sense of "being capable of or subject to suffering."¹⁴³ The emphasis in its context lies not on questions of necessity regarding Jesus' suffering,¹⁴⁴ but the claim that all

¹³⁹ Haenchen cautions against importing material from Pauline literature (Haenchen 1971:687) however this may well be illuminating on this point. Also contra Drury, who expounds, with clear if unstated influence from Conzelmann: in Luke "there is a leveling down of Paul's doctrine of the unique interruption, a muffling of the crash of the descent of the Redeemer causing a radical discontinuity in the conditions of life. Instead we have a Jesus who is a link in time's chain, himself the ligature of old and new, the middle of time." (Drury 1976:9). By contrast, Ellis suggests it is appropriate to consider Lukan and Pauline theology as they illuminate each other, and rightly argues that even Paul includes elements of salvation history (Ellis 1974:49).

¹⁴⁰ The two somewhat confusing uses of εἰ are best translated as indirect interrogatives indicating questions about *what* Moses and the prophets have said; so Pervo 2009:624. They may also be translated, as Johnson does, with the sense of a conditional introducing as a topic for debate, not whether Jesus has been raised but whether Moses and the prophets point to this (Johnson 1992:431, 442; so also Zerwick 1988:446).

¹⁴¹ See extended discussion of Luke's use of δεῖ in Chapter 4, where I provide evidence that Luke does not use the term simply to indicate 'divine necessity.' Importantly, δεῖ and the divine βουλή are not equivalent in Luke's understanding.

¹⁴² The term has the sense of being subject to suffering (BDAG:748; or, according to Johnson, being capable of suffering: Johnson 1992:438), and is actually an adjective though translated here with the sense of a verb. Johnson emphasises that this is not another use of a δεῖ clause (p.438). Indeed, given that Luke frequently uses δεῖ elsewhere, caution should be exercised in importing the same meaning into another construction. Unhelpfully, Witherington introduces δεῖ into the Greek, and then footnotes the correct term (Witherington III 1998:748).

¹⁴³ Bruce notes this is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, though taken up later by Ignatius and Justin (Bruce 1988:390).

¹⁴⁴ Conzelmann 1987:171n.2, and Haenchen 1971:687, focus on this sense of the necessity of suffering.

of this was prophetically foretold about the Messiah. Regardless of the accuracy of the Lukan Paul's use of the tradition at this point, the recipient of his rhetoric is placed in the position of having to affirm that Moses and the prophets point to such a resurrection, with the immediate consequence that Jesus must be viewed as the Messiah and thus the sign of a new era in history (cf. also Lk 16.31; 20.37-38; Acts 3.21b-25).¹⁴⁵

This fits with the kind of scandal caused by the testimony. The immediate interruption of Festus, who questions Paul's sanity, highlights the significance of Paul's statement. Here Festus fulfils the role of a naïve character who acts as an ironic foil, unaware of the true significance of the kind of claims at work.¹⁴⁶ To Festus claiming someone has returned from the dead is insane, but he is oblivious to the expectations about the pattern of end-time events that underlie it. Agrippa understands Paul's proclamation better. He sees immediately that accepting the testimony that Jesus is the first to be raised from the dead would have significant consequences, necessarily leading to following him, and thus "so quickly persuading [Agrippa] to become a Christian" (v.28).¹⁴⁷ Luke's Paul draws on these traditions about resurrection but his conclusions are different; the other Jewish texts

¹⁴⁵ Those who argue that Acts does not contain imminent eschatological expectation (e.g. Adams 2007:179n.222; Pervo 2009:25) overlook the interrelation of these ideas about resurrection, 'first fruits,' and the final judgement (cf. Acts 10.42; 17.31; 26.22-23).

¹⁴⁶ See Chapter 4 on a similar irony in the incident involving Gamaliel in Acts 5.

¹⁴⁷ See Barrett on the question of whether this is to be taken as serious or ironic—that is lightly "playing the Christian" or being made a Christian with little effort (Barrett 2002:392-3). Given Paul takes the comment seriously in his response I suggest that is the more likely reading, even if Agrippa's response is also incredulous. Contra Bruce, Agrippa's statement is not likely a sign of his embarrassment for having religious discussions in front of Festus (Bruce 1988:471).

discussed *anticipate* resurrection, as noted above, but they do not claim that this *has ever taken place*.¹⁴⁸

Speeches in Acts also draw connections between the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection and his identity as Messiah. Again, identifying an individual with the Messiah demonstrates a clear difference from texts like 4 Ezra or 2 Baruch, where the Messiah remains imminently *expected* and is not identified with any historical individual. Moreover, despite the significance attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness in texts such as CD and 1QpHab, even these texts do not approach claims similar to the NT affirmation of Jesus as Messiah.¹⁴⁹ In Peter's speech in Acts 2.17-36, Psalm 16 is cited as Davidic support for resurrection without corruption being a sign of the Messiah (vv.25-28, 31, 36) with connections also to Psalm 110 and sitting at God's right until enemies are made a footstool (vv.34-35).¹⁵⁰ Thus, Peter concludes his speech by asserting that in raising Jesus God has proven Jesus is both Lord and Messiah (v.36; cf. Acts 5.42). Furthermore, Jesus' resurrection is intrinsically connected to the completion of these end-time events. Paul

¹⁴⁸ Cullmann uses similar observations to claim a "radical difference" between Jewish and Christian understandings of time (Cullmann 1962:83).

¹⁴⁹ Understanding the status of the Teacher of Righteousness is important, though exact attributions are difficult to uncover. Despite Davies's claims discussed above (Davies 1985:54), Qumran texts do not seem to identify him with the messiah and thus claims about the Teacher differ in this crucial way to the NT's claims about Jesus.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. also Lk 20.41-44, which makes these connections between Ps 110, messianic status, and sitting at the right of God, ready for application in Jesus in Acts 2.34-5.

tells the Athenians that the fact of Jesus' resurrection simultaneously provides the confidence (πίστις) that God has set a date for judgement (Acts 17.31).¹⁵¹

Thus, Jesus' resurrection plays a central role in signalling the position of the historical present in Luke's schema of history.¹⁵² In his resurrection, Jesus is confirmed as the Messiah and divinely appointed judge, roles associated with the end of history. At the same time, the decisive action of God in raising him confirms the entry into a new and ultimate period of history.

5.2.2 The presence of the Spirit

Luke interprets the drama of Pentecost with words from Joel (Acts 2.17-21; cf. Joel 2.28-32). He evokes a picture of inspired prophecy, renewal of the old and vision of the young.¹⁵³ In itself, particularly in the context of the dramatic Pentecost account, it could give the sense of a new eschatological period. But, perhaps in order to be completely clear, Luke adds the time reference "in the last days" to the LXX quotation (Acts 2.17; cf. Joel 2.28-32; LXX 3.1-5).¹⁵⁴ Both the LXX and MT begin this passage with less precise time references to "after"

¹⁵¹ See Chapter 3 for my argument for interpreting the καιροί established by God in Acts 17.26 as historical periods and not annual seasons. On Acts 17.31 and Luke's expectation of an imminent end, see below (§5.3.1).

¹⁵² Following Conzelmann, several Lukan scholars debated the placement of transition in Luke's historical schema, but their focus was a transition postulated between the time of Jesus and the church, not the end, in particular in relation to verses such as Lk 16.16. See Chapters 1 and 3.

¹⁵³ For further discussion of NT reception of Joel, see Strazicich 2007:371-75.

¹⁵⁴ Barrett argues that the descent of the Spirit and the phrase "in the last days" here confirm a separate time of the church, indicated also by the ascension, with obvious connections to

events just described.¹⁵⁵ Luke's addition underscores the eschatological significance of the event and its position in his schema of history; the activity unfolding before the hearers was prophesied to take place in the ultimate period of history.

5.2.3 The position of the exalted Jesus

Jesus' position at the right of God also functions to confirm the new eschatological era. In a convincing study of Luke 22.66-71 and Acts 7.54-60, Martin Bauspieß notes the significance of Jesus' response to interrogation in the trial scene of Luke 22, namely the announcement that "from now on (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (Lk 22.69).¹⁵⁶ Importantly, Luke's wording differs from that in Mark 14.62.¹⁵⁷ Luke has added the ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, thus describing a reality which is in place if not "from now" at the point of the trial, certainly from the time of the ascension. Bauspieß argues that Luke has deliberately drawn connections between this trial scene and Stephen's vision at the point of his martyrdom in order to present Jesus' placement at God's right as a hidden reality already in place throughout Acts¹⁵⁸ (cf. Acts 2.33).

Conzelmann's salvation historical periods (Barrett 2002:li-lij; cf. Conzelmann 1960). By contrast, Witherington argues that these events indicate the beginning of the eschatological age, though elsewhere he argues for an anti-eschatological outlook of Acts (Witherington III 1998:140, cf. 111).

¹⁵⁵ καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα [LXX]; וְהָיָה אַחֲרָיִךְ כֵּן [MT]

¹⁵⁶ Bauspieß 2011:125-148. See also discussion in Maddox 1982:108.

¹⁵⁷ The text is also different to Mt 26.64, but Matthew communicates a similar sense, through: ἀπ' ἄρτι, (see the comparison in Bauspieß 2011:130).

¹⁵⁸ Bauspieß 2011:139.

Importantly, insight into this reality is not available to all characters. Stephen can only describe the vision to others who are present but cannot see the revelation.¹⁵⁹ And upon hearing his report, the characters are also unable truly to hear the significance of his testimony and so carry on the stoning. But the two spatial realities—the world seen by all the characters and the world of the exalted Christ—have been revealed to Stephen and to any readers with ears to hear.

5.3 The character of life in the present according to Luke

Despite these signs that the ultimate period of history has begun, the promise of the return of the Son of Man, the call to repentance, and recognition of current experiences of suffering ensure that the fraught question of Luke's expectations of a final culmination to history remains in play. For Luke also, despite the placement of the present after certain key events of the end, expectations about further changes still reflect a dynamic relationship between the present and the culmination of history. This maintains hope in the present, without compromising the certainty that arises from Luke's claims that the present lies already well within the events of the end. Thus, although both Luke and Virgil align the present with the events of the end of history, this dynamic highlights crucial further differences between their schemas.

¹⁵⁹ Bauspieß 2011:141.

5.3.1 The return of the Son of Man

While Luke 22.69 and Acts 7.56 confirm that Jesus is already placed at God's right, the promise of his return acknowledges that the situation is not ultimately resolved. Following the Acts account of the ascension, the men in white robes declare that Jesus will come again in the same manner as his departure (Acts 1.11), while Jesus himself points to a future coming of the Son of Man on clouds (Lk 21.27), in apparent contrast to his description of an ongoing reality of the Son of Man seated at God's right "from now" in Luke 22.69.

It could be that Luke understands these two realities as coexisting indefinitely, with some mediation between the two spaces to be performed by the Son of Man and/or the Spirit.¹⁶⁰ However, this seems unlikely given Acts 3.21, in which Jesus' place at the right of God is described as a reality that must endure "until the time" of universal restoration.¹⁶¹ Thus, the promised time of judgement (Acts 17.30-31, cf. 10.42), and coming of the Son of Man, is best understood as a final point in history which draws the separation of these realities to a close.

¹⁶⁰ This spatial solution is offered, for instance, by Flender 1967:98, 106, 100-1. Bockmuehl identifies in Luke's narrative a dialectical tension between Jesus' absence from the discipleship community following Jesus' ascension in Acts, and his presence in some form through his name and the Spirit (Bockmuehl 2015:95-97). Although Jesus remains in the authoritative position to the right of God throughout the narrative of Acts, any sense of absence seems to underscore the importance of the promised restoration of his presence (cf. Acts 3.21).

¹⁶¹ Sleeman's study of geography and the ascension, through which he develops the idea of "third-space," contributes valuably both an emphasis on the ways in which Jesus' placement following the ascension affects life in the present *and* remains a time-limited reality until the time of restoration promised in Acts 3.21 (Sleeman 2009:108-9).

The considerable debate about the timing of that return¹⁶² has centred particularly on interpretations of Lk 21.5-36.¹⁶³ In this passage, Jesus prophesies about events that are to take place in the time beyond the literary present of his ministry. As in the manner of the *vaticinia ex eventu* discussed above, Luke's original readers know that some of these events have taken place by their own time, while others still await fulfilment. Although this pericope has featured in the studies of those who argue Luke has separated history from eschatology, reading the passage with an awareness of the other models discussed above clarifies Luke's purpose with this passage and his underlying teleological view of history.¹⁶⁴

The passage opens with Jesus prophesying the destruction of the temple (vv.5-6), eliciting the question which then prompts Jesus' longer speech: "Teacher, when will this be, and what will be the sign (σημείον) that this is about (μέλλη) to take place?" (v.7).¹⁶⁵ It is

¹⁶² Wolter suggests that questions about Luke's expectations about the timing of the Son of Man's return, though once fraught, are now "settled" (Wolter 2011:103), with the understanding that Luke emphasises "the proper conduct of life for the Christians," given an attitude of uncertainty about the parousia (involving implicit delay but some small possibility that it *might* be sooner; p.105).

¹⁶³ Cf. Mk 13.5-31; Mt. 24.1-35.

¹⁶⁴ This is a key text in the history of interpretation. Debate has been particularly fraught over which events Luke associates with the literary present of Jesus' prophecy, his own historical present, and events still to be fulfilled in the future. Whether to view the destruction of Jerusalem as part of the events of the end has also been contentious. See Conzelmann 1960:132-35; Fitzmyer 1981-1985:2.1327; and contrasting views by Mattill 1979; Knight 1998:188-89 (responding to Conzelmann). Bovon seeks to address the problems through source criticism (Bovon 2002-2013:3.106-9). Ongoing concern about these interpretive issues is evident, for instance, in Jeffrey's discomfort with N.T. Wright's interpretation (Jeffrey 2012:243-51).

¹⁶⁵ On μέλλω, see below.

significant that the speech in verses 8-36 is a response to this question about *how to read the times* in light of prophecy. The speech can then be set out as:

- vv.8-9 Jesus warns about false prophets, before turning to his own prophecies:
- vv.10-11 Tumult, violence, and portents (most likely associated with the Jewish War).
- vv.12-19 Predicted persecution, explicitly positioned “before all this” (v.12), thus beginning prior to Jerusalem’s destruction.¹⁶⁶
- vv.20-24 Jerusalem surrounded and its inhabitants to flee—*beginning* with an instruction about recognising this time of destruction (v.20).
- vv.25-28 Further signs (employing traditional eschatological language),¹⁶⁷ the return of the Son of Man, and the nearness of redemption—*ending* with a further instruction about recognising this time (v.28).
- vv.29-36 Further exhortation about recognising the time, including the analogy of attending to the fig tree in order to recognise the imminent arrival of summer (vv.29-33)

Whether or not Luke means to indicate that the persecution in verses 12-19 continues into his readers’ present time, it is clear that the persecution at least begins earlier, being identified with events that predate the fall of Jerusalem and connect to the stories in Acts.¹⁶⁸ Here Luke has added the comments at verses 10-11 (cf. Mk 13.8).¹⁶⁹ For

¹⁶⁶ Fusco discusses the structural issues of the passage, including this shift to an earlier time reference, in detail (Fusco 1991:84). He confirms that, when assumptions that Luke redacts the passage to distance the parousia are put aside, the continuity of events leading into eschatological events is clearly recognisable (pp.91-92).

¹⁶⁷ The “signs and portents” appear to escalate across these verses (Nolland 1989-1993:3.1006), though “that day” (vv.34) will still come suddenly (Adams 2007:177n.218).

¹⁶⁸ Maddox 1982:116.

¹⁶⁹ Maddox 1982:115. See also Adams’s redaction-critical comparison (Adams 2007:172-79).

Conzelmann, Luke's attention to Jerusalem here confirms his shift to identifying divine action in the events of history, severed from the end-time events.¹⁷⁰ By contrast, by setting out events of the past in a sequence which leads to the events of the end, Luke instead brings into focus the *connections between* these events. As in the *vaticinia ex eventu* discussed above, being able to identify the events of their own experience in the historical review enables readers to confirm their own position within the unfolding events and thus the imminence of the events of the end.

This is in keeping with the question which prompted the prophecy and the exhortation to which it leads. Jesus returns to the question about how to read the signs at several points (vv.20, 28), including in the closing parable (vv.29-33) and the exhortation to vigilance (vv.34-36). By attending to the signs in this unfolding series of events, Luke's readers recognise that they live among the events of vv.20-24. But there is no indication of a long gap before the next events,¹⁷¹ just as in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch the emphasis lies on the imminence of those events due to unfold next in the schema. Having exhorted vigilance and 'prophesied' events of the recent past, Jesus' speech concludes by asserting the nearness of the time of redemption (v.28).

¹⁷⁰ Conzelmann 1960:95-136.

¹⁷¹ Contra Adams, who suggests Luke has inserted the time of the gentiles between the fall of Jerusalem and the end-time events as an indefinite interim period (Adams 2007:176).

Acts 17.31 likewise confirms the imminence of the end. Paul concludes his speech in Athens by asserting that God “has fixed a day on which he will have (ἐν ἧ μέλλει) the world judged (κρίνειν) in righteousness.” As noted above, it is the resurrection which confirms that this will take place. But the term μέλλω introduces also an element of imminence. Although, in a “weakened” form it can simply indicate the future¹⁷² or (counter-intuitively) delay/lingering,¹⁷³ other meanings reflect inevitability or determinism¹⁷⁴ or a sense of imminence—that something is about to happen.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, Mattill argues that imminence is the term’s basic meaning.¹⁷⁶ Certainly this is the sense in which it is used in Lk 21.7, in the question about how one can know when the prophesied events are “about (μέλλῃ) to happen (γίνεσθαι).”¹⁷⁷ In an important critique, Mattill observes that translations of μέλλω in Luke/Acts have been constrained by existing assumptions about Luke’s eschatology, rather than detailed engagement with the meaning of the term in its literary setting.¹⁷⁸ In

¹⁷² BDAG meaning 1β (pp.627-28).

¹⁷³ BDAG meaning 4, in the sense: “why are you delaying?”

¹⁷⁴ BDAG meaning 2.

¹⁷⁵ BDAG meaning 1. In relation to Acts 17.31, BDAG specifies a meaning “intended action” (meaning 1γ) with the present infinitive, though Mattill argues compellingly against this case (Mattill 1972:279). The remainder of Acts 17.31 supports the case for a stronger sense of the term, including the reference to having “fixed a day” and the assurance provided by the past event of Jesus’ resurrection.

¹⁷⁶ Mattill 1972:279.

¹⁷⁷ Mattill provides a list of uses with the meaning of “soon” in Luke/Acts, noting the majority of its uses across the NT, including in Luke/Acts, take this sense (Mattill 1972:280-81).

¹⁷⁸ Mattill 1972:276, 269. Mattill’s criticism is justified. The *EDNT* entry for μέλλω by Radl simply asserts: “in Acts μέλλω contains no suggestion of a near future (against Mattill)” (2.404), without any evidence in support. By contrast, the thrust of the question in Lk 21.7, at least, *requires* a sense of imminence. Similarly, the treatment by Schneider in *TDNT* deals mostly with references in epistles and Hebrews, and simply cites Conzelmann’s “Eschatologie im Urchristentum” as one of the key references (1.325-27).

Acts 17.31 the term adds further urgency into a statement that stresses the need for repentance: the resurrection shows already that Jesus has been appointed to the key role in the judgement, which is about to take place.

5.3.2 Repentance

Indeed, the exhortation to repentance throughout Acts provides a key to understanding the time that Luke presents as beginning with the decisive intervention of God in raising Jesus, but which still awaits culmination with the promised judgement. In seven speeches from apostles in Acts the proclamation of good news about Jesus leads into an exhortation to repentance and promise of forgiveness (Acts 2.38; 3.19; 5.31; 11.18; 17.30; 20.21; 26.20). Five of these instances are also those speeches discussed above, in which the resurrection forms a key element in the proclamation (Acts 2.38; 3.19; 5.31; 17.30; 26.20). In each of these cases the speaker identifies repentance as the required discipleship response following claims about Jesus' resurrection.

Although the reader is assured that the time of judgement has already been appointed, the consequences of this for individuals remain contingent upon characters' openness to participation through repentance (Lk 7.18-50; 13.1-9; 14.1-24) and in aligning lives to the deeds of repentance—to the priorities of this new reign (Acts 26.20).¹⁷⁹ Some characters

¹⁷⁹ Green refers multiple times to repentance as aligning to God's priorities (Green 1995:35, 37, 70). See also the political imperative Rowe discerns in Acts (Rowe 2009:88-89).

respond wholeheartedly (Lk 5.27-32; 7.44-50; 19.1-10; Acts 2.41; 10.33, 44-48); others hover uncertainly or with hostility (Lk 7.44-46; 15.2; Acts 5.35-39; 17.32; 26.28-32).¹⁸⁰ But even beyond the end of the narrative, as Paul continues to “welcome all who came to him” (Acts 28.30), the possibility of repentance remains open for readers.¹⁸¹

5.3.3 Accounting for suffering in the present

Finally, in contrast to the longing of the writer of 4 Ezra, whose focus on suffering places the current generation immediately prior to the intervention of God, Luke’s presentation of the final period having already begun complicates the understanding of suffering, which he still identifies as a part of life in the generation contemporary to his writing.¹⁸² The suffering of both Jesus and those who follow him mitigates against a triumphalist version of the present.¹⁸³ Luke’s emphasis on the resurrection has been in part the basis for criticism that Luke focuses on *theologia gloriae* at the expense of *crucis*.¹⁸⁴ However, his

¹⁸⁰ See Chapter 5. Even pericopes in which characters respond with hostility tend to come to a close before the character has decided how to respond, for instance Simon the Pharisee’s uncertain position at Lk 7.50 serves to challenge the reader (Crabbe 2011:264).

¹⁸¹ See p.204n.205 on Luke’s audience.

¹⁸² A similar structure to history is evident in the Book of Revelation. The vision of the heavenly court in Rev 4, provides assurance of transcendent authority already in place. Rev 4 and 5 deal with past events, while present events are attributed the status of messianic woes. The interspersed focus on judgement, the messianic age, and a new heaven and new earth (esp. Rev 7; 20-22), provides confidence to readers, with which they may face suffering.

¹⁸³ Schleffer sets out a table that compares Jesus’ predictions of suffering in Lk 21, his own sufferings, and those of the apostles (Scheffler 1993:148-9).

¹⁸⁴ See discussion and examples in Fitzmyer 1981-1985:22-23. Cunningham attributes such views to an over-emphasis on redaction criticism, for which he criticises Conzelmann (Cunningham 1997:17). Moessner similarly refutes the longstanding assumptions by highlighting Luke’s presentation of

theological understanding of suffering is confirmed by the inherent connection between the cross and God's vindication in raising Jesus,¹⁸⁵ which is also God's authoritative vindication of his death (Acts 2.36; 3.13-15). Similarly, rather than triumphalism, Acts 14.22 describes tribulations suffered by the apostles in the time after the resurrection that will yet be vindicated. Luke recognises that suffering exists in the life of the Acts community, as well as in the events that have taken place between the time of the narrative's literary present and Luke's audience's historical present, such as the destruction of Jerusalem (Lk 21.6, 20-21). Even the placement of the exalted Christ at the right of God and the descent of the Spirit into the life of the discipleship community do not preclude the possibility of suffering.

This fits with the assertion that, although the Son of Man is at the right of God, the end will not come immediately (ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος, Lk 21.9).¹⁸⁶ In contrast to claims that Luke's redaction here reflects a delayed parousia, note that Mark and Matthew include "for the end is not yet" (Mk 13.7; Mt 24.6).¹⁸⁷ Thus, Luke's amendment does not *remove*

Jesus in the tradition of OT prophets who suffer, concluding the cross is essential to Luke's understanding of scriptural attestation of the divine plan (Moessner 1996:249).

¹⁸⁵ Bauspieß 2011:140. See also Fitzmyer's reflections on Jesus' promise "Today you will be with me in paradise" (Lk 23.43) in Fitzmyer 1981-1985:1.23.

¹⁸⁶ Jervell connects the unknown timing of the end with claims that Luke "obviously thought that he was living in the last days, although the end was not yet" (Jervell 1984:25). Fitzmyer argues that "the end" in view in 21.9 is the end of Jerusalem, as the focus in the first half of the prophecy, quite separate from the focus on the parousia in the second half (Fitzmyer 1981-1985:2.1327), but this overlooks the explicit way in which Luke takes the reader back to an earlier time in verse 12.

¹⁸⁷ Bauspieß 2011:130.

eschatological interest, but rather reflects this possibility of an ultimate period which has already begun but not yet come to completion, perhaps also made clearer by an appreciation for Luke's periodisation of history. Unlike the additional period for the time of the church Conzelmann identified in Luke/Acts,¹⁸⁸ however, for Luke the decisive event of Jesus' resurrection has prompted the transition into a period which itself is comprised of the end-time events whose continued unfolding is imminently expected.

By recognising the final events of the end of history still to be fulfilled, Luke maintains the kind of dynamic approach to the present which allows for repentance and overcoming the imperfections of present experience, as also in the Jewish texts discussed above, without collapsing his vision of the end into a static picture of the present, as I have argued is the effect in *Aeneid*. Luke's treatment of afflictions, as indeed repentance, confirms that he is not disinterested in the question of the culmination of history. Without designating dates, Luke remains focused on the sudden and unknown nature of the final date (Lk 12.20-21, 35-40, 43-46; cf. Mt 24.42-51, 46-51; 25.1-13), but also its imminence, as discussed above in relation to Lk 21.5-36 and Acts 17.31 (cf. Lk 12.56).¹⁸⁹

Luke's understanding of the pattern of end-time events is consistent with the expectations of the writers of the Jewish texts discussed above, as also is his understanding that events

¹⁸⁸ Conzelmann 1960:135.

¹⁸⁹ Ellis 1974:49; contra Pervo 2009:25.

of the past provide confidence in the decisive divine action promised for the future. But for Luke, the present time is already among the pattern of end-time events, even though history still awaits a final culmination. Indeed, in the fact that these events have already begun in Jesus' resurrection, Luke finds confirmation that the final culmination is not far off.

6. Conclusion: hope, politics, and invitation at the end of history

The relationship between the present and the end of history in a given text has profound consequences for the text's message to those who suffer and the kind of politics it encourages. As set out in Chapter 1, these have been controversial aspects of Lukan theology, flowing in the most part from a particular view of Luke's eschatology, in which interpreters claimed, following Conzelmann, that Luke had removed all imminent eschatological expectation from his account.¹⁹⁰ It is through this lens that the different incidents with civic authorities in Acts (16.35-40; 17.5-9; 18.12-17; 19.35-41) have been interpreted as advocating complicity with ruling authorities,¹⁹¹ rather than due attention

¹⁹⁰ Conzelmann 1960:14, 131-2; Conzelmann 1987:xlvi; This view is also taken in Haenchen 1971:94; Drury 1976:9; Fitzmyer 1981-1985:182-87; and so on. See Chapter 1 above.

¹⁹¹ Walaskay paints Luke as more politically complicit than other early church figures, seeking to present Rome positively to the church, and identifying divine justification for secular rule, which Walaskay links directly to Conzelmann's delayed parousia hypothesis (Walaskay 1983:64-67). See a critical summary of earlier accounts of Luke's politics in Rowe 2009:5-6. See also Walton's summary and evaluation of five types of arguments about Lukan politics he identifies (Walton 2002:2-12, 29-33). Walton advocates a middle way (amicable relationships with authorities but witness to Jesus, p.35) though, despite his focus on the centrality of God's action in Luke's narrative, he does not consider eschatological elements of Luke's politics. See also Bonz's parallels between Lukan politics

being given to the implications of the proclamation of Jesus' lordship and the urgent call for characters and readers to align their priorities with his reign.¹⁹² Similarly, by presuming a schema of extended civic life from which forward-orientated longing for God's final action is deemed absent, interpreters have viewed the proclamation of the resurrection as triumphalist *theologia gloriae*.¹⁹³

However, seen in the context of the discussion above, a writer's depiction of the relationship between the present and the end of history, *and* the character of the present, play significant roles in shaping approaches to politics and suffering. These are important *effects* of a writer's eschatology. It is central for the assurance Luke provides that through Jesus' resurrection the ultimate period of history has been entered, which relativises everything else.¹⁹⁴ And it is also crucial to Luke's account that some movement through human response remains possible. The combination of these features facilitates hope.

and epic themes (Bonz 2000:56-57, 182-83), through which she still, nonetheless, argues the parousia's delay drove Luke's restructuring of the kerygma in this form (p.193).

¹⁹² In contrast to my argument here, Schwartz identifies parallels between 2 Maccabees and Acts in terms of circular history and political stability, see also Schwartz 2009:124. Rowe offers welcome attention to the eschatological features of Luke's politics. He argues that two differing trends in Acts capture on the one hand the claim to divine lordship that relativises all other worldly powers, and on the other the desire to ward off any accusations of insurrection by presenting positive relationships with civic leaders, who in turn declare the innocence of Jesus (Lk 23:47) and Paul (Acts 26:31-32) alike, and that these strands have caused the polarised treatments of Luke's politics (pp.88-89).

¹⁹³ See, for instance, Käsemann 1957:21, and Chapter 1 above.

¹⁹⁴ Drawn out well by Rowe 2009:89.

Where writers equate the completion of history with current political realities an entirely different picture emerges, as in Mannheim's distinction between ideology and utopia.¹⁹⁵ As noted above, according to Mannheim's terminology, 'utopia' reflects a hope yet to be fulfilled beyond current structures, while 'ideology' considers such fulfilment to have been realised already within those worldly structures.¹⁹⁶ Understandably, ideology tends to be associated with the powerful, utopia with the disempowered.¹⁹⁷ In an article in which he draws on Mannheim's approach, Collins captures the explanatory power of this distinction in relation to the politics of apocalypses:

Imperial propagandists and apocalyptic dissenters had similar views of the structure of history—a sequence of transitory kingdoms followed by a definitive rule that would last forever. The crucial difference was one of vantage point and location on the time scale. For the triumphalist, the final kingdom has already arrived; for the visionary the kingdom of the present is passing away. Whether the advent of the final kingdom is imminent or deferred to some time in the future does not make an essential difference so long as the conviction is real that an end to the present order is assured.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁵ Mannheim 1960:36. Mannheim primarily deals with other epistemological and psychological considerations, which may not be of continuing relevance. But his distinction between ideology and utopia supplies a contribution to the current study.

¹⁹⁶ Steven Schweitzer takes a very different view of Acts. Following Roland Boer (and noting the influence of theorist Lyman Sargent), he applies utopian theory to Chronicles. It is through this lens that he approaches Acts, arguing that the Chronicler focuses on maintaining political order, and Luke does likewise in Acts (Schweitzer 2007:131). His brief treatment does not benefit from the kind of insights Rowe has brought to the study of politics in Acts (Rowe 2009), nor deal with eschatological considerations. See also Weinfeld (1983), who applies these ideas on ideology and utopia to various OT strands related to Zion and kingship.

¹⁹⁷ Collins discusses "relative deprivation theory," in which writers' claims of various groups' suffering and disempowerment relates to the groups' own perceptions. He also uses this to reconsider traditional claims that apocalypses arise from situations of crisis (Collins 2002:27-8).

¹⁹⁸ Collins 2002:42.

Collins rightly draws attention to shared views for writers whose schemas of history are periodised and teleological,¹⁹⁹ and the way in which their understandings of the present time in relation to the end shape political perspectives. Virgil's *Aeneid* offers an archetypal version of Mannheim's 'ideology,' in which (despite some more ambiguous or nuanced approaches to the past) the present and future are collapsed into a static continuity, and the ruling empire emerges triumphant. Virgil is not alone in depicting Rome in such a way,²⁰⁰ nor are Christian texts immune; such ideology emerges from later Christian writers of the empire like Eusebius.²⁰¹

By basing readings of Luke/Acts on the delayed parousia hypothesis, however, interpreters have suggested that for Luke the events of the end are not only distant but irrelevant—thereby, I suggest, overlooking key ways in which Luke's understanding of the end shapes his portrayal of the priorities of, and basis for hope in, the present.²⁰² From this perspective it is possible to see that Collins is too ready to endorse a binary distinction between writers who depict the end of history in the present and those who keep it in the

¹⁹⁹ See Chapter 3.

²⁰⁰ Collins notes the inherent difficulties of utopian thinking becoming ideology as revolution leads into political power (Collins 2002:42-43).

²⁰¹ Nobbs claims Acts and Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* share optimistic, triumphalist elements and their "underlying message" (Nobbs 1993:158); my assessment of Luke/Acts here is different.

²⁰² After his extensive overview of Lukan studies on the theme, Bovon argues that according to Luke, "the Parousia, or at least the date of the end, loses its importance. Only the ἀρχή counts. The τέλος, the end, depends on it, not by reason of a historical determinism but rather by theological necessity" (Bovon 2006:85).

future, however distantly.²⁰³ As seen in the discussion above, some writers do maintain a focus on the present which reduces the impact of their expectations about the end of history. Second Maccabees focuses on rescue through divine action *within* history with less concern about the culmination of history aside from post-mortem reward for martyrs, and Josephus exhorts readers to repent from revolutionary dissent in order to create harmonious relationships with Rome until God intervenes at the end of history, according to a divine timetable.²⁰⁴ The affirmations about divine vindication for writers who expect the end imminently, such as the authors of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, offer quite different implications for readers who identify their own experiences with the negative events interpreted as signs of history in decline, or even eschatological woes, and long for the promised end to suffering. Thus, in contrast to Collins's claims, the sense of imminence to the end *does* matter, and most particularly to those who writers imply are suffering in the present.

But it also matters to Luke that the final events of history have already begun and, although the timing of the final culmination remains unknown, as end-time events continue to unfold, it should be constantly anticipated. Stuckenbruck is right to highlight important continuities between NT and contemporaneous Jewish texts in their writers'

²⁰³ Rajak distinguishes between general expectations of the end and belief in its imminence in Jewish millenarian thought (Rajak 2002a:164).

²⁰⁴ Bilde 1998:188.

understandings of the structure of time,²⁰⁵ including a sense of continuity between the kind of assurance offered by NT texts and apocalypses, as well as other texts such as 1QpHab and 1QM. Luke's promise of assurance, which draws on earlier divine acts, sits in continuity with this late Second Temple tradition.

However, there are also important differences in NT texts.²⁰⁶ When Luke has Paul proclaim in Acts 17.31 that "God has set a date on which to have²⁰⁷ the world judged and of this he has given assurance by raising him from the dead," the past event which provides assurance, namely Jesus' resurrection, is a *unique* decisive event. It is analogous to the events anticipated in the War Scroll, where the final battle of the eschatological war constitutes a unique annihilation of evil. Though of course the certainty of this future action in the War Scroll is in turn also based on God's faithful action in the past, it is a different kind of past action—characteristic of God but not decisively named among the events of the end in the same manner as the eschatological war in the War Scroll, or the first person raised from the dead (Acts 26.23), whose resurrection itself constitutes evidence that he has been vindicated by God as the Messiah (Acts 2.24; 3.15) in Luke/Acts.

²⁰⁵ Stuckenbruck 2014a:320-26; Stuckenbruck 2016:145-52. See discussion of continuity versus rupture in the interpretation of understandings of history in the New Testament and contemporaneous Jewish texts in Chapter 3.

²⁰⁶ See p.342n.182 on the Book of Revelation.

²⁰⁷ Or, a date on which "he is about to" have the world judged. See above.

Thus, Jesus' resurrection is *unlike* the military action of Judas Maccabeus, which, though made unstoppable by divine favour, may lead into future times of trial if the people again require disciplining (2 Macc 10.4) until the (distantly anticipated) final resurrection. And, despite some similarities in the dynamic relationship between the present and the future according to Graeco-Roman writers such as Diodorus and Valerius, Luke's understanding of the future addresses a type of definitive action which is unfamiliar to these writers. Again, this demonstrates that those texts with which Luke/Acts shares greatest generic similarity, and with which it is most often compared, are not those with which Luke shares key elements of his conception of history.

Yet, although according to Luke the events of the end have already begun, Luke avoids the triumphalism of *Aeneid* through his characterisation of the present and the continued possibility for change between the present and still further events anticipated. This understanding of the present time in Luke/Acts also overcomes the kind of problematic conclusions Cullmann came to, in which his understanding of what had been achieved by God's decisive action in raising Jesus at the 'mid-point' in time essentially introduced into NT texts a static relationship between the 'mid-point' and the end of history. This meant that, according to Cullmann's interpretation, evil was constrained in the present time, and the events of the end merely constituted paperwork to confirm what was already the

case.²⁰⁸ Cullmann's assessment of these questions in NT salvation history thus edged towards Virgil's interpretation of the end of history.

However, this chapter has demonstrated that a dynamic character to the present is important for a great range of writers, including the ways in which future changes of fortune impact upon present experience and moral imperatives in the other Graeco-Roman texts discussed, as also in the Jewish texts examined. When this dynamic relates to the end of history, a writer's recognition of the need to explain suffering in the present inherently calls final claims into some question. Having compared the structure of time in a range of texts and noted some unique features NT writers introduced, Stuckenbruck concludes: "in relation to evil, the most important point to make is that in the NT, no less than in contemporary Jewish apocalyptic, the solution to the problem of sin and suffering, though presented as definitive, nevertheless remains provisional."²⁰⁹ He rightly highlights that all such frameworks, as they seek to explain evil in the present by looking towards future divine action, ultimately retain a level of provisionality, or partial-realisation, which reflects the need for further change. Despite the post-war criticisms levelled at Luke for being triumphalist, Luke also still communicates that future action remains necessary,

²⁰⁸ Cullmann 1962:xix, 84; Cullmann 1967:169.

²⁰⁹ Stuckenbruck 2016:168.

because the experience in the present remains marred by ongoing experiences of imperfection, including persecution and rejection of the apostles' proclamation.²¹⁰

Nonetheless, urgency underscores this assurance within the final period of history, highlighting further differences between Luke/Acts and some other texts examined. In Luke/Acts, present experience is already qualitatively affected by its position within the final period of history. Though without the kind of political implications of *Aeneid*'s 'ideology,' Jesus' lordship drives Luke's politics even while further change to bring an end to all opposition to this reign is still anticipated. This in turn leads to the central invitation of Luke/Acts. Readers are exhorted to repentance and thereby to aligning their priorities to those of this final reign. In Luke/Acts life is lived conscious of the present time within the final period of history, and with confidence that the end is coming—indeed, the resurrection of Jesus proves that divine action to this *telos* is already underway.

²¹⁰ I refer here to the implied portrait of present suffering (also drawing on the understanding of "relative deprivation," see Collins 2002:28 and p.347n.197 above), rather than relying on historical claims about how widespread any first-century persecution actually was.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

Our experience has made a theology of history suspect for us from the very outset, whatever the reasons may be which are urged in its support. It determined the liberalism whose faith in progress was finally shattered by the First World War. However erroneously and improperly, it was capable of serving as a shield for Nazi eschatology.

—Ernst Käsemann, U.S. Lectures, first delivered in 1965-1966¹

Luke's understanding of the end of history is central to his account. It not only shapes the continuity he sees across the whole course of history, but his portrayal of divine and human agency and of the significance of the present moment in the final period of history. But Lukan eschatology has been obscured by assumptions about the incompatibility of history and eschatology that go back to the mid-twentieth century, compounded by diminished interest in these questions in recent studies. Käsemann's words above speak to the profound concerns that arose from the post-war setting, where salvation history was deemed to reflect a distortion of Jesus' message and so was excluded from portraits of Paul and denounced in readings of Luke/Acts. These particular tensions have lessened in the intervening period, and the contemporary scholarly landscape no longer gives rise to articles like Kümmel's "Current theological accusations against Luke."² But the conclusions of the exegesis in this era remain influential.

¹ Käsemann 1971:64. Käsemann originally gave this paper in a series of lectures in the U.S. in 1965 and 1966, and revised it for publication in *Paulinische Perspektiven* (1969; ET 1971).

² Kümmel 1975a.

This thesis has attempted to offer a fresh approach. In this chapter I outline the study's findings, assess the methodology, and highlight some further implications arising from this thesis for the interpretation of themes related to history and eschatology across the NT.

Luke's eschatology and its effects

This study has shown that Luke's understanding of the end, far from being severed from his understanding of history, is integral to each of the other features of history examined in the thesis. In Chapter 3, I considered the direction and shape of history in the study's key texts and argued that, while the writers of the non-Jewish texts depict different scales of history, at times within an overall trajectory of improvement or decline, most of these writers describe a continuous pattern of rising and falling empires which is not expected to reach an end. By contrast, Virgil's *Aeneid*, all of the Jewish texts, and Luke/Acts indicate a teleological understanding of history—that is a belief that history follows a linear shape that draws to some sort of conclusion at its end.

Moreover, contrary to Conzelmann's hypothesis about the function and uniqueness of Luke's periodised view of salvation history, periodisation is evident in almost all of the texts examined. Indeed, the highly-structured historical reviews of texts such as 4 Ezra

and 2 Baruch demonstrate that periodisation itself does not indicate that a writer views history as severed from eschatology or is uninterested in the imminence of the end. Rather, I suggested that periodisation enables writers to provide a sense of continuity across history in a way which also allows for significant change without *rupture* in history. Luke's periodised, teleological view of history is likewise able to hold history and eschatology together, balancing what Luke considers to be the cataclysmic change brought about by God's action in raising Jesus from the dead with a sense of continuity across the full sweep of history.

In examining evidence of beliefs about determinism and divine guidance of history in the key texts, in Chapter 4 I also noted ways in which Luke's understanding of the end of history shapes his portrayal of divine guidance. Although a variety of writers, including Josephus and the authors of the non-Jewish texts, describe determinism and divine involvement in history through the actions of divine forces like *τύχη/fortuna* or *εἰμάρμενη/fatum*, they do not all use the terms in the same way. My exploration demonstrated that not only are these characteristic terms absent from Luke/Acts, but Luke's understanding of divine guidance is shaped in significant ways by his claims about the end of history: for Luke, divine action is not merely a form of moral accountability or way of explaining unpredictable changes of fortune in human experience, but the basis for assurance about the end.

Differences in the role of prophecy in the key texts also relate to the writers' portrayals of the end of history (or lack thereof). For writers like Valerius Maximus or Diodorus Siculus, prophetic insights confirm that a predicted event (which also took place prior to writing) was set in advance. Whereas, for the writers of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and Luke/Acts, accurate prophecies in the past confirm the accuracy of prophecy *yet to be fulfilled*. However, Luke's understanding of the divine βουλή and even his use of the term δεῖ, are also different from the elements of determinism in 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and the War Scroll. For Luke, the divine βουλή can be opposed, as evidenced by numerous events of the past and present, exemplified in the rejection of Jesus and those who proclaim his resurrection. But, looking to the future, the divine βουλή remains the basis of the assurance that, just as God and God's prophets foresaw this rejection, so will divine action adapt to ensure that the events of the end will certainly unfold as promised.

These conclusions led directly into the discussion of Chapter 5, in which I examined the ways in which the writers of this study's key texts portrayed the relationship between divine and human agency, in order to illuminate Luke's understanding of human culpability and freedom. Interacting with John Barclay's helpful framework for modelling the relationship between divine and human agency,³ I advocated extending the framework to include appreciation for temporal orientation. The textual analysis indicated differences in the ways the writers attribute events to divine sovereignty and

³ Barclay 2008:6-7.

responsibility, or human freedom and culpability, depending on whether writers were seeking to *explain the events of the past* or *provide hope for the future*. I also observed that many of the texts made clear distinctions between ‘opponent’ and ‘protagonist’ characters in portrayals of culpability and freedom. By contrast, Luke explains negative events in the past as the result of tragic opposition, maintaining a notable appreciation for human freedom exercised in the choices of almost all characters. And when Luke looks to the future, an (urgent) universal invitation confirms the human freedom for all to respond positively, though repentance itself is also portrayed as a divine gift.

Finally, in Chapter 6 I examined the writers’ portrayals of the present and the end of history and the relationship between the two. I noted the ways in which possible change in the future contributes a dynamic element to the present time even for writers who do not anticipate an end to history, facilitating either comfort or challenge in response to a reader’s present experience. The structure of history in the Jewish texts confirmed a similar dynamic for life in the present, whereas Virgil’s static alignment of the *telos* of history with the present has a quite different effect, prompting a kind of ‘ideology’ over ‘utopia’ which limits the possibilities for hope in the present.⁴

Thus, the structure of history in Luke/Acts is most similar to that in the Jewish texts, where assurance of the past provides confidence in the end, and some final events are still

⁴ Cf. Mannheim 1960:36.

anticipated. However, while the late Second Temple writers locate the present time at different points within the pattern of events anticipated at the end of history (and 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch even identify current events with the eschatological woes), none place the present after such decisive events as the presence of the messiah or the first one raised from the dead. In Luke/Acts, Jesus' resurrection, the presence of the Spirit, and the location of the ascended Christ all confirm that the final period of history has begun. Nonetheless, despite the possible similarities between *Aeneid* and Luke/Acts, both of which locate the present in the final period of history, the character of the present causes their eschatologies to function in starkly different ways. By exploring the extent to which the end of history is already realised in the present and the static or dynamic character of the present, this analysis demonstrated that *both* of these elements are essential for understanding how eschatology functions in Luke/Acts.

Together these features facilitate hope and bring about crucial *effects* of Luke's eschatology. The possibility of future change at the culmination of history reassures those who suffer (unlike Luke's alleged *theologia gloriae*), whereas Jesus' presence already at the right of God relativises other political claims (contrary to concerns about political complicity). Indeed, I suggest the frequent failure to consider Luke's understanding of the present and the end of history in studies of Luke's politics has led to misrepresentations of his politics.

Therefore, I suggest, Luke's understanding of the *end* of history is essential to his conception of history. In each of these areas, Luke's eschatological consciousness shapes his text in crucial ways: divine faithfulness in the past confirms that divine guidance governs all of history, including its end, even as the unstoppable divine βουλή adapts to the tragic consequences of opposition. Contrary to Conzelmann's reading, in which the end has become so distant as to be irrelevant, Luke's attention to the end provides assurance of the culmination of faithful divine action and underscores the urgency of human response. To Luke, from his perspective within the final period of history, the end-time events leading to judgement are already underway.

Assessment of method

The methodology employed in this thesis is based on my argument that numerous features of a text—such as those that reflect the writer's understanding of history and its end, and portrayal of divine and human agency in history—*transcend genre*. Just as ancient writers do not have to write philosophical treatises in order to hold Stoic beliefs about the world and for these to impact on their writing, a writer does not need to be a historian in order to hold a view about divine involvement in history or expectations about the end of history. It remains important to attend to the generic features of a text, which create a framework of expectations for competent contemporaneous readers, and thus shape their interpretations. But ancient writers may communicate their particular beliefs on topics

like the end of history as they write in any one of a variety of genres. Given this study's focus, therefore, I have argued that it is not only possible but *necessary* to engage in cross-genre comparison, in order to fill out the set of beliefs about these themes evident in Luke's broader context.

In assessing this method in practice, I wish to make three principal observations. (1) By comparing Luke/Acts to ten texts of the Graeco-Roman period (five Jewish and five non-Jewish) from a range of genres—including historiography, epic, and apocalypse—this study has shown that it is possible and effective to compare such diverse texts on their writers' depictions of the shape and direction of history, divine guidance of history, human freedom and culpability, and the relationship between the end of history and the present time. That is, it is possible and effective to compare diverse texts in relation to features that transcend genre. (2) This method has demonstrated that on these important topics, Luke/Acts holds more in common with texts of other genres than the Graeco-Roman historiographies which share its genre. This is particularly important, given the tendency in recent Lukan studies (which is less marked in studies of other parts of the NT) to limit comparison texts to those which interpreters identify as the same genre as Luke/Acts, even when dealing with a theological theme such as the presentation of the divine or the nature of the divine plan in Luke/Acts.

(3) Finally, the broad sample of comparison texts enabled the study to counter the tendency to find (or dismiss) parallels between texts when considering a more limited set of texts. Indeed, the history of interpretation of Luke/Acts since the mid-twentieth century can be expressed in part as a series of consequences arising from the kinds of decisions interpreters have made about comparison texts. Conzelmann's redaction-critical approach led him to overstate Luke's uniqueness in relation to the other synoptic Gospels,⁵ as Vielhauer's treatment of Luke and Paul had also accentuated differences between these two biblical writers.⁶ Combined with a set of assumptions about the way in which eschatological consciousness changed over the first generations of disciples, the portrait that emerged from these studies emphasised only Luke's *difference*.

More recent studies, inspired by Luke's style and linguistic skills, have likewise assumed Luke's difference from the other Evangelists, and limited comparisons to (generally) other Hellenistic historiographies, or biographies. As interpreters have made claims about the ways in which these comparisons have illuminated Luke/Acts, they have tended to focus on rhetorical devices or themes they consider the texts to share, excluding other themes from the field of vision and overstating the similarities between Luke/Acts and the non-Jewish Graeco-Roman texts.

⁵ Conzelmann 1960.

⁶ Vielhauer 1950-1951.

By contrast, the broad range of texts considered as detailed case studies in this thesis has enabled greater sensitivity in comparisons. For instance, aside from Virgil's approach in *Aeneid*, none of the non-Jewish writers were found to portray a teleological view of history—which is crucially important for considering Luke's understanding of history. However, almost all of the study's writers portrayed history as periodised in some form. The study has also shown that there are important ways in which an understanding of the human capacity to contribute to divine πρόνοια, as suggested by Diodorus Siculus, might illuminate Luke's understanding of human participation in the βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ, while the overall structure of history in texts such as 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, in which the events of the past provide confidence in divine action for events promised in the future, comes closest to Luke's understanding of assurance for future hope.

Therefore, I suggest that the method employed in this study has been effective. By extending the comparison to a wider range of texts, it has built up a fuller picture of ways of thinking about history, or relevant 'mental tools,' available in Luke's setting. In so doing, the analysis has supported a more nuanced portrait of the similarities and differences between these texts and Luke/Acts in relation to the features of their writers' underlying understandings of history.

As noted in setting out the study, inevitably any selection of comparison texts will be limited. Given constraints on the number of ancient sources with which the study could

engage effectively, other NT texts were excluded from detailed study, recognising also that they had been the focus of previous studies. However, I believe these findings in relation to history and eschatology in Luke/Acts and the Jewish and non-Jewish literature from his broader context would likewise illuminate assumptions about the relationship between history and eschatology in other NT texts. Future research could contribute positively by employing the same methodology but also incorporating some key NT texts as well as a mix of Jewish and non-Jewish texts, to illuminate how closely Luke/Acts reflects the understanding of history in other NT texts. Indeed, the issues that drove post-war assumptions in Lukan studies reflect tensions that run throughout NT interpretation.

Salvation history and post-war concerns

As noted in Chapter 1, François Bovon identified “history and eschatology” as the beginning of “everything” in his analysis of Lukan scholarship in the second half of the twentieth century.⁷ In so many ways he is, of course, right. But the prior question about *why* these themes became the beginning of such fraught debate in Lukan studies demonstrates the crucial impact of the post-war context upon the complex of issues considered in this thesis, and underscores why this study’s reconsideration of Lukan eschatology, in light of the enduring influence of scholarship from that era in particular,

⁷ Bovon 2006:11.

has been necessary. It also highlights further areas for exploration that touch on these big picture topics in NT studies.

Käsemann's lecture, cited above, reflects on the reasons why interpreters of Romans had viewed justification and salvation history as antitheses, the latter being associated with "a conception of salvation history which broke in on us in secularised and political form with the Third Reich and its ideology."⁸ Conzelmann's influential thesis is grounded in the same powerful worry about salvation history, seen as a distortion of the kerygma.⁹ Similar concerns shine through other treatments, like Helmut Flender's emphasis on the transcendence of the kingdom inaugurated by Jesus' ascension, as an emphatic counter to the "false sacralisation of history."¹⁰ Mid-twentieth-century secular philosophy of history shows the same anxiety about "Meaning in History" in response to the war.¹¹ And even Oscar Cullmann's choice of military imagery tied to particular historical events—"D-day" and "V-day"—to describe God's decisive action, in Christ and at the end of history, itself seems, to a contemporary reader, extraordinary.¹² It is perhaps no wonder that Cullmann elicited criticism from Barth,¹³ using historical events as an analogy for divine action—and

⁸ Käsemann 1971:64.

⁹ Conzelmann 1960. See also Conzelmann 1952; Conzelmann 1966; Conzelmann 1987.

¹⁰ Flender 1967:106. See also Drury 1976:12.

¹¹ Löwith's approach in his book of this title (Löwith 1949), as well as his autobiographical reflections in *My life in Germany before and After 1933* (Löwith 1994), demonstrate the entanglement of influences in the post-war context and approaches to history.

¹² Cullmann 1962:xix, 84.

¹³ Cullmann 1962:xxv.

such complex and harrowing events at that. But the salience of wartime imagery for Cullmann offers a telling reminder of the impact of the setting upon these interpreters.

Intellectual tensions about salvation history run in different directions through NT scholarship. It is not the task of this thesis to delve further into the mid-twentieth-century setting and its divergent influence upon the interpretation of texts like Romans or Galatians, or assumptions about the ‘early catholic’ tendencies of NT texts attributed to later generations of disciples—though I hope that this discussion has demonstrated the need for further reflection on this. Perhaps particularly in relation to later texts dubbed ‘early catholic,’ these questions arising from mid-twentieth-century assumptions have been less often considered. But it is important to emphasise that this pattern of assumptions about Luke/Acts fits into a broader post-war cultural context, and a set of presuppositions about the relationships between NT texts. Although new interpretative methods have been employed in Lukan studies since, recent commentaries, introductory textbooks, and even specialised studies on other Lukan topics have nonetheless frequently maintained the same core assumptions about Luke’s setting and de-eschatologising tendencies.

History and eschatology may have been issues at the heart of a new and influential era in Lukan interpretation, as Bovon argues. But *also*, from the beginning, it was a caricatured portrayal of the contrasts between Paul and Luke which emphasised history over

eschatology in the latter, and drove further conclusions about the *effects* of Luke's (allegedly absent) eschatological consciousness, such as culpably comfortable politics and *theologia gloriae*.

This thesis has attempted a new approach to the question of Lukan eschatology. The study has shown that in Luke/Acts, as in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, and even Josephus's *Jewish War*, history and eschatology go together. The past confirms continuity with the end. Moreover, for Luke, negative events of the past are attributed to the tragic choices of humans who reject the divine plan, even as God enabled the prophets to foresee that they would. But the dynamic divine plan cannot be stopped. As opposition to this plan has already been transformed, so may readers be assured that the promised events yet to be fulfilled will certainly take place. Yet, even within the final period of history, the present time provides further opportunity for change and grounds for hope that current suffering will yet be brought to an end. Therefore, humans in the present are called to align themselves urgently with the priorities of the kingdom and to recognise the lordship of the one who is already at the right of God. Time is running short, which makes this message one of comfort and of challenge. Indeed, the resurrection of Jesus confirms that divine action to the final culmination is already underway:

While God has overlooked the times of human ignorance, now he commands all people everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will have the world judged in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead. (Acts 17.30-31)

Bibliography

- Adams, Edward. 2007. *The Stars Will Fall from Heaven: Cosmic Catastrophe in the New Testament and its World*. LNTS, 347. London: T&T Clark.
- Adams, Sean A. 2013. *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography*. SNTSMS. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ahl, Frederick. 2007. *Virgil, Aeneid: A New Translation*. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexander, Loveday. 1993. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1*. SNTSMS, 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2007. "Reading Luke-Acts from Back to Front." Pages 207-29 in *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay. JSNTSup, 298. London: T&T Clark. Original edition, 1999.
- Alexander, Phillip S. 2003. "The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome." Pages 17-31 in *Emmanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields. VTSup, 94. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Alter, Robert. 2011. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. Revd ed. New York: Basic Books. Original edition, 1981.
- Ashton, John. 2013. "Intimations of Apocalyptic: Looking Back and Looking Forward." Pages 3-35 in *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and Catrin H. Williams. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Attridge, Harold W. 1976. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. HDR, 7. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for Harvard Theological Review.
- . 1986. "Jewish Historiography." Pages 311-43 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. BMI, 2. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Aune, David E. 2013. "Genre Theory and the Genre-Function of Mark and Matthew." Pages 25-56 in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity: Collected Essays II*. Edited by David E. Aune. WUNT, 303. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Austin, R. G. 1977. *P. Vergili Maronis, Aeneidos: Liber Sextus*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bachmann, Veronika. 2014. "More Than the Present: Perspectives on World History in 4 Ezra and *The Book of the Watchers*." Pages 3-21 in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski. LSTS, 87. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Bailey, D. R. Shackleton. 2000. *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*. 2 vols, LCL, 492-93. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press.
- Ballard, Paul H. 1972. "Reasons for Refusing the Great Supper." *JTS* 23 (2): 341-50.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds. 1990-1993. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1997. "Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis." Pages 271-81 in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Edited by Charles Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barclay, John M. G. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bibliography

- _____. 2008. "Introduction." Pages 1-8 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole. T&T Clark Biblical Studies. London/New York: T&T Clark. Original edition, 2006.
- _____. 2015. *Paul and the Gift*. vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Barr, James. 1969. *Biblical Words for Time*. 2nd revd. ed. SBT, 33. London: SCM. Original edition, 1962.
- _____. 2000. *History and Ideology in the Old Testament: Biblical Studies at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barreto, Eric D. 2010. *Ethnic Negotiations: The Function of Race and Ethnicity in Acts 16*. WUNT 2, 294. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1979. "Theologia Crucis—in Acts?" Pages 73-84 in *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Carl Andresen and Günter Klein. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- _____. 1994-1998. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. 2002. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Shorter Commentary*. London/New York: T&T Clark.
- Barton, John. 2002. *The Biblical World*. 2 vols. London: Routledge.
- Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gringrich. 2000. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3d. ed. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Bauspieß, Martin. 2011. "Die Gegenwart des Heils und das Ende der Zeit: Überlegungen zur lukanischen Eschatologie im Anschluss an Lk 22,66-71 und Apg 7,54-60." Pages 125-48 in *Eschatologie—Eschatology: The Sixth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Eschatology in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, September, 2009)*. Edited by Hans-Joachim Eckstein, Christof Landmesser and Hermann Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- _____. 2012. *Geschichte und Erkenntnis im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu einer christlichen Perspektive auf Geschichte*. Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte, 42. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Ben Zeev, Miriam Pucci. 1996. "Polybius, Josephus, and the Capitol in Rome." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 27 (1): 21-30.
- Bergren, Theodore A. 1996. "Christian Influence on the Transmission History of 4, 5, and 6 Ezra." Pages 102-27 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. CRINT, 4. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Berthelot, Katell. 2011. "Philo's Perception of the Roman Empire." *JSJ* 42 (2): 166-87.
- Bilde, Per. 1988. *Flavius Josephus, between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance*. JSPSup, 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- _____. 1998. "Josephus and Jewish Apocalypticism." Pages 35-61 in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*. Edited by Steve Mason. JSPSup, 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Bizzarro, Laura. 2014. "The 'Meaning of History' in the Fifth Vision of 4 Ezra." Pages 32-38 in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski. LSTS, 87. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Bloomer, W. Martin. 1992. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. London: Duckworth.
- Bobzien, Susanne. 1998. *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. 1991. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress.
- _____. 2008. "Inner-Jewish Debate on the Tension between Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 9-26 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole. T&T Clark Biblical Studies. London/New York: T&T Clark. Original edition, 2006.

- Bock, Darrell L. 2011. *A Theology of Luke and Acts: God's Promised Program, Realised for All Nations*. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. 1990. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 2, 36. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- _____. 2010. "Why not Let Acts be Acts? In Conversation with C. Kavin Rowe." Pages 70-73 in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Edited by Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- _____. 2012. "Creatio ex nihilo in Palestinian Judaism and Early Christianity." *SJT* 65 (3): 253-70.
- _____. 2015. "The Gospels on the Presence of Jesus." Pages 87-102 in *The Oxford Handbook of Christology*. Edited by Francesca Aran Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonz, Marianne Palmer. 2000. *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Bovon, François. 2002-2013. *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas, Donald S. Deer and James Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress. Original edition, 1989-2009, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 4 vols, EKKNT, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- _____. 2006. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950-2005)*. 2nd Revd ed. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Brandenburger, Egon. 1981. *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen: Das literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches*. ATANT, 68. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Braun, Willi. 1995. *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*. SNTSMS, 85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braund, S. H. 1992. *Lucan, Civil War: Translated with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Braund, Susanna Morton. 1997. "Virgil and the Cosmos: Religious and Philosophical Ideas." Pages 204-21 in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Edited by Charles Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruce, F. F. 1982. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. WBC, 45. Waco: Word.
- _____. 1988. *The Book of Acts*. Revised ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Brueggemann, Walter. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. 1952-1955. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. London: SCM. Original edition, 1948-1953, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 3 vols., Tübingen: Mohr.
- _____. 1957. *History and Eschatology*. The Gifford Lectures 1955. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Burke, Peter. 1999. "Strengths and Weaknesses of the History of Mentalities." Pages 442-56 in *The Annales School: Critical Assessments*. Edited by Stuart Clark. 4 vols. vol. 2. London: Routledge. Original edition, 1986, in *History of European Ideas*, 7.5: 439-51.
- Burridge, Richard. 1992. *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. SNTSMS, 70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, Anne. 1972. *Diodorus Siculus, Book I: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Busse, Ulrich. 2011. "Eschatologie in der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 141-78 in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. WUNT 2, 315. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Byrne, Brendan. 2000. *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel*. Strathfield: St Pauls Publications.
- Cadbury, Henry J. 1956. "Acts and Eschatology." Pages 300-21 in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1958. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK. Original edition, 1927, New York: Macmillan.

Bibliography

- Campbell, Douglas A. 2009. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Cancik, Hubert. 1997. "The History of Culture, Religion, and Institutions in Ancient Historiography: Philological Observations Concerning Luke's History." *JBL* 116 (4): 673-95.
- _____. 1998. "The End of the World, of History, and of the Individual in Greek and Roman Antiquity." Pages 84-125 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. vol. 1, *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Continuum.
- Carroll, John T. 1988. *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS, 92. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- _____. 2012. *Luke: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Carter, C. J. 1975. "Valerius Maximus." Pages 26-56 in *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin II*. Edited by T. A. Dorey. Greek and Latin Studies, Classical Literature and its Influence. London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chandler, Daniel. *An Introduction to Genre Theory* (Revd), 2000, 1997. Available from http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/intgenre/chandler_genre_theory.pdf.
- Chandler, Daniel, and Rod Munday. 2011. "Genre." in *A Dictionary of Media and Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chartier, Roger. 1988. *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Cambridge: Polity.
- Childs, Brevard S. 2001. *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox.
- Clark, Gillian. 2010. "Paradise for Pagans? Augustine on Virgil, Cicero, and Plato." Pages 166-78 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, Katherine. 2008. *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, Ralph. 2003. "Introduction." *New Literary History* 34 (2): v-xv.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. 1982. "Polybius, Jeremiah, and Josephus." *History and Theory* 21 (3): 366-81.
- Collins, John J. 1975. "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 25 (3): 596-612.
- _____. 1979a. "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14: 1-19.
- _____. 1979b. "Short Notes: Dualism and Eschatology in 1 QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies." *VT* 29 (2): 212-15.
- _____. 1987. "Messianism in the Maccabean Period." Pages 97-109 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1993. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- _____. 1995. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday.
- _____. 1997. "Expectations of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 74-90 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. 2002. "Temporality and Politics in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 26-43 in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and John Barton. JSPSup, 43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Conzelmann, Hans. 1952. "Zur Lukasanalyse." *ZTK* 49 (1): 16-33.

- _____. 1960. *The Theology of St Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber. Original edition, 1954, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. BHT, 17. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- _____. 1966. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." Pages 298-316 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press.
- _____. 1987. *Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress. Original edition, 1963, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, HNT, 7, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. 1984. "The Divine Δ EI in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence." *NovT* 26 (2): 168-90.
- Crabbe, Kylie. 2011. "A Sinner and A Pharisee: Challenge at Simon's Table in Luke 7:36-50." *Pacifica* 24 (3): 247-66.
- _____. 2015. "Being Found Fighting Against God: Luke's Gamaliel and Josephus on Human Responses to Divine Providence." *ZNW* 106 (1): 21-39.
- _____. 2016, *forthcoming*. "Accepting Prophecy: Paul's response to Agabus with Insights from Valerius Maximus and Josephus." *JSNT* 39 (2).
- Culler, Jonathan D. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cullmann, Oscar. 1962. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Revd ed. London: SCM. Original edition, 1946, *Christus und die Zeit: Die urchristliche Zeit- und Geschichtsauffassung*, Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer verlag.
- _____. 1967. *Salvation in History*. Translated by Sidney G. Sowers. London: SCM. Original edition, 1965, *Heil als Geschichte*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Cunningham, Scott. 1997. "Through Many Tribulations": *The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. JSNTSup, 142. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Darr, John A. 1995. "Review of John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 76; Cambridge/New York/Oakleigh: Cambridge University, 1993). Pp. x + 233 N.P." *CBQ* 57 (1): 191-92.
- _____. 1998. "Irenic or Ironic? Another Look at Gamaliel before the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:33-42)." Pages 121-40 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Davies, G. I. 1978a. "Apocalyptic and Historiography." *JSOT* 5: 15-28.
- Davies, Philip R. 1978b. "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll." *VT* 28 (1): 28-36.
- _____. 1980. "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder." *VT* 30 (1): 93-97.
- _____. 1985. "Eschatology at Qumran." *JBL* 104 (1): 39-55.
- _____. 1990. "Qumran and Apocalyptic or Obscurum per Obscurius." *JNES* 49 (2): 127-134.
- _____. 1992. *In Search of "Ancient Israel"*. JSOTSup, 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. 2000a. "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 189-212 in *Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Late Antiquity*. Edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner. *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 4. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2000b. "War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness." Pages 965-68 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, James C. VanderKam and Philip R. Davies. 2 vols. vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dibelius, Martin. 1956. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: SCM. Original edition, 1951, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, FRLANT, 60, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Dick, Bernard F. 1967. "Fatum and Fortuna in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*." *Classical Philology* 62 (4): 235-42.

Bibliography

- Dicken, Frank. 2014. *Herod as a Composite Character in Luke-Acts*. WUNT 2, 375. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dimant, Devorah. 2011. "Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema." Pages 235-56 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref. STDJ, 93. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2013. "4 Ezra and 2 Baruch in Light of Qumran Literature." Pages 31-61 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction After the Fall*. Edited by Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 164. Leiden: Brill.
- Dodds, E. R. 1973. *The Ancient Concept of Progress and Other Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Donahue, J. R. 1989. "Two Decades of Research on the Rich and the Poor in Luke-Acts." Pages 129-44 in *Justice and the Holy*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight. Atlanta: Harrelson.
- Doran, Robert. 1979. "2 Maccabees and 'Tragic History'." *HUCA* 50: 107-14.
- _____. 1999. "Independence or Co-existence: The Responses of 1 and 2 Maccabees to Seleucid Hegemony." Pages 94-103 in *Society of Biblical Literature, 1999 Seminar Papers*. SBLSPS, 38. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- _____. 2012. *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Doty, William G. 1972. "The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis." Pages 413-48 in *Seminar Papers: The Society of Biblical Literature, 108th Annual Meeting*. Edited by Lane C. McGaughey. Missoula, MT: SBL Press.
- Dräger, Paul. 2002. "Ananke." Pages 642 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. vol. 1. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Dreyer, Boris. 2007. "Polybius." Pages 495-503 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. vol. 11. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Drury, John. 1976. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Dubrow, Heather. 1982. *Genre. The Critical Idiom*, 42. London/New York: Methuen.
- Dunn, James D. G. 2009. "The Book of Acts as Salvation History." Pages 385-401 in *Heil und Geschichte: die Geschichtsbezogenheit des Heils und das Problem der Heilsgeschichte in der biblischen Tradition und in der theologischen Deutung*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Stefan Krauter and Hermann Lichtenberger. WUNT, 248. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Eckstein, Arthur M. 1995. *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius*. Hellenistic Culture and Society, 16. London: University of California Press.
- Edelstein, Ludwig. 1967. *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.
- Edwards, Mark. 2006. "Gospel and Genre: Some Reservations." Pages 51-62 in *The Limits of Ancient Biography*. Edited by Brian McGing and Judith Mossman. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- Edwards, Mark W. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. vol. 5: *Books 17-20*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ego, Beate. 2007. "God's Justice. The 'Measure for Measure' Principle in 2 Maccabees." Pages 141-54 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology, Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 118. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Eliade, Mircea. 2005. *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Cosmos and History*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Bollingen Series, 46. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press. Original edition, 1949, *Le mythe de l'éternel retour: archétypes et répétition*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Elliott, Gregory. 2008. *Ends in Sight: Marx/Fukuyama/Hobsbawm/Anderson*. London: Pluto Press.

- Ellis, E. Earle. 1972a. "Eschatology in Luke." Pages 105-19 in *Eschatology in Luke*. FBBS, 30. Philadelphia: Fortress. Original edition, 1969, 'Die Funktion der Eschatologie im Lukasevangelium,' ZTK 66: 387-402.
- _____. 1972b. "Eschatology in Luke Revisited." Pages 120-28 in *Eschatology in Luke*. FBBS, 30. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- _____. 1972c. "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke." Pages 129-46 in *Eschatology in Luke*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis. FBBS, 30. Philadelphia: Fortress. Original edition, 1965, NTS 12 (1): 27-41.
- _____. 1974. *The Gospel of Luke*. Rev. ed. NCB. London: Oliphants. Original edition, 1966.
- _____. 2001. "The End of the Earth (Acts 1:8)." Pages 53-63 in *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*. BibInt, 54. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Elvers, Karl-Ludwig. 2008. "Strabo." Pages 865-69 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. vol. 13. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Emmrich, Martin. 2013. *At the Heart of Luke: Wisdom and Reversal of Fortune*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. 2010. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Craig A. 1989. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. JSOTSup, 64. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Fairclough, H. R., and G. P. Goold. 1999. *Virgil: With English Translation*. Revd ed. 2 vols. LCL, 63-64. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Fantham, Elaine. 2007. "Introduction." Pages xi-xlv in *Virgil, Aeneid: A New Translation*. Edited by Frederick Ahl. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farahian, Edmond. 1991. "Paul's Vision at Troas (Acts 16:9-10)." Pages 197-207 in *Luke and Acts*. Edited by Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi. New York: Paulist.
- Farrell, Joseph. 2003. "Classical Genre in Theory and Practice." *New Literary History* 34 (3): 383-408.
- Fascher, Erich. 1954. "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ." Pages 228-54 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann.
- Febvre, Lucien. 1982. *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: The Religion of Rabelais*. Translated by Beatrice Gottlieb. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press. Original edition, 1942, *Le problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle: la religion de Rabelais*, Paris: Michel.
- Fee, Gordon D. 2009. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Feeney, D. C. 1986. "History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld." *Proceedings of the Classical Philological Society* 32: 1-24.
- _____. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Feldman, Louis H. 1998. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 58. Leiden: Brill.
- Fishbane, Michael A. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981-1985. *The Gospel According to Luke: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 2 vols. AB, 28 & 28A. New York/London: Doubleday.
- _____. 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles*. AB, 31. New York: Doubleday.
- Flannery Dailey, Frances. 1999. "Non-Linear Time in Apocalyptic Texts: The Spiral Model." Pages 231-45 in *Society of Biblical Literature, 1999 Seminar Papers*. SBLSPS, 38. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Bibliography

- Flender, Helmut. 1967. *St Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller and Ilse Fuller. London: SPCK. Original edition, 1965, *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*, BZET, 41, Erlangen: Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
- Foakes Jackson, F.J., Kirsopp Lake, James Hardy Ropes, and Henry J. Cadbury. 1920-1933. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1, The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. London: Macmillan.
- Fowler, Alastair. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. 2003. "The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After." *New Literary History* 34 (2): 185-200.
- Francis, F. O. 1969. "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts." *JAAR* 37: 49-63.
- Franke, Thomas, and Egon Flaig. 2009. "Tacitus." Pages 105-12 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. vol. 14. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Franklin, Eric. 1970. "The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts." *SJT* 23 (2): 191-200.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Fusco, Vittorio. 1991. "Problems of Structure in Luke's Eschatological Discourse (Luke 21:7-36)." Pages 72-92 in *Luke and Acts*. Edited by Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi. New York: Paulist Press.
- Galinsky, Karl. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- García Martínez, Florentino. 1998. "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 162-92 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. vol. 1: *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Continuum.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 1997. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. 2003. *Acts*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon.
- _____. 2013. *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5-8*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. 1987. "How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the "Messianic" Promises." Pages 69-96 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottlieb, Gunther. 1998. "Religion in the Politics of Augustus, (*Aeneid* 1.278-91, 8.714-23, 12.791-842)." Pages 21-36 in *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*. Edited by Hans-Peter Stahl. London: Duckworth.
- Goulder, M. D. 1964. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK.
- Gowler, David B. 1991. *Host, Guest, Enemy and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity, 2. New York: P. Lang.
- Grabbe, Lester L. 2000. "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus." Pages 163-85 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part Four: Death, Life-after-death, Resurrection and the World-to-come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner. HdO. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- _____. 2007. *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* London: T&T Clark.
- Grässer, E. 1979. "Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 99-127 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie*. Edited by Jacob Kremer. BETL. Gembloux/Leuven: J. Duculot/Leuven University Press. Original edition, 1957.
- Gray, Rebecca. 1993. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, Anna. 2007. *Cultural History. Theory and History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Green, Joel B. 1995. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- _____. 1996. "Internal Repetition in Luke-Acts: Contemporary Narratology and Lucan Historiography." Pages 283-99 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, Joel B., and Michael C. McKeever. 1994. *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography*. IBR Bibliographies, 8. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Gregory, Andrew. 2007. "The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts." *JSNT* 29 (4): 459-72.
- Gregory, Andrew, and C. Kavin Rowe. 2010. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Grethlein, Jonas. 2013. *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: "Futures Past" from Herodotus to Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, Miriam T. 2009. "Tacitus as a Historian." Pages 168-83 in *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*. Edited by A. J. Woodman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gruen, Erich S. 2011. "Polybius and Josephus on Rome." Pages 149-62 in *Flavius Josephus: Interpretation and History*. Edited by Jack Pastor, Pnina Stern and Menahem Mor. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 146. Leiden: Brill.
- Gunkel, Hermann. 1990. "Das vierte Buch Esra." Pages 331-402 in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des alten Testaments*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. vol. 2. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. 2014. "Eschatological Rewards for the Righteous in 2 Baruch." Pages 107-15 in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski. LSTS, 87. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Haaland, Gunnar. 2007. "What Difference Does Philosophy Make? The Three Schools as a Rhetorical Device in Josephus." Pages 262-88 in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*. Edited by Zuleika Rodgers. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 110. Leiden: Brill.
- Haenchen, Ernst. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn and R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Original edition, 1955, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hakola, Raimo. 2009. "'Friendly' Pharisees and Social Identity in Acts." Pages 181-200 in *Contemporary Studies in Acts*. Edited by Thomas E. Phillips. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Hall, R. G. 1991. *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography*. JSPSup, 6. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Hanks, William F. 1987. "Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice." *American Ethnologist* 14: 668-92.
- Hanneken, Todd R. 2012. *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees*. EJL. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harnisch, Wolfgang. 1969. *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte: Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4. Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse*. FRLANT, 97. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Harrington, Daniel J. 1988. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution*. OTS, 1. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier.
- Harrison, S. J. 1990. "Some Views of the Aeneid in the Twentieth Century." Pages 1-20 in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Edited by S. J. Harrison. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2011. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Original edition, 2007.
- Hau, Lisa Irene. 2009. "The Burden of Good Fortune in Diodorus of Sicily: A Case for Originality?" *Historia* 58 (2): 171-97.
- Hays, Christopher M. 2010. *Luke's Wealth Ethics: A Study in their Coherence and Character*. WUNT 2, 275. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bibliography

- Hegel, G. W. F. 2011. *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*. Translated by Robert F. Brown and Peter C. Hodgson. vol. 1: *Manuscripts of the Introduction and the Lectures of 1822-1823*. Oxford: Reinhold Hoffmann.
- Hejduk, Julia Dyson. 2009. "Ovid and Religion." Pages 45-58 in *A Companion to Ovid*. Edited by Peter E. Knox. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Chichester, UK/Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hengel, Martin. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. 2 vols. London: SCM. Original edition, 1973, *Judentum und Hellenismus, Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mittes des 2 Jh.s v. Chr.* WUNT, 10, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Hengel, Martin, and in Collaboration with Christoph Marksches. 1989. *The 'Hellenization' of Judea in the First Century after Christ*. Translated by John Bowden. London; Philadelphia: SCM; Trinity Press International.
- Henze, Matthias. 2008. "Torah and Eschatology in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." Pages 201-15 in *Themes in Biblical Narrative, The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Hindy Najman. Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2011. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hernadi, Paul. 1972. *Beyond Genre: New Directions in Literary Classification*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hill, Charles E. 2001. *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Hobbins, John F. 2001. "Resurrection in the Daniel Tradition and Other Writings at Qumran." Pages 395-420 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. vol. 2. VTSup, 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Hogan, Karina Martin. 2008. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 130. Boston: Brill.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 2013. *Virgil, »Aeneid« 6: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Jeffrey, David Lyle. 2012. *Luke*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos/Baker.
- Jervell, Jacob. 1984. *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- _____. 1996. "The Future of the Past: Luke's Vision of Salvation History and its Bearing on his Writing of History." Pages 104-26 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2002. "The Divided People of God: The Restoration of Israel and the Salvation of the Gentiles." Pages 41-74 in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock. Original edition, 1965.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1991. *The Gospel of Luke*. SP, 3. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- _____. 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles*. SP, 5. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- _____. 2010. "Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception History Pertinent?" Pages 66-69 in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Edited by Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press. Original edition, 2005, *JSNT* 28 (2): 159-62.
- Joyce, Paul. 2007. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. LHBOTS, 482. New York/London: T&T Clark.
- Just Jr, Arthur A. 1993. *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus*. Collegeville: The liturgical Press.
- Kamerbeek, J. C. 1948. "On the Conception of ΘΕΟΜΑΧΟΣ in Relation with Greek Tragedy." *Mnemosyne* 1: 271-83.

- Karris, Robert J. 1978. "Poor and Rich: The Lukan Sitz im Leben." Pages 112-25 in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Käsemann, Ernst. 1954. "Das Problem des historischen Jesus." *ZTK* 51: 12-53.
- _____. 1957. "Neutestamentliche Fragen von Heute." *ZTK* 54: 1-21.
- _____. 1971. *Perspectives on Paul*. NTL. London: SCM. Original edition, 1969, *Paulinische Perspektiven*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Kearns, Emily. 2004. "The Gods in Homeric Epics." Pages 59-73 in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Edited by Robert Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keener, Craig S. 2012-2015. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Kenney, E. J. 2009. "The *Metamorphoses*: A Poet's Poem." Pages 140-53 in *A Companion to Ovid*. Edited by Peter E. Knox. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Chichester, UK/Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ker, James. 2006. "Seneca, Man of Many Genres." Pages 19-41 in *Seeing Seneca Whole: Perspectives on Philosophy, Poetry and Politics*. Edited by Katharina Volk and Gareth D. Williams. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, 28. Leiden: Brill.
- Kim-Rauchholz, Mihamm. 2008. *Umkehr bei Lukas: Zu Wesen und Bedeutung der Metanoia in der Theologie des dritten Evangelisten*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. 1964-1976. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Klawans, Jonathan. 2009. "Josephus on Fate, Free Will, and Ancient Jewish Types of Compatibilism." *Numen* 56: 44-90.
- _____. 2012. *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, G. 1964. "Lukas, 1, 1-4 als theologisches Programm." Pages 183-216 in *Zeit und Geschichte Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Klijn, A. F. J. 1983. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." Pages 615-52 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. vol. 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday.
- Knauer, G. N. 1990. "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer." Pages 390-412 in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Edited by S. J. Harrison. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Knibb, Michael. 2010. "Apocalypticism and Messianism." Pages 403-32 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Knight, Jonathan. 1998. *Luke's Gospel*. New Testament Readings. London/New York: Routledge.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. 1988. *Psalms 1-59*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg. Original edition, 1961, *Psalmen, 1, 1-59*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. 1957. *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. 3rd Revd ed. SBT, 23. London: SCM. Original edition, 1945, *Verheissung und Erfüllung: Untersuchungen zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu*, Basel: H. Majer.
- _____. 1975a. "Current Theological Accusations against Luke." *ANQ* 16: 131-45.
- _____. 1975b. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by A. J. Mattill. Rev. ed, NTL. London: SCM. Original edition, 1965, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Lamberton, Robert. 1986. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 9. Berkeley/London: University of California Press.
- Lee, DooHee. 2013. *Luke-Acts and "Tragic History": Communicating Gospel with the World*. WUNT 2, 346. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bibliography

- Lemche, Niels Peter. 1998. *The Israelites in History and Tradition*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight. LAI. London; Louisville: SPCK; Westminster John Knox.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 1989. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon. Original edition, 1979.
- Lincicum, David. 2010. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*. WUNT 2, 284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. 1991. *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1-11*. JSNTSup, 57. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Löwith, Karl. 1949. *Meaning in History*. Phoenix Books. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1994. *My Life in Germany Before and After 1933: A Report*. Translated by Elizabeth King. London: Athlone Press.
- Luther, Susanne. 2015. "'Jesus was a man, ...but Christ was a fiction': Authentizitätskonstruktion in der antiken narrativen Historiographie am Beispiel lukanischer Gleichniserzählungen." Pages 181-208 in *Wie Geschichten Geschichte schreiben: Frühchristliche Literatur zwischen Faktualität und Fiktionalität*. WUNT 2, 395. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1990. "Vergil and the Politics of War." Pages 316-38 in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Edited by S. J. Harrison. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lyons, William John. 1997. "The Words of Gamaliel (Acts 5.38-39) and the Irony of Indeterminacy." *JSNT* 68: 23-49.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. 2014. *Luke and Vergil: Imitations of Classical Greek Literature*. New Testament and Greek Literature, 2. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- _____. 2015. *The Gospels and Homer: Imitations of Greek Epic in Mark and Luke-Acts*. New Testament and Greek Literature, 1. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Maddox, Robert. 1982. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Mallen, Peter. 2008. *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. LNTS, 367. London/New York: T&T Clark International.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1960. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. Original edition, 1936.
- Marguerat, Daniel. 2002. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles"*. Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham. SNTSMS, 121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marincola, John. 2007. "Speeches in Classical Historiography." Pages 118-32 in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Edited by John Marincola. 2 vols. vol. 1. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Marshall, I. Howard. 1970. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter: Paternoster.
- _____. 1980. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press.
- Martin, Ronald. 2001. *Tacitus: Annals V & VI*. Warminster, UK: Aris & Phillips.
- Martyn, Louis. 1997. *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. London/New York: T&T Clark Continuum.
- Marx, Karl. 1967. *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*. Garden City: Anchor Books.
- _____. 1974. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. Translated by Martin Milligan. 4th revd. ed. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Mason, Steve. 1992. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- _____. 2007a. "Josephus's Pharisees: The Narratives." Pages 3-40 in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton. Waco: Baylor University Press.

- _____. 2007b. "Josephus's Pharisees: The Philosophy." Pages 41-66 in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Maston, Jason. 2010. *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul: A Comparative Study*. WUNT 2, 297. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Matthews, Lydia. 2012. "Roman Constructions of Fortuna." DPhil diss., Faculty of Classics, University of Oxford.
- Mattila, Sharon Lea. 1994. "Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran (4Q246 vs 1QM)." *Biblica* 75 (4): 518-38.
- Mattill, A. J. 1972. "Naherwartung, Fernerwartung, and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Weymouth Reconsidered." *CBQ* 34: 276-93.
- _____. 1979. *Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought*. Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press.
- Meister, Klaus. 2007. "Diodorus Siculus." Pages 444-46 in *The New Pauly*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider. vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Mermelstein, Ari. 2014. *Creation, Covenant, and the Beginnings of Judaism: Reconceiving Historical Time in the Second Temple Period*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 168. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1983. "The Fourth Book of Ezra: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 516-59 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. vol. 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- _____. 1994. *A New Testament Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Meyers, Eric M. 2010. "Khirbet Qumran and its Environs." Pages 21-43 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Timothy Lim. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Millar, Fergus. 1993. "Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83: 1-17.
- Miller, John B. F. 2007. *Convinced that God had Called Us: Dreams, Visions and the Perception of God's Will in Luke-Acts*. BibInt, 85. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Minear, Paul S. 1966. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." Pages 111-30 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville/New York: Abingdon.
- Moessner, David P. 1996. "The 'Script' of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's 'Plan' (βουλή) for the World for the 'Release of Sins'." Pages 218-50 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2004. "'Completed End(s)ings' of Historiographical Narrative: Diodorus Siculus and the End(ing) of Acts." Pages 193-221 in *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung: Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Jens Schröter. AGJU, 57. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2008a. "Luke's 'Plan of God' from the Greek Psalter: The Rhetorical Thrust of 'The Prophets and the Psalms' in Peter's Speech at Pentecost." Pages 223-38 in *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*. Edited by Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day. NovTSup, 129. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2008b. "'Managing the Audience': The Rhetoric of Authorial Intent and Audience Comprehension in the Narrative Epistemology of Polybius of Megalopolis, Diodorus Siculus, and Luke the Evangelist." Pages 179-97 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Edited by J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe and A. Katherine Grieb. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Bibliography

- Molthagen, Joachim. 2009. "Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsverständnis in der Apostelgeschichte im Vergleich mit Herodot, Thukydides und Polybios." Pages 159-81 in *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild and Jens Schröter. BZNW, 162. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1977a. "Popular Religious Beliefs and the Late Roman Historians." Pages 141-59 in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Blackwell's Classical Studies. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Original edition, 1947.
- _____. 1977b. "Time in Ancient Historiography." Pages 179-204 in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Blackwell's Classical Studies. Oxford: Blackwell. Original edition, 1966, *History and Theory* 6: 1-23.
- _____. 1983. "The Origins of Universal History." Pages 133-54 in *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Richard Elliott Friedman. HSS. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Moore, Nicholas J. 2015. *Repetition in Hebrews: Plurality and Singularity in the Letter to the Hebrews, its Ancient Context, and the Early Church*. WUNT 2, 388. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Morgan, Teresa. 2007. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2015. *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mowery, Robert L. 1991. "The Divine Hand and the Divine Plan." Pages 558-75 in *Society of Biblical Literature, 1991 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Jr Lovering, Eugene H. SBLSPS, 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Mueller, Hans-Friedrich. 2002. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*. Routledge Classical Monographs. London/New York: Routledge.
- Najman, Hindy. 2012. "The Idea of Biblical Genre: From Discourse to Constellation." Pages 307-21 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Eileen M. Schuller, Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner and Cecilia Wassen. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2014. *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nave, Guy D. 2002. *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*. Academia Biblica, 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Newsom, Carol A. 2014. "The Rhetoric of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 201-17 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 1981. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- _____. 1987. "Salvation Without and With a Messiah: Developing Beliefs in Writings Ascribed to Enoch." Pages 49-68 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2003. "1 and 2 Maccabees: Same Story, Different Meaning." Pages 659-74 in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2006. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. Expanded ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nicklas, Tobias. 2007. "Irony in 2 Maccabees?" Pages 101-11 in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology, Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and Józef Zsengellér. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 118. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

- Nitzan, Bilhah. 2014. "Apocalyptic Ideas in 4 Ezra in Comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 22-31 in *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: International Studies*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski. LSTS, 87. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Nobbs, Alanna. 1993. "Acts and Subsequent Ecclesiastical Histories." Pages 153-62 in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. BAFCS, 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Nolland, John. 1989-1993. *Luke*. 3 vols. WBC, 35. Dallas, TX: Word Books.
- Noth, Martin. 1981. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Sheffield: University of Sheffield. Original edition, 1943, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, Halle: Niemeyer.
- O'Hara, James J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Roman Literature and Its Contexts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oldfather, C. H. 1933-1967. *Diodorus of Sicily: The Library of History, with an English Translation*. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Olson, Daniel C. 2013. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: "All Nations Shall be Blessed"*. Boston: Brill.
- Palmer, Darryl W. 1993. "Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph." Pages 1-29 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. BAFCS, 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Panagopoulos, Johannes. 1972. "Zur Theologie der Apostelgeschichte." *NovT* 14 (2): 137-59.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. 2008. *Acts*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Paton, W. R., F. A. Walbank, and Christian Habicht. 2010-2012. *Polybius: The Histories*. Revd ed. 6 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Penner, Todd. 2004. "Madness in the Method? The Acts of the Apostles in Current Study." *Currents in Biblical Research* 2 (2): 223-93.
- Perlitt, Lothar. 1994. *Deuteronomium-Studien*. FAT, 8. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Pervo, Richard I. 1987. *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- _____. 2006. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge.
- _____. 2009. *Acts: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Peterson, David. 2009. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Phillips, Thomas E. 2006. "The Genre of Acts: Moving Toward a Consensus?" *CurBR* 4 (3): 365-96.
- Popović, Mladen. 2014. "Apocalyptic Determinism." Pages 225-70 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Puech, Emile. 1994. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 235-56 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. C. Ulrich and James C. VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Quint, David. 1989. "Repetition and Ideology in the Aeneid." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 23: 9-54.
- Rad, Gerhard von. 1962-1965. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. Edinburgh/London: Oliver & Boyd. Original edition, 1957-1960, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Munich: Kaiser Verlag.

Bibliography

- _____. 1972. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Translated by John H. Marks. Revd ed. OTL. London: SCM. Original edition, 1961, *Das erste Buch Mose, Genesis*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. 2005. "The Beginnings of Historical Writing in Ancient Israel." Pages 125-53 in *From Genesis to Chronicles: Explorations in Old Testament Theology*. Edited by K. C. Hanson. Fortress Classics in Biblical Studies. Minneapolis: Fortress. Original edition, 1944, 'Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im alten Israel,' *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 32, 1-42.
- Rajak, Tessa. 1986. "The Sense of History in Jewish Intertestamental Writing." Pages 124-45 in *Crises and Perspectives: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Polytheism, Biblical Theology, Palestinian Archaeology, and Intertestamental Literature: Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference, held at Cambridge, UK 1985*. Edited by Johannes C. de Moor. OtSt, 24. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 1991. "Friends, Romans, Subjects: Agrippa II's Speech in Josephus's *Jewish War*." Pages 122-34 in *Images of Empire*. Edited by Loveday Alexander. JSOTSup, 122. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- _____. 2002a. "Jewish Millenarian Expectations." Pages 164-88 in *The First Jewish Revolt: Archaeology, History, and Ideology*. Edited by Andrea M. Berlin and J. Andrew Overman. London/New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2002b. *Josephus: The Historian and his Society*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth.
- _____. 2007. "The Angry Tyrant." Pages 110-29 in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Edited by Tessa Rajak. Hellenistic Culture and Society, 50. Berkeley/London: University of California Press.
- Rapske, Brian. 1998. "Opposition to the Plan of God and Persecution." Pages 235-56 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Regev, Eyal. 2011. "Josephus, the Temple, and the Jewish War." Pages 279-93 in *Flavius Josephus: Interpretation and History*. Edited by Jack Pastor, Prina Stern and Menahem Mor. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 146. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Reynolds, Benjamin. 2013. "John and the Jewish Apocalypses: Rethinking the Genre of John's Gospel." Pages 36-57 in *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and Catrin H. Williams. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Richardson, Peter. 1999. *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Rius-Camps, Josep, and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. 2004-2009. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*. 4 vols. London: T&T Clark International.
- Robinson, William Childs. 1960. "Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative." *JBL* 79 (1): 20-31.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. 1989. *Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rosmarin, Adena. 1985. *The Power of Genre*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rosner, Brian S. 1993. "Acts and Biblical History." Pages 65-82 in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. BAFCS, 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Rothschild, Clare K. 2004. *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography*. WUNT 2, 175. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. 2007. "Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts." *JSNT* 29 (4): 449-57.
- _____. 2009. *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rowland, Christopher. 1985. *Christian Origins: An Account of the Setting and Character of the Most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism*. London: SPCK.
- _____. 2002. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock. Original edition, London: SPCK, 1982.
- _____. 2007. "The Temple in the New Testament." Pages 469-83 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. LHBOTS, 422. London: T&T Clark.

- Sacks, Kenneth S. 1981. *Polybius on the Writing of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1990. *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sailor, Dylan. 2008. *Writing and Empire in Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sallmann, Klaus. 2007. "Pliny (the elder)." Pages 383-90 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, vol. 11. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM.
- _____. 2007. "God Gave the Law to Condemn: Providence in Paul and Josephus." Pages 78-97 in *The Impartial God: Essays in Biblical Studies in Honor of Jouette M. Bassler*. Edited by Calvin J. Roetzel and Robert L. Foster. New Testament Monographs, 22. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Sanders, James A. 1974. "The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable." Pages 245-71 in *Essays in Old Testament Ethics (J. Phillip Hyatt, in Memoriam)*. Edited by James L. Crenshaw and John T. Willis. New York: Ktav.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E., and Gordon McConville. 2007. *The Histories*. Exploring the Old Testament, 2. London: SPCK.
- Scheffler, Eben. 1993. *Suffering in Luke's Gospel*. ATANT, 81. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Schlapbach, Karin. 2008. "Providentia." Page 82 in *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, vol. 12. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Schlaudraff, Karl-Heinz. 1988. 'Heil als Geschichte?' *Die Frage nach dem heilsgeschichtlichen Denken, dargestellt anhand der Konzeption Oscar Cullmanns*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schultz, Brian. 2009. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ. Leiden: Brill.
- Schulz, Siegfried. 1963. "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas." ZNW 54 (1-2): 104-16.
- _____. 1967. *Die Stunde der Botschaft: Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten*. Hamburg: Furche.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. 2008. *2 Maccabees*. CEJL. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- _____. 2009. "Circular or Teleological, Universal or Particular, With God or Without? On 1-2 Maccabees and Acts." Pages 119-129 in *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild and Jens Schröter. BZNW. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- _____. 2011. "Josephus, Catullus, and the Date of the Judean War." Pages 331-52 in *Flavius Josephus: Interpretation and History*. Edited by Jack Pastor, Pnina Stern and Menahem Mor. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 146. Leiden: Brill.
- Schweitzer, Albert. 1910. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by William Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black. Original edition, 1906, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*.
- _____. 1931. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. London: A & C Black. Original edition, 1930, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schweitzer, Steven. 2007. *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*. LHBOTS, 442. New York/London: T&T Clark.
- Schweizer, Eduard. 1984. *The Good News According to Luke*. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Scott, James M. 2005. *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 91. Leiden: Brill.
- Scott, Russell T. 1968. *Religion and Philosophy in the Histories of Tacitus*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 22. Rome: American Academy.
- Seitel, Peter. 2003. "Theorizing Genres: Interpreting Works." *New Literary History* 34 (2): 275-97.
- Shauf, Scott. 2005. *Theology as History, History as Theology: Paul in Ephesus in Acts 19*. BZNW, 133. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bibliography

- _____. 2015. *The Divine in Acts and Ancient Historiography*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Shillington, V. George. 2015. *An Introduction to the Study of Luke-Acts*. T&T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies. London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Skidmore, Clive. 1996. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Slater, D. A. 1912. "Was the Fourth Eclogue Written to Celebrate the Marriage of Octavia to Mark Antony? - A Literary Parallel." *Classical Review* 26: 114-19.
- Sleeman, Matthew. 2009. *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts*. SNTSMS. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Robert H. 1958. "History and Eschatology in Luke-Acts." *CTM* 29 (12): 881-901.
- Sparks, H. D. F. 1963. "Review of H. Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (3d ed.)." *JTS* 14: 454-66.
- _____. 1984. "The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." Pages 835-96 in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Edited by H. D. F. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Spencer, F. Scott. 1999. "Out of Mind, Out of Voice: Slave-girls and Prophetic Daughters in Luke-Acts." *BibInt* 7 (2): 133-55.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. 1981. "Gottesfeind." Pages 996-1043 in *RAC*. Edited by Theodor Klauser. vol. 11. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.
- Squires, John T. 1993. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. SNTSMS, 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stählin, G. 1973. "Τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Apostelgeschichte 16:7)." Pages 229-51 in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*. Edited by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sterling, Gregory E. 1991. *Historiography and Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*. NovTSup, 64. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 1999. "'Opening the Scriptures': The Legitimation of the Jewish Diaspora and Early Christian Mission." Pages 199-225 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*. Edited by David P. Moessner. Luke the Interpreter of Israel, 1. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press.
- Stone, Michael E. 1968. "The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra." Pages 295-312 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. SHR, 14. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 1983. "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'The End' in 4 Ezra." *JBL* 102 (2): 229-43.
- _____. 1987. "The Question of the Messiah in 4 Ezra." Pages 209-24 in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green and Ernest Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1990. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- _____. 2011. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Stone, Michael E., and Matthias Henze. 2013. *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Translations, Introductions, and Notes*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Strazicich, John. 2007. *Joel's Use of Scripture and Scripture's Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Biblical Interpretation Series, 82. Leiden: Brill.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 2005. "'Reading the Present' in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90)." Pages 91-102 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. SymS, 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

- _____. 2006. "The Formation and Re-formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 101-30 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. vol. 1: *Scripture and the Scrolls*. Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, 2. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- _____. 2007. "Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the *Habakkuk Pesher* (1QpHab)." Pages 124-149 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- _____. 2014a. "Overlapping Ages at Qumran and "Apocalyptic" in Pauline Theology." Pages 309-26 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*. Edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey. STDJ, 102. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2014b. "Posturing 'Apocalyptic' in Pauline Theology: How Much Contrast with Jewish Tradition?" Pages 240-56 in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. WUNT, 335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- _____. 2016. "How Much Evil Does the Christ Event Solve? Jesus and Paul in Relation to Jewish 'Apocalyptic' Thought." Pages 142-68 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. WUNT 2, 417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stylianou, P. J. 1991. "Review of Kenneth S. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990. Pp. xii, 242. ISBN 0-691-03600-4. \$29.95." *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2 (6): 388.
- _____. 1998. *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Syme, Ronald. 1958. *Tacitus*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Talbert, Charles H. 1966. *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lucan Purpose*. Nashville/New York: Abingdon.
- _____. 1974. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBLMS, 20. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press.
- _____. 1976. "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke." *Interpretation* 30 (4): 381-95.
- _____. 1982. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad.
- _____. 2007. "Conzelmann, Hans Georg (1915-1989)." Pages 324-28 in *DMBI*. Edited by Donald K. McKim. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Tannehill, Robert C. 1985. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *JBL* 104: 79-81.
- _____. 1986-1990. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. FF. Philadelphia/Minneapolis: Fortress.
- _____. 1994. "Review of John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (SNTS Monograph Series 76). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993. x-233p. 14,5 x 22. £30.00." *Biblica* 75 (3): 425-28.
- Tanner, Kathryn. 1988. *God and Creation in Christian Theology: Tyranny or Empowerment*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Taubes, Jacob. 2009. *Occidental Eschatology*. Translated by David Ratmoko. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Original edition, 1947, *Abendländische Eschatologie*.
- Theissen, Gerd. 1983. *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Translated by Francis McDonagh. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Theodorakopoulos, Elena. 1997. "Closure: The Book of Virgil." Pages 155-65 in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Edited by Charles Martindale. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, Alan J. 2011. *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus: Luke's Account of God's Unfolding Plan*. New Studies in Biblical Theology, 27. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Tiller, Patrick A. 1993. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. EJL, 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Bibliography

- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1990. *Genres in Discourse*. Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomson, P. J. 1999. "Gamaliel's Counsel and the Apologetic Strategy of Luke-Acts." Pages 585-604 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. BETL, 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Unnik, W. C. van. 1973. "An Attack on the Epicureans by Flavius Josephus." Pages 341-55 in *Romanitas et Christianitas: Studia Iano Henrico Waszink A.D. VI Kal. Nov. A. MCMLXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata*. Edited by W. den Boer, P. G. van der Nat, C. M. J. Sicking and J. C. M. van Winden. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Uytanlet, Samson. 2014. *Luke-Acts and Jewish Historiography: A study on the Theology, Literature, and Ideology of Luke-Acts*. WUNT 2, 366. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- van der Woude, Adam S. 1998. "Fifty years of Qumran Research." Pages 1-45 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. vol. 1. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Van Seters, John. 1992. *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- VanderKam, James C. 1984. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS, 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- _____. 2010. "The Book of Enoch and the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 254-77 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vermes, Geza. 1991. "Josephus' Treatment of the Book of Daniel." *JJS* 42: 149-66.
- _____. 1997. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Allen Lane The Penguin Press.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. 1950-1951. "Zum 'Paulinismus' der Apostelgeschichte." *EvT* 10: 1-15.
- Villalba i Varneda, Pere. 1986. *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*. ALGHJ, 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Vogel, Manuel. 2009. "Traumdarstellungen bei Josephus und Lukas." Pages 130-56 in *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild and Jens Schröter. BNZW, 162. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Vovelle, Michel. 1990. *Ideologies and Mentalities*. Translated by Eamon O'Flaherty. Cambridge: Polity. Original edition, 1982, *Idéologies et Mentalités*, Paris: F. Maspero.
- Waanders, F. M. J. 1983. *The History of telos and teleō in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Grüner.
- Walaskay, Paul W. 1983. *'And So We Came to Rome': The Political Perspective of St Luke*. SNTSMS, 49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walbank, Frank A. 2002a. "Supernatural Paraphernalia in Polybius' *Histories*." Pages 245-57 in *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: Essays and Reflections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Original edition, 1994, Pages 28-42 in *Ventures into Greek History*, Edited by I. Worthington, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walbank, Frank W. 1957. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. 1960. "History and Tragedy." *Historia* 9 (2): 216-34.
- _____. 2002b. "The Idea of Decline in Polybius." Pages 193-211 in *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: Essays and Reflections*. West Nyack, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2007. "Fortune (*tychē*) in Polybius." Pages 349-55 in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Edited by John Marincola. 2 vols. vol. 2. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wallace, Daniel B. 1997. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

- Walton, Steve. 2002. "The State They Were in: Luke's View of the Roman Empire." Pages 1-41 in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*. Edited by Peter Oakes. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Wardle, D. 1998. *Valerius Maximus, Memorable Deeds and Sayings translated with Introduction and Commentary, Book 1*. Clarendon Ancient History. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. 2000. "Valerius Maximus on the Domus Augusta, Augustus, and Tiberius." *The Classical Quarterly* 50 (2): 479-93.
- Waterfield, Robin, and Brian McGing. 2010. *Polybius The Histories: A New Translation*, Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1972. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. 1983. "Zion and Jerusalem as Religious and Political Capital: Ideology and Utopia." Pages 75-115 in *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Richard Elliott Friedman. Harvard Semitic Studies. Chico, Ca: Scholars.
- Wells, Kyle B. 2014. *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart*. NovTSup, 157. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- West, D. A. 1990. "Cernere erat: The Shield of Aeneas." Pages 295-304 in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Edited by S. J. Harrison. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1998. "The End and the Meaning: Aeneid 12.791-842." Pages 303-18 in *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*. Edited by Hans-Peter Stahl. London: Duckworth.
- White, Hayden. 2003. "Anomalies of Genre: The Utility of Theory and History for the Study of Literary Genres." *New Literary History* 34 (3): 597-615.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. 1966. "Interpreting Luke-Acts in a Period of Existentialist Theology." Pages 60-83 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Willett, Tom W. 1989. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. JSPSup, 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Williams, Gordon. 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Sather Classical Lectures, 45. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Williams, Howard. 1997. "The End of History in Hegel and Marx." *The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms* 2 (3): 557-66.
- Williams, R. D. 1990. "The Sixth Book of the Aeneid." Pages 191-207 in *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Edited by S. J. Harrison. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, S. G. 1970. "Lukan Eschatology." *NTS* 16 (4): 330-47.
- Witherington III, Ben. 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Wolter, Michael. 2004. "Das lukanische Doppelwerk als Epochengeschichte." Pages 253-84 in *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung: Festschrift für Eckhard Plümacher zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Jens Schröter. AGAJ, 57. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2009. "Paulus, der bekehrte Gottesfeind: Zum Verständnis von 1.Tim 1,13." Pages 241-57 in *Theologie und Ethos im frühen Christentum: Studien zu Jesus, Paulus und Lukas*. WUNT, 236. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- _____. 2011. "Eschatology in the Gospel According to Luke." Pages 91-108 in *Eschatology in the New Testament and Some Related Documents*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. WUNT 2, 315. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wright, N. T. 1991. "How Can the Bible be Authoritative? (The Laing Lecture for 1989)." *VE* 21: 7-32.
- _____. 1992. *The New Testament and the People of God*. London: SPCK.
- _____. 2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. London: SPCK.

Bibliography

- _____. 2013. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 vols. London: SPCK.
- York, John O. 1991. *The Last Shall be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*. JSNTSup, 46. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Zerwick, Max. 1988. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. 3rd rev. ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.