

Luke the Theologian
Fifty-five Years of Research (1950–2005)

second revised edition

FRANÇOIS BOVON

B

Baylor University Press
Waco, Texas 76798

CONTENTS

Preface to the First Edition	.vii
Preface to the English Edition	.xi
Preface to the Second English Edition	.xiii
1 The Plan of God, Salvation History, and Eschatology	.1
2 The Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel	.87
3 Christology	.123
4 The Holy Spirit	.225
5 Salvation	.273
6 The Reception of Salvation	.305
7 The Church	.329
8 What about Luke? (1983)	.463
9 Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect (1992)	.479
10 Luke the Theologian, from 1980 to 2005	.503

APPENDICES

A A Bibliography of Books on Luke-Acts, 1980–2005	.567
B Bibliographic Index on Luke 1–24, 1980–2005	.623
C Bibliographic Index on Acts 1–28, 1980–2005	.627
D Bibliographic and Thematic Index on Luke-Acts, 1980–2005	.631
Indices	.647

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

This book presents the principal theological research consecrated to the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles that has appeared in the last quarter of the century (1950–1975). The starting point is 1950, for this date represents a turning point in Lukan studies.¹

When I began the task, I envisaged a state of the question for the Acts of the Apostles. Afterward, I opted for the theological problems alone, abandoning the literary, historical, and textual problems. It was then necessary to integrate the studies of the gospel, which I did as I was able. This change in direction may explain the lacunas concerning the first book to Theophilus.

To accord one's preference to theological problems does not signify a renouncement of exegesis nor the scorning of history. The theological positions that I mention are most often the result of an interpretation of the biblical text. They take into consideration the place Luke occupies in the development of primitive Christianity. By an understandable reaction, however, the study of theology allows us to specify the historical insertion of the evangelist, who, we must admit, remains imprecise at the junction of influences from Mark, the source of the logia (Q), the Jerusalem church (Peter and James) and Paul, in a Greek environment, attached to biblical traditions and around 80–90 C.E.

As this work gradually progressed, an outline imposed itself upon me: beginning with the most burning problem in 1950, the relations between history and eschatology, and ending with the church, a theme that today holds our attention. Christology occupies center position, according to a necessity that the evangelist himself was held to respect. The logic of the Lukan faith incited me to insert the chapter concerning Christology between the pages dedicated to the OT and those dealing with salvation. From objective salvation, it was fitting to pass on to

¹We have explained this starting point in the beginning of our article, "Orientations actuelles des études lukanienes," *RTPhil*, 3d ser., 26 (1976): 176f.

subjective salvation, that is, the reception of redemption by conversion and faith. This explains the organization of our book, which begins with God and God's plan to come to men and women living in the church.

Concerned with the desire to be complete, I have sometimes had difficulty disengaging the main tendencies towards Lukan studies and perceiving the theological implications. Finally, I decided to present in the text the most representative and original studies and to place in the notes the other books and articles.

If time had permitted, I would have dealt with other topics: the Lukan discourse on nature (God creator), the place of culture in Luke's theology (these two would be centered on Acts 14 and 17),² and finally the pre Lukan traditions concerning the apostles.³ With regard to this last subject, I would have affirmed, against a strong theological current, that the first Christians were interested in the life of the apostles and communities, bringing forth facts and actions in a liturgical and parenetic perspective. Thus, a rooting would have appeared, a *Sitz im Leben* of the diverse accounts brought by Luke. This rooting would have taken away from the book of Acts its radically new character and from its author a theological originality for which many are pleased to reproach him.

Let me mention that the different conclusions were written at one time, at the end, when the body of the seven chapters was composed. In consulting the table of contents, the reader encounters the grand themes of Lukan theology and the main stages of recent interpretation. Thanks to the indexes, the reader can discover several interpretations of the same Lukan text, diverse analyses of such and such Greek term, or the general position of an exegete.

The following works arrived too late for me to study as they merit: E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke Acts* (London, 1975); R. Glöckner, *Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas* (Mainz, n.d. [1975?]); G. Hayas Prats, *L'Esprit, force de l'Eglise. Sa nature et son activité d'après les Actes des apôtres* (Paris, 1975); G. Lohtink, *Die Sammlung Israels. Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (Munich, 1975); P. S. Minear, *To Heal or To Reveal. The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke* (New York, 1976); L. Monloubou, *La prière selon saint Luc. Recherche*

² Cf. the lines we have given to the subject in the article mentioned in the note above (p. xx–xx).

³ To the works mentioned in the article cited above in n. 1 (p. xx–xx) and the study entitled "L'origine des récits concernant les apôtres," *RTPPhil*, 3d ser., 17 (1967): 345–50, it is fitting to add S. E. Johnson, "A Proposed Form Critical Treatment of Acts," *AnglTR* 21 (1939): 22–31.

d'une structure (Paris, 1976); as well as the last unpublished dissertations summarized in *DissAbstr.*

The work I am presenting today would not have been possible without the following instruments of work: *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus of Biblica* (Rome), *Internationale Zeitschriftenshau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete* (Düsseldorf), *New Testament Abstracts* (Cambridge, Mass.), *Dissertation Abstracts International* (Ann Arbor, Mich.), and A. J. and Mary Mattill's *A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles* (Leiden, 1968). Furthermore, I have mentioned other states of the question of Lukan studies,⁴ the most important being those of W. Gasque, E. Rasco, and E. Grasser.⁵ I have added several in the notes.⁶ I am following the abbreviation system of *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* 55 (1974): v–xxx, edited by Father P. Nober. For the signs that do not appear in this volume of *Elenchus*, I am conforming to the indications found in volume 49 (1969): iii–xii and as a last resort, the list of abbreviations in A. J. and Mary Mattill's *A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles* (Leiden, 1966): xiii, xviii.

It is agreeable for me to note that the most important part of the bibliographical pursuit, tracking down and reading, was taken over successively by Marcel Fallet, Jean Marc Prieur, Daniel Roquefort, and Joel Dhauteville during their passage at the Faculté de théologie of Geneva. Without them, no doubt, I would have been unable to swim through the waves of the innumerable publications. I thank them with all my heart. The Société Académique de Genève merits my thanks as well, as they granted me an important subsidy to remunerate one collaborator. My thanks also go out to the Comité genevois pour le protestantisme français who, through several subsidies, permitted the work of other collaborators. I address my hearty feelings of thankfulness to the Conseil national du Fonds national suisse de la Recherche scientifique,

⁴ In the article mentioned in n. 1.

⁵ W. Gasque, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (Tübingen, 1975); E. Rasco, *La teología de Lucas: engen, desarrollo, orientaciones* (Rome, PUBL. 1976); E. Grasser, "Acta Forschung seit 1960," *TRu* 41 (1976): 141–96, 259–90; 42 (1977): 1–68.

⁶ F. F. Bruce, "The True Apostolic Succession. Recent Study of the Book of Acts," *Interpr* 13 (1959): 131–43; C. S. Williams, "Luke Acts in Recent Study," *ExpTim* 73 (1962): 133–36; J. Rhode, *Die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode* (Hamburg, 1966), 124–83; I. H. Marshall, "Recent Study of the Acts of the Apostles," *ExpTim* 80 (1969): 292–96; I. Panagopoulos "Ail Praxeî - jApostol wn kai; hî kritikh; aujtwn eřeuna," *Qeol ogiâ* 42 (1971): 582–601; 43 (1972): 350–68, 682–91; H. Conzelmann, "Literaturbericht zu den Synoptischen Evangelien," *TRu*, N.F. 37 (1972): 220–72, esp. 264–72; C. H. Talbert, "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke," *Int* 30 (1976): 381–8–05 (the whole issue is dedicated to the Gospel of Luke).

which accorded me a large subsidy for the publication. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Janine Chérix, who typed with great care my manuscript; Marie Molina, who tirelessly read the proofs of this book; Frédy Schoch, who established the indexes with precision in the French; the translator Ken McKinney; Michèle Rosset, and the Editions Delachaux & Niestlé, who facilitated the publication; to the printers and typographers of the Imprimerie des Remparts in Yverdon; to the librarians at the Bibliotheque Publique et Universitaire de Genève; and the library of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome.⁷Fonds national suisse de la Recherche scientifique, which accorded me a large subsidy for the publication. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Janine Chérix, who typed with great care my manuscript; Marie Molina, who tirelessly read the proofs of this book; Frédy Schoch, who established the indexes with precision in the French; the translator Ken McKinney; Michèle Rosset, and the Editions Delachaux & Niestlé, who facilitated the publication; to the printers and typographers of the Imprimerie des Remparts in Yverdon; to the librarians at the Bibliotheque Publique et Universitaire de Genève; and the library of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome.⁷

Christmas 1976
François Bovon

⁷ In the bibliography we mention three new commentaries of the Gospel of Luke.

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

The French language has lost the privileged position it held in the eighteenth century. It has ceased to be a universal–international language between the diverse civilizations. As we all know, it has been supplanted in this function by English.

This declaration explains the joy of an author of French expression, from the French part of Switzerland, before the English translation of one of his works. This joy is accompanied with gratitude: to Dr. Dikran V. Hadidian who, after having encouraged this translation, welcomes it now into the collection for which he is responsible; to Ken McKinney, who had the idea and realized it with energy, devotion, perseverance, and competence; to the Société auxiliaire de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Genève as well as the Fondation Ernst and Lucie Schmidheiny, both of which provided important subsidies thanks to which this translation was made possible. I express my warmest gratitude to each one.

The original work appeared in 1978 and quickly sold out. The English edition has the advantage of making accessible this state of research which covers the years 1950 to 1975 again. It also has the supplementary advantage of offering the translation of an article which was written later. It brings up to date—in a form a bit different from the book—the studies published concerning Luke between the years 1975 and 1983.

November 1986
François Bovon

PREFACE TO THE SECOND ENGLISH EDITION

I would like to begin this preface to the second edition of *Luke the Theologian* by expressing my gratitude to four persons. First, I thank warmly Dr. Carey Newman, the director of Baylor University Press, who accepted this new edition in the editorial program of his press, encouraged me to update my text, and has been very generous in his understanding of the practical difficulties that can arise for an author who is also a professor. Second, I express my thanks to Kathy Maxwell, who scanned the first English edition, controlled it with real expertise, and adjusted particularly the numerous Greek words, expressions, and titles. I also express my gratitude to Robyn Faith Walsh, a master of theological studies student at Harvard Divinity School and now doctoral student at Brown University, for offering her time, her competence, and her enthusiasm toward this project. She revised the English style of the seven chapters of the first edition, and compiled two indices and a large bibliography of the books published on Luke-Acts during the last quarter of the century. Finally, I thank Linda Cummings Grant, master of divinity graduate from Harvard Divinity School, who revised and improved considerably the quality of my English in the long new chapter (ch. 10).

I would like also to explain the new elements contained in this second edition, which are numerous and substantial. While chapter 8 (“What about Luke?”) represents a short survey of the scholarship covering the period 1975 to 1983, which was already presented in the first edition of *Luke the Theologian*, chapter 9, published in *Harvard Theological Review* 85 (1992) under the title “Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect,” constitutes a first addition. The extensive new bibliography provides a concrete overview of the development of scholarship on Luke-Acts over the past twenty-five years, 1980–2005. The new chapter 10 focuses on the works published during the same period of time that are relevant to the topics of the seven chapters of the first edition.

It is evident here that nowadays scholars attempt to determine Luke's theological intentions more from the composition of the double work and its literary genre than from the Lukan redaction of several sources and traditions. The first edition of *Luke the Theologian* also mentioned a shift from the question of "History and Eschatology" to "Pastoral Care and Church Life" during the period of scholarship 1950 to 1975. This second edition reveals, in the period 1980–2005, a renewed interest in the role of the Spirit and a shift from ecclesiology to ethics.

I have added to this new bibliography and chapter three new indices. The first indicates the titles of books and monographs related to certain major issues in Luke-Acts. I have not confined this index to theological problems but have included references to text-critical issues, historical problems, and literary questions. The second new index provides convenient bibliographical references to each of the twenty-four chapters of the Gospel of Luke, while the third offers the same type of references for the twenty-eight chapters of the Acts of the Apostles.

Cambridge, Massachusetts

March 2005

F. B.

INTRODUCTION

Everything began with history and eschatology. Luke was caught between the anvil of *redaktionsgeschichtlich* exegesis and the hammer of Bultmannian theology. For many, the objectification of faith into creed or history was a temptation that early Christianity could not resist. From the beginning, eschatology, or rather eschatological conscience, had to seek for temporary and contingent forms of expression. These forms were found in the apocalyptic sphere. R. Bultmann, P. Vielhauer, H. Conzelmann, E. Haenchen, S. Schulz, E. Dinkler, E. Grasser and G. Klein¹ think that the evangelist modified this mode of expression. By choosing historical narrative instead of the apocalyptic urgency, he betrayed the cause and revealed a loss of the eschatological sap.

Settled in the Roman Empire, which for some was peaceful and for others dangerous, Luke would have lived according to a gospel that had become a holy and ideal evangelical story as well as a hope in a distant resurrection from the dead. Associated with a certain, but as yet remote, return of the Son of Man, absent because of the ascension, this hope could no longer nurture, except in an ethical manner, an existence whose origin was more ecclesiastical than christological. For the present, this memory and hope left an uncomfortable situation in which the presence of the Spirit was unable to institute eschatological fullness, but only an *Ersatz* (substitute). Considered from a Bultmannian theological point of view and read in a redactional manner, Luke seems to be quite distinct from Paul—perhaps even opposed to him. With the existentialist Paul serving as the norm, the canon within the canon, Luke emerges from the investigation perhaps admired, but with the admiration one has for a gifted culprit for whom the verdict is in any case guilty. He is guilty of having historicized and, in so doing, having deeschatologized the kerygma. Furthermore, he is also guilty of giving a false solution to a real problem, a solution which only touches the apocalyptic framework of the delay of the Parousia and not the existential and eschatological reality of the gospel. The stages of salvation history necessarily project backward into the past the eternal present of the Word, which still holds true. Moreover, the idea of a church history contradicts the conviction of the first Christians for whom Jesus Christ was the end of history. An over-optimistic consideration is given to the Old Testament

¹ Cf. below 1, pp. 13-16.

(OT), whose promises are highlighted, and this in turn provokes the ignoring of the failures.² The manifestation of Jesus itself culminates in a powerful proclamation and a privileged resurrection. The cross, the paradoxical center of a still-actual message, becomes a failure, which for Luke is quickly effaced. It is merely a human obstacle, overcome in three days, by a God whose power is a little too visible. Moreover, who tells us that the image of this God remained biblical? What if the God of Luke was an avatar of a Greco-Roman *fatum* of inescapable decisions? Concerning this, unity was not to be found within the Bultmannian school. Some pointed out that in Luke's thought, the role of the free will, without much reflection, should have hindered him from having a solid doctrine of grace. Does Luke give too much to humanity by limiting God to heaven? Is secularization the final word of historization? If this is so, we should underline the word *history* in the expression "salvation history." Or does Luke give too much place to God by making humans into puppets? The helping strokes of God in history would be intolerably imperialistic: history would advance in miraculous bounds, and Luke would be wrong in observing the famous *Heilstatsachen* with the aid of the binoculars of an experienced historian. The positivism of revelation could be the ultimate consequence of a salvation history conceived only from the angle of salvation. Whether too human or too "theophile," Luke is condemned. Certain Protestants wonder what an author who is so Catholic is doing inside the canon.

Today, the sculptors of the image of Luke have grown older. Their blows have weakened, and they are becoming rarer. Others have come to give yet another banal or eccentric form to the abused evangelist. And yet others have been happy to wrest this view from their hands, declared unworthy for the task. Quite numerous are the others, impressed by the intelligence and exegetical talent of Conzelmann and friends, who accept his general schema and limit their ambitions to the correction of certain details. Finally, still others, understanding that Luke, less original concerning eschatology than first thought, judge that his interests lie in the church and the moral life of the communities. This is why Lukan studies have taken a new direction. The dissertations concerning the Eucharist, the ministries, the church, etc. are multiplying. Salvation history, so vigorously defended by O. Cullmann in the

² Cf. R. Bultmann, "Weissagung und Erfüllung," *ST* 2 (1949): 22–44; taken over in *ZTK* 47 (1950): 360–83 and in R. Bultmann, *Glauben und Verstehen*, II (Tübingen: PUBL. 1961), 162–86.

peak of the storm, is no longer of utmost concern. Many German Catholic exegetes wonder if salvation history cannot get along with eschatology, an eschatology whose definition remains still unclear or even ambiguous. The existentialist Paul was not the historical Paul, and Luke lives a generation after him. Could not a Lukan rereading of the gospel be one of the legitimate actualizations of the message of which we speak so often today? Formally Luke inserts the gospel into his time differently than Paul. But did he do so responding to the same requirements of faith? The certainty that he wishes his readers to share (against Bultmann and company) could not be the assurance of the modern intellectual who has verified the facts and accepted the proof. This is an anachronistic view of reality. The aporia mentioned above, between a tyrant God and a God who is absent, between a human robot and a Promethean human, can be surpassed by a new conception of history, of the real action. This conception is mediated by God in a world where humans are taken seriously not only in their abstract existential existence but also in their corporality and finiteness, which is also the true mark of the image of God. Luke is the theologian of social realities, of the popular incarnation, of collective hope, of conflicts for bread. The space of humanity, henceforth, takes on an autonomous theological dimension, coexisting with and not subjugated to salvation history. It is a cultivated space.

Twenty five years of Lukan studies have passed: the preceding lines have summarized what seems to us to be the essential ideas of the discussions concerning history and eschatology. It is now the moment to discover in detail the position of each and the manner in which the exegetes and theologians have advanced—although perhaps not always making progress—the debate.

FROM ESCHATOLOGY TO SALVATION HISTORY

The Setting in Motion: P. Vielhauer and H. Conzelmann

Under the intellectual guidance of R. Bultmann,³ P. Vielhauer (1950) examines the theology of Luke by opposing the figure of Paul painted

³ E. Rasco (1976) has recently shown what P. Vielhauer and H. Conzelmann owed to R. Bultmann. It is necessary to recall the role Käsemann played between the end of the war and the first articles of Conzelmann and Vielhauer. We owe this information to

in Acts and the one discovered in the Epistles. Being a bearer of pre-Pauline christological traditions, Luke shows himself succeeding Paul in his understanding of natural theology, the role of the law and eschatology. This, according to the opinion of the late professor of Bonn, has become secondary. *Locus de novissimis* eschatology only serves, here and there (Acts 17:30), to incite repentance. Having been marginalized, it has been transformed; unfaithful to what Vielhauer thinks is the essence of primitive Christian eschatology (the paradoxical contemporaneity of the present and the future of salvation), Lukan eschatology combines chronologically and quantitatively the ties that bind the “already” and the “not yet.” The very existence of the book of Acts suggests a Christianity that is turning its back on primitive eschatology and settling into the world. Thus the little interest that Luke has for eschatology is confirmed. By assembling historical documentation, as Luke writes in his intention in the Prologue (Luke 1:1-4), he is anticipating with an “enormous prolepsis” second-century Apologetics and fourth-century Christian historiography. By doing this, he offers his readers human security (ἀσφάλεια of Luke 1:4), which is incompatible to the risk of faith.

If Luke defines his gospel as a first book (Acts 1:1), he must intend to write a second. The history of Jesus, which is still the last for Mark, becomes Luke’s next-to-last. The end of history is transformed into the middle of history. To express this conviction, Conzelmann gave his book the title, *Die Mitte der Zeit* (“The Middle of Time”; ET, *The Theology of St. Luke*).

The first part of this book (1954) presents a continuous reading of Luke’s gospel. The continuity of the text, understood in its redactional nature, witnesses to a deliberate linking of the places (Galilee, the journey, Jerusalem). The exegete does not doubt the theological virtue of this geography: Galilee is the place where Jesus becomes conscious of his Messiahship and gathers witnesses whose ulterior missions will be decisive. The journey attests that this Messiahship will entail suffering, whereas Jerusalem, the city where the miracles cease and teaching rings forth, loses its eschatological function. By entering the capital, Jesus hastens the coming of the cross and not the kingdom of God. Moreover, Luke disconnects the announcement of the fall of Jerusalem, hence-

Käsemann, who affirms his dependence on the commentary of the Acts by A. Loisy (*Les Actes des apôtres* [Paris: Nourry, 1920]).

forth secular, from the coming of the end times. From these geographical stages, Conzelmann formulates his very distinct chronological steps, marked by the epiphanies of Jesus and followed by the scenes of rejection: the baptism and lack of success in Nazareth; the transfiguration and Samaritan inhospitality; and the entry into Jerusalem and Jesus' passion. The reality of this historical schema appears each time in an analysis of the materials, especially those of Mark, which the evangelist has reinterpreted. For example, John the Baptist is no longer the forerunner. Luke places him with the OT prophets. His message, as his sermon to the guilds attests, ceases to be eschatological and becomes moral. Satan leaves the scene to return later at the eve of the passion, thus offering Jesus an unperturbed salvific period. The disciples' equipment will have to vary according to the circumstances; stripped materially (Luke 10) during the time when Jesus protects them, they must arm themselves for the period when they will be deprived of the Master's comforting presence (Luke 22:35-36).

This dissection of the periods of Jesus' life is but one aspect of a more abundant theological effort to grasp the total historical reality from the viewpoint of the divine will, which adapting itself to history, molds the latter according to its purposes. The life of Jesus was preceded by the prophets and followed the time of the church which can be subdivided into the beginning period and the contemporary era, and is called to endure. The three last parts of the book take up again the study of the three large sections of redemptive history, from an analysis of the vocabulary related to the project of God and God's providence. It is a salvation history, not a philosophy of history.

Between the first part, consecrated to geography and chronology, and the last three, Conzelmann inserts an investigation of the Lukan texts which are strictly eschatological. He comes to the following conclusions: The Lukan rereading of the apocalyptic vocabulary (the notions of tribulation, of conversion, and of kingdom) and the composition of the two eschatological discourses (Luke 17 and 21) confirm the geographical indications and the *heilsgeschichtlich* schema. Everything that concerns the believers and the world loses its eschatological coloring, and everything that touches on the last days is thrown to the end of history, in the distant future. Jesus announces the kingdom but not the proximity of the kingdom. This kingdom exists in heaven; its image can be seen in anticipation in the life of Jesus. But today only the message of the kingdom rings out. The kingdom is absent.

It remains to be seen why Luke carried out this huge project. The answer is simple: as the Parousia was delaying, Christians could not continue to maintain the imminence (*Verharren im Trotzdem*⁴). If Christianity wanted to develop and expand itself, it needed a radical solution. It was to renounce the imminence of the Parousia and replace it with a full salvation history. Luke's theological merit lies in having given this answer. Alas, it is an answer which betrays the existential perception that should have been given to the eschatological message of Jesus and the first apostles. Just as he specified the bodily appearance of the dove at Jesus' baptism, Luke materialized the eschatological vocabulary of Jesus and of primitive Christianity. Jesus and Paul announced eschatology, and it was salvation history that came.

I would like to acknowledge several of the criticisms that have appeared since the arrival of this book, a monograph impressive because of its distant stringency. If the three great periods of salvation history are confirmed by the existence of the three books—the Septuagint, the Gospel of Luke, and Acts—the exact partitioning of these periods is not nearly as clear as Conzelmann thinks. Does the time of Jesus begin only with John the Baptist? Do not the infancy narratives, which his inquiry curiously neglects, serve as an overture to the account of salvation in Jesus Christ? In an opera, the overture is an integral part of the work. As a theologian of salvation history, does not Luke insist more on continuity, on the dynamic movement of history, than on the periods (W. C. Robinson)? Does not he seek to designate this continuity with characters or events that we might call “hooks”? Thus John the Baptist would serve as the link between the OT and Jesus' time. He belonged to both, just as the double narrative of the ascension would unify the time of Jesus with the time of the church.⁵ This movement, which the periods are content to scan, would explain why the passage from the second to the third period is so difficult to fix. Conzelmann himself hesitated to date it. Was it at the new irruption of Satan just before the passion? If so, would the death and resurrection no longer be a part of Jesus' time? Is it at the Cross, at Easter, or at the ascension? Luke would no doubt prefer the ascension, even if he refuses to fix the passage from one time to the other on one certain day. Finally, there is the theological criticism. Yet we must admit that Conzelmann does not become vehement and refuses to speak of *Frühkatholizismus*.

⁴ H. Conzelmann (1952), 31.

⁵ Cf. K. Löning (1969) and E. Kränkl (1972).

The Momentum Continues

Even if the article of G. Harbsmeier (1950) is more theological than exegetical, it merits mention for it claims to draw dogmatic conclusions from the positions presented above and demonstrates well the hostile state of mind that reigned among the German Protestant theologians. The author openly admits that he accepts the conclusions of Vielhauer, and he compares them with Christian life and thought in order to deduce that Luke's influence on the churches was and remains stronger than Paul's. Even if this influence is rather secretive with regard to natural theology, the law (baptism considered as circumcision), and Christology (Jesus as an example), it is acknowledged with respect to salvation history. This is how the author diagnoses the churches coming from the Reformation (it is evident for the author that in this case Catholicism can also claim to be conformed to the Bible, at least with one part, Luke). While for Paul, the history of the world is identified with the history of the salvation of this world (through Jesus Christ alone), for Luke, salvation history is a history separate from universal history. It is this conception, so widespread in the churches, which is to be criticized in the name of Paul and with the help of Christ, present by his Spirit. We may not, however, exclude Luke from the canon, for the Bible is and must remain a human collection where the tares and the good grain have grown together.

Three criticisms are in order: (1) Since he himself accepts the risk, the attack brought against Luke—our critical distance taken—comes more from the theologus praesens than from the Christus praesens! (2) The essence of the Lukan message, centered on the manifestation of Jesus the savior, is totally neglected to the benefit of the theological themes, which Luke considers secondary, or he could not yet treat them as such. (3) By refusing to ban Luke from the canon, the author remains simply at the level of words; that is, he refuses to place a coherent act with his thought. Thus he finds refuge in ideological discourse. This theological position corresponds to acrimony against Luke, who is reproached precisely for having inserted the gospel into the historical structures of this world: "So ist das Reich Gottes im Siegeszug in dieser Welt begriffen . . ." (p. 357). Is it incorrect to see in this reaction the influence of Kierkegaard and the refusal of a Hegelian interpretation of the gospel?

E. Grässer's monograph (1957) is of interest for it completes Conzelmann's study on two points. (1) It places the Lukan effort within the history of doctrines of early Christianity, and (2) it pursues the analysis of Luke into Acts, a possibility curiously neglected by Conzelmann. Let me begin with the second point. As the exegesis of the first chapter of Acts shows, Luke was conscious of the problem caused by the delay of the Parousia and gave a definite solution, in itself satisfying. There is indeed an intermediate time between the resurrection and the Parousia. Whether this acknowledgment worries, saddens, or rejoices, one can but verify it here. This period can and must be qualified theologically: it is the time of the universal mission, which is provoked and sustained by the Holy Spirit. Such is the purpose of God, which appears in the last resolutions of the resurrected One, in the declarations of the angel at the ascension or in the activities of the first Christians. Moreover, the Parousia, which Luke never denies as a future reality, is eclipsed by the death of the individual, because of the time that endures. Future salvation seems to be bound as much, if not more, to this after death--in concert with J. Dupont (1972)--than to the Parousia. Grässer thinks that the remainder of Acts confirms his exegesis of the first chapter: Pentecost brings the Holy Spirit, a welcome response to the delay of the Parousia of the Son of Man. The speeches of Acts do not associate the resurrection of Christ to eschatology but to the past events of the cross, and in a noneschatological manner. Acts places Christianity, considered as a religion, within world history. If Luke continues to speak of the kingdom of God in Acts, he can carefully avoid mentioning its arrival. Finally, a text like Acts 28:28 reveals that Luke anticipates a history that will endure.

In his analysis of the Gospel of Luke (pp. 178–98) and in the few pages (pp. 199–204) consecrated to the Word and the church as an *Ersatz* (an unfortunate term in our opinion) of eschatological existence, Grässer relies heavily on Conzelmann. He is more personal in the pages where he inserts Luke's thought into the history of early Christian doctrines, for Conzelmann did not attempt this approach (in the introduction of third edition of *Die Mitte der Zeit*, he explains the methodological reasons that motivated him to isolate Luke (p. vi). Since then, H. Conzelmann [1966] has proposed an insertion of this type). Nonetheless Grässer's originality remains formal, for he arrives at a conclusion close to Conzelmann's premises: the Lukan solution is an isolated case in the New Testament (NT).

Grässer's evaluation of this situation requires us to admit that this elaboration of a salvation history, which emphasizes the durable intervention of the Word and the Spirit in a church that participates in the world, is a regrettable peculiarity. O. Cullmann justly condemns this deduction, along with the theory common to both German theologians according to which the delay of the Parousia was the major instigator—eminently negative—of this construction.

For my part, I accept the movement described by Grässer. Diverse solutions have been offered for the problem of the delay. He will come anyway. He is coming, so let us remain vigilant. He is absent, but the Holy Spirit is present. He desires to delay to give everyone a chance. Yet it seems to me that Luke is less original than has been said. Several NT authors, particularly Mark and Paul, on whom Luke relies, considered the time between Easter and the Parousia designated for the evangelization of the world. This time should not be seen as evidence of the absence of God, but rather is characterized by the presence of the Spirit. Luke simply develops a conception common to several movements within primitive Christianity.

Moreover, in doing this, Luke does not betray his kerygmatic heritage, whether it is Synoptic or Pauline, for a salvation history does not contradict *ipso facto*, an eschatological perspective. J. Panagopoulos has described it well: the church and the activity of the Spirit guarantees a presence of salvation, indeed the last salvation, and Luke's contemporaries are called to be associated with it. Furthermore, it is not certain that Luke elaborated his salvation history because of the delay. Certainly, the delay favored this view, but the OT tradition of a salvation embedded in history, as well as the concrete proclamation of Jesus, facilitated and, I would say, legitimated this theological perspective as well. Others, like C. K. Barrett, G. Klein, and C. H. Talbert, will add that the anti-gnostic polemic also played a role in Luke's refusal to move into the disincarnate world of spirituality.

In the debate that holds our attention, E. Käsemann's interventions are limited to a few pages (1954 and 1957), which prove to be incisive. Leaning on P. Vielhauer, the German exegete affirms that the existence of the book of the Acts attests to the weakening of the apocalyptic hope in Luke. A broad salvation history, well demarcated and organized, replaces the primitive eschatology. Historian, psychologist, pastor, and theologian, Luke sees his gospel as a life of Jesus, where the effects correspond to the causes and the materials are grouped as in a secular

historical work of antiquity. The exterior order—that is, the composition of the double work—reflects an interior order, the purpose of God. This Lukan position merits the qualification of theology, but it is a theology of glory that moves away from a theology of the cross, so typical of the early Christians. Indeed, Luke had to pay a high price to exchange eschatology for salvation history. Jesus became the founder of a new religion; the cross, a misunderstanding; the resurrection, a welcome correction; Jesus' teaching, notorious morals; his miracles, visible demonstrations of celestial power. In short, the story (*Geschichte*) of Jesus is transformed into past events (*Historie*). Associated with the fate of the apostles, these events are formed into an ideal and exemplary era. While in early Christianity history is inscribed in eschatology, in Luke eschatology forms a chapter of history. More than the time of Jesus (Conzelmann), it is the époque of the church that constitutes the center of history, the *Mitte der Zeit*. Luke, the first Christian historian, is a theologian of the advent of *Frühkatholizismus*. Henceforth, the church controls the message that until then had defined it. The evangelist has earned his theological position by reason of the circumstances, particularly by opposition of the wave of enthusiasm that unfurled itself on the church. Later I show that we cannot accept the positions of Käsemann as they stand.

S. Schulz (1963), who wrote an introduction to the theology of the Gospels (1967), in which he takes a critical position with regard to Luke (a proto-Catholic position according to this view), presented a shattering thesis, which to our knowledge has yet to receive the criticism due. The professor of Zurich starts with Conzelmann's position, which he first tries to consolidate by analysis of (1) the numerous verbs composed with the preposition *prov* that underline the will and providence of God. These are important themes in a time and an environment which can no longer content themselves with authoritative arguments from Scripture;⁶ (2) the subject of these verbs, which is no longer God but God's purpose; (3) the verbs that indicate "to fix" or "to determine" and eclipse the vocabulary of individual election to the benefit of a reflection interested in collectivity; (4) the vocabulary of "economic" necessity, a necessity that ceases to be eschatological and makes game of humans and transforms them into pawns, stripped of their autonomy. His conclusion goes beyond Conzelmann's views. Comparatively speak-

⁶ God's foresight finds its basis in God's essence and no longer in God's revelation.

ing, Luke's conception of God and God's purpose does not fit into the OT tradition of Yahweh, who elects his people, but rather fits into the Greco-Roman context in which God submits to destiny (*ἀναγκή—tuch—fatum*).⁷ The article ends with a list of the exegetical methods Luke uses to make known the destiny that anticipated this history of Christ and the church: the historization of the tradition, the miracles, the visible legitimation of the divine prescience, the interventions of the Spirit and the angels which orient the action, the scriptural testimonies as proof of the providence (esp. Luke 22:22), the predications, the testimonies, and the apologies as instruments God uses to vigorously direct history.

At least three arguments can be brought against Schulz. (1) If Luke had accepted the Greco-Roman concept of history, he would not have overlooked the opportunity to better relate the death of his hero with this divine necessity. Is it not this rapport that privileged especially the belief in the Moirai? (2) In as much as such a generalization is authorized, it is necessary to remark that the notions of *εἰρήμην* and *fatum* were associated with the individual in a static way. Luke has a dynamic perspective that regards history and people together. It is significant that ancient historiography hardly used the idea of destiny as a vector of the related elements, at least during the Hellenistic era. (3) Finally, Luke witnesses to a God who desires the salvation of people. This perspective fits into the line of OT historiography, even if certain abstract notions, such as the concept of *βούλη* came from Hellenism (certain Hellenistic terms had already been taken over by Jewish historiography).

In a difficult article (1964), G. Klein attempts to complete the interpretive model of Conzelmann, based on Luke's prologue. Significantly, he calls this prologue a theological program and presents a redactional type of exegesis. Up to this time, the prologue had been studied particularly from a literary point of view.

Briefly, here is this new interpretation:

Verse 1: Luke criticizes his predecessors (*ἐπιειρεῖν* has a pejorative sense) who had already sensed the problem of tradition.⁸ However, these men had contented themselves with fixing in writing the life of

⁷ S. Schulz offers as indications the Greek proverb "one can not kick against the goads" (Acts 26:14), the texts Acts 13:46 and 10:3ff., and the theme of *γεομακία* (Acts 5:39).

⁸ The "events" take place before their "accomplishment among us." G. Klein recommends a distance between the time of salvation and the ulterior time.

Jesus (the *dihghsi-* is the account of the witnesses and not the product of the work of Luke's forerunners).

Verse 2: Between the events themselves and the predecessors, Luke assigns the decisive function to those who had been the eyewitnesses and had become the guardians of the word. The understanding of this link is new with regard to all the previous Synoptic tradition. Luke limits this formidable privilege of having transmitted the *dihghsi-* (not the *pragmata*) to the twelve apostles.

Verse 3: Luke claims for himself all the authority of the apostolic tradition; the *εἶπε* *kamoiu* reveals a pretension to inspiration parallel to that expressed in the apostolic decree. He wants to go over the heads of his predecessors and go back to the events themselves (what happens to the poor apostles and their authority? "Tendenziell ersetzt für ihn die eigene Wahrheitsfindung den Rekurs auf die apostolische Tradition" [p. 206f./p. 250]).

Verse 4: Luke wanted to produce a secular as well as scientific work (Klein speaks of verification, yet does not say how it happens in history!). Luke extends the story of Jesus at the beginning, by telling the infancy narratives (the *αἰῶνες*, distinct from *αἰὲν* *αἰῶνες*-, indicates this backtracking in time) and at the end, by linking the time of Jesus with the contemporary age by means of the primitive church's history. It is *καταξιῶ* which has to express all of this. This term indicates not the order of the narrative, but its fullness. With this complete and serious story, Luke desires to communicate a knowledge (*ἡ ἐπίγνωσις*) and not faith (of course!). The *ἀσφάλεια*, first a certainty of knowledge, will become a conviction that assures me of my salvation (*Heilsgewissheit*). I am finally saved, for I have read the work of Luke who is certainly right, Theophilus will say to himself. He would also unscrupulously neglect the essays of Luke's predecessors (the *logoi* are the literary products of the *πολλοί*). Having erected this beautiful construction, Klein criticizes it as incompatible with true faith.

I find that Klein merits numerous criticisms. First of all, he uses extreme language and harsh tone, and while his desire is to bring out the problems, he in fact often makes anachronistic and unlikely suggestions. To cite but one example, many will not see what is for him the *unüberehbare Differenz* (p. 198/p. 242) between *pragmata* and *πειρῆσιν*. Furthermore, (1) it is not said that *εἰπεῖν* is pejorative; (2) *dihghsi-* is the product of the predecessors and not the account of the apostles; (3) the fulfillment of the events is one and the same thing;

(4) the object of *paredosan* is *pragmata* rather than *dihghsi-*; (5) no reader in antiquity could have imagined that one could find behind *ahwqen* and *kaqexh-* what Klein believes to have discovered; (6) *εδοξε* *kamoiν* reflects no pretension to religious or inspired character (in the apostolic decree, the authority of the text lies in the mention of the Holy Spirit, which is precisely absent here).

In reality, we can accept only one of Klein's points: Luke is sensitive to the time factor and feels like a man of the third generation who is concerned to maintain contact with the origins. But this contact is neither exclusively secular nor scientific. Rather this contact has to do with faith, which the historical account requires and confirms. Thus the apostolic witness coincides with—as would later be the case with Irenaeus, for example—history that can be written from the primitive events. Nothing says that here *αἴσθαί εἶα* is a *Heilsgewissheit*. The point is that the certainty of faith is based on knowledge of what has happened.

One must read the critique of E. Haenchen,⁹ the commentary of H. Schürmann (1962), and the exegesis of W. C. van Unnik (1973) to situate the literary, historical, and religious preoccupations of Luke in his time and not ours, and in short, to understand him.¹⁰

The pages of E. Dinkler (1955) consecrated to Luke in his presentation of early Christian historiography, also follow the line opened by Bultmann and his disciples. Luke is the Christian author whose intentions and accomplishments come closest to that of the modern historian: “. . . he sees connections and endeavors to explore their meanings and explains sequences through a motive and power . . .” (p. 333). He thinks in terms of anticipation and of a temporal future. For him, the development of mission is a historical fact that requires form and meaning: “This has to do not with stories but with history” (p. 334). The double consequence is (1) a salvation history with a center and (2) a succession of cause and effect that produces a secularization of history. This is why, in Luke, there are synchronisms between the Christian events and universal history.

As this summary shows, some obscurity remains. How can we reconcile salvation history, which according to this exegetical current makes history sacred, and secularization, which is also acknowledged, which projects sacred events in the secular realm? Without explanation,

⁹ Cf. E. Haenchen (1956); p. 679f. of the 1968 edition and p. 134f. of the 1977 one.

¹⁰ The reader can consult a second article by G. Klein (1967), which shows how Luke posed and resolved the problem of syncretism.

Dinkler dissociates human history and history directed by God, which are but one for Luke.

The same tension appears in the appendix that E. Haenchen (1956) adds to the 1968 edition of his commentary on Acts. It comes to light in a rejoinder—one of the few that we know of from the pen of the disciples and friends of Bultmann—addressed to those who, to the surprise of the author (p. 670), are the defenders of Luke. In fact, the attack is directed against Wilckens, of whom I speak below. The reaction of the famous commentator can be summarized in three theses, of which only the last interests the reader.¹¹ It is not because Luke is fond of a theological pertinence of history, as Wilckens would like, but rather it is because of the *sine die* report of the Parousia, and thus the chronological conception of eschatology, that Luke is able to write his double work and insert materials relative to the history of the church into his work. The massive character of the Lukan presentation of the resurrection of Jesus is not to be confounded with a positive valorization of history. The presence of the name of the resurrected one, who is himself absent, which accompanies the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, does not suffice to give time its existential connotation. For history and salvation history, and human interventions and divine actions do not coincide. The death of Jesus belongs to the secular horizon: Luke does not succeed in giving it the soteriological importance it should have.

At the end of this section, I would like to present two monographs on the eschatological texts in Luke; one is by J.-D. Kaestli and the other, Ruthild Geiger. Both of them know the criticisms addressed to the exegetes presented above by Wilckens and Flender and finally, in the majority of the cases, they side with the author of *Die Mitte der Zeit*.

J.-D. Kaestli (1969) knows well the bibliography concerning this subject. The first part is exegetical and confirms the deeschatologization of the Synoptic Tradition which had struck Conzelmann.¹² Luke substitutes here a perspective, unconcerned with time, for an apocalyptic hope (we ask what happens to the words *to taste death* then in his expla-

¹¹ The first thesis is: Paul is a theologian of salvation history, too. Of course, he understands it differently than Luke (p. 686f.). The second thesis is that Paul is not unaware of the traditions relative to Jesus' life, as U. Wilckens would like, but voluntarily neglects them for a theological reason. In fact, he conceives of Jesus' resurrection eschatologically (p. 687f.). The majority of these developments disappear in the 1977 edition (p. 140f.).

¹² J. D. Kaestli comes to this conclusion even for certain texts for which Conzelmann maintains an apocalyptic point, like Luke 12:49-59.

nation of Luke 9:27, as well as the theme of judgment and the notion of kingdom in Acts).¹³ Moreover, he transfers the “delay” of the Parousia, which the tradition suggested, over onto the life of the individual (Luke 12:57-59, p. 22). Furthermore, he takes the accent which lies on eschatology and places it on ethics (Luke 18:1-8, p. 37). He justifies the delay of the Parousia in the parable of the talents (Luke 19:11-27). These motifs clearly appear in the two major eschatological discourses in Luke 17:20–18:8 and 21:5-36. As can be seen, the exegesis often stays within the path outlined by Conzelmann.

The second part of the study intends to situate Luke’s eschatology in the history of early Christianity. In fact, the author rather confronts the line, one would call Bultmannian, with important nuances which distinguish, for example, a Conzelmann from a Käsemann and the critical positions that have emerged since then, especially from H. W. Bartsch, H. Flender, W. C. Robinson, O. Cullmann, and U. Wilckens. At the end of all this arbitration, he decides on the following solution. (1) The schema of salvation history exists indeed. (2) The delay of the Parousia played an important role in its elaboration. (3) This delay, however, is not the principle factor. (4) Luke is less original than was said, for Paul himself defends a salvation history and Mark, before Luke, had already sketched out the life of Jesus and interpolated the mission between Easter and the Parousia. (5) It remains that Luke does not succeed in conferring a positive meaning to the cross, which is a serious lacuna (p. 92). (6) Luke redeems himself, if we may say so, by conferring a positive sense on deeschatologized history, which he studies as a scholar (Luke 1:1-4); this optimistic perspective would be acceptable to the theologian because of the Word and the Spirit on the one hand, and the ethical responsibility of Christians on the other. Luke’s originality lies in this new historical consciousness (cf. p. 91), which expresses itself in a dialectical unity between the historical event and its kerygmatic significance (p. 90).¹⁴

In her dissertation in Würzburg, Ruthild Geiger (1973) concentrated her attention on the two eschatological discourses in Luke 17 and 21.

¹³ Page 72. Kaestli thinks that the entrance into the kingdom occurs at the death of the individual rather than at the Parousia of the Son of Man. How can this be reconciled with Luke 21:31, if we decide to follow the exegesis that Conzelmann offers for this verse (on p. 53, the author does not decide).

¹⁴ A last chapter asks the question of Luke’s proto-Catholicism, i.e., the ecclesiological question. We cannot say that Luke fights a gnostic front, nor that he establishes a succession guaranteed juridically or sacramentally.

The tradition taken over in Luke 17:20-37 comes from the source of the Logia of which it formed the conclusion (the warning with regard to the seductions of false messiahs). Its eschatology is primitive. Furthermore, Luke introduces the notions of faith and humility into literary units, which henceforth frame this eschatological chapter.

In the exegesis that follows, the author stops at length on the famous verses 20-21, presenting the principal interpretations. In her opinion, Luke refuses the presages concerning the arrival, whether spatial or temporal, of the kingdom, which regularly occupied Jesus' audience. Concerning the future, Luke prefers to speak of the Son of Man rather than the kingdom, and he associates the latter with the historical activity of Jesus. The kingdom and the Son of Man remain related as the content of Christian preaching, but they are still separated by the present moment, which is sandwiched between the manifestation of the kingdom and the Parousia of the Son of Man (the separation is marked in Luke 17:22 by the change in audience). Sudden and inescapable, the future of the Son of Man is, however, not unknowable, for it is articulated in Jesus' past, marked by suffering (Luke 17:25 is redactional). In an original way, Geiger valorizes the historical abasement of the Son of Man.¹⁵

The explanation of the parables of Noah and Lot (Luke 17:26-30) that Luke transforms into allegories, following a Jewish Hellenistic tradition, leads the author to seek for the Lukan significance of the word day. In the singular, the term signifies the eschatological event disconnected from history. Vielhauer and Conzelmann had already thought this. On this day of the Son of Man, rewards and punishments will be distributed to humans. In the plural, the days characterize the long present period, the daily life of the community. Our German exegete rejects all qualitative relations between these days and the last day: "Bei Lukas hat die Geschichte keine über sich hinausweisende Kraft, sondern erschöpft sich in der Zeit vor der Vollendung, die dann ein ganz und gar von aussen gesetzter Akt ist" (p. 108). The reader finds here a bit out of place the distinction between history and eschatology, which the Bultmannian school believes to have discovered in Luke. Salvation is for tomorrow. Only today can the call to salvation be heard, according to

¹⁵ Concerning Luke 17:24 (the image of lightning), Geiger notes that the evangelist shifts the focus from what in tradition dealt with the day or the coming of the Son of Man, to the person of the Son of Man. This eschatological manifestation of the Son of Man gained inspiration from the OT and Jewish tradition concerning the apparition of the hypostasized glory of Yahweh.

the book of Acts. Different from Vielhauer and Conzelmann, she thinks that Luke, with regard to his sources, emphasizes the importance of this final day. The problem of the delay of the Parousia does not occupy the evangelist here. In later chapters of his work (12 and 17), Luke has already found a solution, by rejecting the “when” and underlining the “that.” Framed by redactional passages, which should orient the interpretation (Luke 17:20-21 and 18:1-8), the discourse, taken from Q, becomes a balanced exposition on the end of time and its demands for today.¹⁶

In my opinion, the exegesis of chapter 21 is inferior to that of chapter 17. The author depends even more heavily on Conzelmann and ignores almost all the non-German literature.¹⁷ She also proposes several explanations that are difficult to support. Allow me to summarize a few of the conclusions. (1) Three motifs are at the source of the Lukan rereading of Mark 13: the time of the church which endures, the evangelization of the nations and the significance of the temple and Jerusalem. (2) The “days” that will see the destruction of the temple are historical and not eschatological, as we have seen with regard to Luke 17. Later, the reader will find again the distinction between historical events and eschatological ones (vv. 10-11, p. 170). (3) Verses 7-11 attack heretics and not the partisans of the imminent Parousia (p. 169). At this point, the author parts company with Conzelmann. (4) Reaching the final events, with the *shmei'a* of verse 11, Luke, as Conzelmann had seen, turns back to his present history, marked by persecutions (vv. 12-19). With regard to verses 12-19, I would like to ask several critical questions. In what way does the meaning of *marturion* (v. 13) differ from its use in Mark? Was Luke aware or not of the Marcan saying concerning the evangelization of the pagans (Mark 13:10)? Does the presence of the name of Jesus permit us to deduce that suffering brings one near to the Lord (p. 189)? Who would accept the following explanation to the mysterious verse 18: “. . . es liegt hier sicher ein Schluss a minori ad majus vor: wie viel weniger kann dann die Person existentiell gefährdet

¹⁶ At the redactional level, Luke 17:34f. concerns the final sorting out, which should not be confused with the noneschatological divisions that the believers' involvement introduced into society.

¹⁷ Especially Kaestli. Concerning the work of A. Salas (1967), she says “mir nicht zugänglich.” She does not know the work except by the review of J. Schmid (*BZ*, n.f. 14 [1970]: 290-92). This is hardly acceptable, for it is a book that concerns the very subject she is studying. The author could have borrowed it from professor Schmid or made a trip to Rome (to the Pontifical Biblical Institute) where it can be found!

werden!” (p. 190)? (5) According to Geiger, the “time of the pagans,” first of all, indicates the period of the Romans' triumph, but also the era of the mission to the Gentiles, which the book of Acts so amply narrates (p. 207). (6) The rough passage from v. 24 to v. 25 confirms that Luke is hardly worried about an apocalyptic reading of the world, but his concern is rather an eschatological one (p. 216). But what have we gained by saying this? Moreover, does not this idea seem to contradict the thesis of the dissociation of the historical and the eschatological? (7) Finally, I think I have understood the author: the long history of the church is distinct from the last times. By separating itself from a chronological type of eschatology, the present time has lost all its apocalyptic coloring. However, even with this, it does not become a secular period (here again Geiger parts from Conzelmann), because it moves toward the end. This is what the author should call the eschatological understanding of the world (p. 209), “eschatological” in the qualitative sense, introduced by Bultmann. All of this is very complex and should be clarified. I still feel a contradiction between the thesis on p. 108, which refuses any transcendental (eschatological) vector into history, and the one on p. 209, which contrariwise confers an eschatological charge to it. In my opinion, for Luke, the history of the world and the church (the “and” must be elucidated) are part of salvation history, and salvation history is marked by the promise (of the Scripture, Luke 21:22, and of Jesus) and is fed by the presence of the Spirit and the Word. For all of this, it is not eschatological in the chronological sense, since the purpose of God seems to have programmed a distant Parousia.¹⁸

¹⁸ E. Trocmé (1957) and J. C. O'Neill (1961) seem to accept the delay of the Parousia and the Lukan displacement of eschatology. In the chapter consecrated to the unity of the work of Luke, Trocmé takes over four of Conzelmann's ideas that are found in Luke Acts: (1) the eschatological recoil; (2) salvation history; (3) the importance of the preaching of the gospel; and (4) the central role of Jerusalem. The French exegete's work is an important contribution to the study of Acts, for it analyzes from a historical, literary, and theological point of view. The double work is apologetical *ad extra* as well as *intra*, not against gnostics but rather against the Judeo-Christians. As for the title of O'Neill's study, it should be inverted. The work deals with the historical setting of Acts from a theological perspective. The result is that the Lukan work, thematically and literarily, is near to Justin. It is thus proper to situate it in the second century. Among the subjects not treated, the author mentions at the end of the book (1) the delay of the Parousia; (2) the normativity of the time of the apostles; and (3) the proto-Catholicism, still unconscious, of Luke.

SEVERAL REACTIONS

Before broaching the authors who have given personal support to the problem of Lukan eschatology in studies consecrated to this subject, I first would like to point out several reactions of lesser import. They are grouped naturally into four themes.

History

O. Cullmann (1965)¹⁹ welcomed with approval Conzelmann's work and accepted Luke's ambitious accomplishment. Yet on two decisive points, the professor of Basel deviates from his colleague in Göttingen. (1) Luke is not the inventor of salvation history; Paul, John and even Jesus were its defenders before him. (2) It is not the delay of the Parousia alone that is at the root of Luke's elaboration. Jesus had already preached an intermediary period that Mark and Paul, to cite but two of Luke's inspirers, proclaimed without shame.²⁰ Far from being a betrayal of the kerygma, the Lukan schema is a faithful presentation of the purpose of God. The present, marked by the resurrection of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, is already the time of salvation which is not yet come to its fulfillment. Let us mention that between *Christ et le Temps* (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1947; ET, *Christ and Time*, 1950) and *Le Salut dans l'histoire* (ET, *Salvation in History*, 1967), Cullmann read G. von Rad's OT theology²¹ and understood that at the risk of falling into *Offenbarungs-positivismus*, it was necessary, with regard to salvation history, to evoke contingency as well as continuity.

For F. Schütz (1969), the church lives in the time of persecutions (Luke 21:12-19), which is no longer identified with the end times. By adhering to an argument from *Die Mitte der Zeit*, the author is led to criticize the concept of history of Conzelmann, Käsemann, and even Wilckens. These men were wrong to presuppose that history has two levels, one human and the other divine, and they were also wrong to say that in spite of the crucifixion, salvation history continued. There is but one history, and it is God's, mediated by humans: God acts by allowing

¹⁹ O. Cullmann (1965), 214–25.

²⁰ Here the author (p. 222 n. 1) can lean on the book of E. Grässer (1957).

²¹ G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I-II (Munich, 1957–1962) (FT, Geneva, 1963–1967; ET, London, 1962–1965).

the rejection of the Messiah. God has foreseen this. Jesus' resurrection would not be a correction along the way; it is rather the pursuance.

Salvation

It is the same according to W. C. van Unnik for Luke's global project (1960). For the Dutch exegete, the German exegesis presented above insisted too much on salvation history and not enough on salvation. For the moment it is fitting to recall the importance of this theme and its vocabulary.

The concern is to modify the normal interpretation of the book of Acts. This second volume does not represent the history of the church. The call to mission, the parenetic effort, and the apologetic worry are secondary motives of composition.

The book of Acts, as much as Luke's gospel, proclaims the kerygma, just as attested in the program of Hebrews 2:1-4, which is a parallel to the book of the Acts. The saving activity of Jesus is confirmed in the apostolic preaching, as Luke transmitted it in writing. At the center of both the gospel and Acts, there is the conviction that God offers salvation to the world. The one complements the other, and they reinforce one another, like the two witnesses required by the Mosaic law. The redaction of Acts does not represent a fleeing into secular activity, but rather the fulfillment of an evangelizing mission, which the eschatological nature of the present time imposes. Historical research and literary anxiety are but means used to this end.²²

I. H. Marshall, in his work (1970),²³ is also centered on Luke's intention concerning salvation. History, which Luke studies by means of his time and the traditions of his church, is the field where salvation emerges. History and eschatology are on equal footing, as the Christian revelation fits into time.

²² On the subject of this chapter, we can read from the same author (1) a state of the question (1966); (2) an article that rejects the thesis according to which salvation history would be in Luke an anti gnostic rampart (1967); and (3) a study of the verb *σωζω* in the Synoptics (1957, in the bibliography of ch. 5). These articles are assembled in the first volume of *Sparsa Collecta* (W. C. van Unnik, *The Collected Essays* [Leiden, 1973]).

²³ For a deeper presentation of I. H. Marshall's book, cf. chapter 5, p. 298-302.

The Number of Periods

As we have seen, Conzelmann distinguishes three periods in salvation history with subdivisions (at least for the last two). The number and nature of the periods have provoked diverse reactions. Many have criticized the break at the ascension. For them, Luke 16:16, the cornerstone of Conzelmann's argument, indicates only two epochs: the time of promise and that of the accomplishment. Reading the Lukan double work confirms them in their view. More important than the break, a unique quality links Jesus' time with the time of the church. The gospel is proclaimed and salvation is present. Luke, in their view, only knows the opposition between the old and the new covenants. The period of the church differs from an uncomfortable waiting room, where we find consolation in contemplating the image of Jesus, who, through his works and days, prefigures the kingdom, which is slow in coming. Besides Cullmann, van Unnik, and Marshall, who draw their criticisms from this reservoir, we can add S. G. Wilson (1969–1970), C. Burchard (1970), J. Kodell (1971),²⁴ G. Lohfink (1971),²⁵ J. Panagopoulos (1972), W. G. Kümmel (1970, both titles),²⁶ and the authors the latter indicates. Generally, it is admitted that the ascension marks the break not of the kerygma which continues to ring out, but of the situation of the believers with regard to Christ. Being absent, the Christ finds in the person of Holy Spirit not an *Ersatz* as Conzelmann would like, but a substitute. The Spirit is henceforth present in the church. Also to be recognized is that the history of the church does not always remain identical to itself. If Conzelmann distinguished the first days of the church of the Pauline period, C. Burchard (1970) and C. H. Talbert (1974), for example, separate the period evoked in Acts from the contemporary era. For Burchard, the present is not, strictly speaking, a period, given the imminence. Talbert, on the other hand, thinks that Luke considered the

²⁴In this article, J. Kodell presents basically the positions of Conzelmann (1954) and H. Flender (1965). With the latter, it seems he opts for the eschatological character of the present period and the continuity of salvation history from Jesus' time to our own (p. 146).

²⁵According to this writer, the time of salvation is subdivided into a period of Jesus and a time of the church; but it is a secondary subdivision with respect to the larger rupture of the OT and the NT. G. Lohfink indicates (p. 255) several authors who share his opinion. Concerning Acts 3:19–21 and the Lukan conception of history that transpires in these verses, cf. G. Lohfink (1969), summarized 146.

²⁶W. G. Kümmel (1970, second title). We are referring to the reedition of this article in the 1973 volume of *Memorial*, L. Cerfaux, 101.

contemporary epoch as decadent, which leads him to propose a salvation history in four movements.

The Motifs

Conzelmann grants a primary function to the delay of the return of Christ. Diverse authors, who accept generally the Lukan schema of salvation history, propose other constitutive factors, which are perhaps more important. In a book that deals with diverse problems of introduction²⁷ and presents the research of several scholars,²⁸ C. K. Barrett (1961) thinks that a reading of Acts is difficult because of the double image of the church which appears: the primitive church that Luke wants to describe and the church of his own time, which he sometimes projects into the past. According to Barrett, the church in Luke's time has to fight against gnosticism. Taken up in this fight, Luke accentuates the historical aspect of revelation and the corporality of the resurrection. This view is similar to G. Klein's (1961), who differs in his procedure. We describe Klein's view in a later chapter: to avoid the dispersion of revelation and authority, Luke creates the concept of the Twelve, protectors of the tradition, and rescues Paul from the gnostics by domesticating him. "That Luke-Acts was written for the express purpose of serving as a defense against Gnosticism" (p. 15) is also the thesis that C. H. Talbert desires to establish in his first work (1966).²⁹ The notion of authorized witnesses, the correct interpretation of the Scripture, the transmission of the tradition, the public character of the Christian proclamation, and the materiality of the events are thus indications of the polemic that Luke embraces.³⁰

Two other authors have proposed another motivation. For G. Braumann (1963, first title), it is the persecution endured by the church, not the delay of the Parousia that incited Luke to dissociate eschatology

²⁷ (1) The text of Luke Acts; (2–3) the literary genre (Luke with regard to the historians and religious writers of his era); (4) the language; (5) the traditions that Luke takes over; and (6) the ecclesiastic roots.

²⁸ M. Dibelius, B. Gärtner, A. Ehrhardt, A. Morgenthaler, H. Conzelmann, and E. Haenchen.

²⁹ Cf. 73–78.

³⁰ Cf. an article of the same author concerning the anti-Gnostic character of the Christology, noted in the bibliography of chapter 3 (1967–1978, second title), and the contents are taken up in the most recent contribution of the author (1974), summarized 73–78.

from the present time. Eschatology is pushed into the indefinite future of the present time. In the present painful situation, the church comforts itself by looking into the past (I ask: is it not a meager consolation for those who suffer, to know that they are not the only ones and that John the Baptist and Jesus were martyrs before them?). By refusing to be exalted today, believers will avoid humiliation at the last punishment.³¹ F. Schütz comes to a similar result (1969). Luke's work contains various indications concerning suffering, which posed a painful problem to the faith of the church, awaiting the imminent triumph of its Lord. Lukan theology would then be the answer to this anxiety. At its heart is the encouraging figure of the suffering Christ.

SALVATION HISTORY AND ESCHATOLOGY

I would like to look step by step at the main authors who have addressed the central problem of salvation history in Luke, either independent of H. Conzelmann or in dialogue with him.³²

E. Lohse (1954)

Contrary to varying critiques, I do not think that E. Lohse interprets Luke independently of Conzelmann's theses. If he could not have referred to *Die Mitte der Zeit*, which appeared the same year as his own investigation, he knew of Conzelmann's article "Zur Lukas Analyse," which appeared in 1952 as well as Vielhauer's (1950). The polemic had already been launched in the same review in which his article appeared (cf. the articles by G. Harbsmeier and O. Bauernfeind). We can appreciate that Lohse opted for a peaceful position in this battle.

³¹ In an article concerning the fall of Jerusalem (1963, second title), G. Braumann accepts the thesis of Conzelmann: the fate of the city is dissociated with eschatology, but the author opts for another cause for this dissociation than the one proposed by Conzelmann. The fall of Jerusalem is historical, for it is the punishment God inflicts, in time, on those who reject Jesus. The destiny of the believers alone remains associated to the Parousia, which will witness the reestablishment of the present martyrs. Jerusalem suffered because it was unfaithful. The believers, we might add, suffered because of their infidelity.

³² Author of a commentary on the Acts that appeared in 1939 (repr. 1980), O. Bauernfeind intervened in the debate on several occasions (1953; 1954; 1963).

His analysis of the prologue (Luke 1:1-4) shows that as he introduces the gospel and Acts, Luke is presenting a literary text as well as an edifying work. With the conscience that explains his method, Luke differs from his predecessors while having the same goal. His goal is to tell the story of the events that God has accomplished, with organized testimonies in historical narrative. Lohse insists on the three terms—events, God, and accomplishment. In doing this, he refers to other revealing passages: Luke 9:51 and Acts 2:1. The two steps in the life of Jesus, like the first days of the church, were truly the accomplishment of the plan of God, already announced in the Scriptures. “In diesem Aufriss, nach dem Heilsereignisse über das Leben des irdischen Jesus hinaus sich in der Kirche fortsetzen, hat Lukas eine Theologie der Heilsgeschichte entworfen, die von dem Evangelium des Markus ebenso charakteristisch unterschieden ist wie von der Theologie des Paulus” (pp. 264–65). The difference resides in the concentration on the Christ event, or more precisely on the cross, which is characteristic of Paul and Mark.

The Lukan work is rooted in the OT in two ways. First, the life of Jesus affirms the persevering faithfulness of God with regard to the people Israel, the first addressee of the gospel. Then, the literary genre of the double work is reminiscent of the OT historiography, especially Deuteronomy.

This bridge, which links the past of salvation history to the present, launches a final arc. The “today” of Deuteronomy brings the Mosaic past and present of Israel together. In similar manner, the historic recollection that Luke offers goes beyond the evocation of the past and becomes reality in a kerygmatic calling. The present time—here Lohse most vehemently opposes Conzelmann—must not only endure the effects of a past salvation, but receives the nourishing presence of Christ. This is why there are abundant occurrences of the title *kurios* in the Gospel of Luke. The intervention of the apostles is clearly necessary so that this may happen. Luke goes as far as to intentionally project the title into Jesus’ life. Faithful to the proclamation, the disciples will also be submitted to the fate of their master. “Wie Christus starb, so enden auch seine Zeugen” (p. 273). As for the simple believers, they are edified by listening to the words of the Lord, as the Parousia ceases to be imminent. They feel that their Christian conviction, born from the hearing of the Word, is confirmed in the reading of the mighty acts of God told by the evangelist throughout his work.

On the whole, I agree with Lohse's study, particularly with the positive value he gives to the present period. Yet I would have liked that the notion of *ajsfavleia*, which plays such an important role in Bultmann and Klein, to be better analyzed.³³ Thus, the reader would have known whether or not the historical presentation threatened the authenticity of faith.

H. J. Cadbury (1956)

I found it difficult to understand all of Cadbury's arguments. Let me note several impressions of the whole. The author discusses more the theses of C. H. Dodd on realized eschatology than the opinions of the German theologians summarized above, and finally comes to a position close to O. Cullmann's. Cadbury considers Luke not an original theologian, but rather a believer with firm but simple convictions. He thinks that Acts was as much an interpretation as an exposition of the prior events and, finally, attempts to situate the Lukan texts in the evolution of early Christianity.

If primitive Christianity, especially Paul, believes in the resurrection of Jesus, the Parousia, and the actual presence of the Spirit, Luke is to be praised for having established a relation between the three. The Spirit is not poured out until after the resurrection (I would say the ascension, cf. Acts 2:33), and he is associated to the Parousia by the addition of the *last days* of the quotation from Joel (Acts 2:17). A resurrection on the earth implies an ulterior ascension, as the Parousia also demands a departure from the earth.

However, there was not only one conception of the resurrection in early Christianity. Differing from, for example, the gospel of Peter, Luke places the appearances before the ascension.

These apparitions are spread out over forty days and follow the return to life of the one who had been three days in the tomb. Another characteristic of Luke is the objective, realistic, even massive presentation of the bodily resurrection of Jesus who returns to his physical activities, for instance, eating and drinking. "Luke himself had apparently an orderly mind and a strong belief in objective reality" (p. 303). Different from Talbert, Cadbury does not conclude an anti-gnostic polemic.

³³ Cf. p. 270, which has a few lines on the subject.

It would be wrong to understand the objective information Luke gives concerning the resurrected One and the Parousia as poetic expressions or projections of the unconscious. It would also be an error to desire to place all the data of the Acts into the eschatological program, for certain uses of the verb *ajnistavnai* and the word *ajnavlhmyi~* cannot be associated with certainty to any precise event, such as a resurrection or an ascension.

Even if Luke does not describe the Parousia after reflection and in detail, he perceives it as a historical and real event. It can be supposed that he is waiting for a spectacular return of the Son of Man with the angels. This will be the time of the reestablishment, the judgment and the resurrection: "As far as the eschatology is concerned it is consistent enough to have been acceptable to the simple mind of the writer" (p. 312). The attention that Luke gives to Jerusalem implies, without a doubt, that just like the resurrection and Pentecost, the Parousia will happen in the holy city. Without resolving the enigma, Cadbury judges that Luke had a precise reason for minimizing the role of Galilee.

Miraculous healings, Jesus' resurrection, and the outpouring of the Spirit are an anticipation of the end. But this anticipation is not to be summarized by realized eschatology, for it does not suppress the objective reality of the act to come. Acts does not spiritualize hope, nor does it emphasize the imminence of the end. The church's condition in the world led Luke to correct an impatient hope into a persevering waiting.

Another work written by Cadbury concerning the cultural environment of the book of Acts,³⁴ attests that this scholar feels more at home in historical rather than doctrinal discussions, and this historical rigor and fear of anachronisms can serve as hedges to the promenades of theologians.

U. Luck (1960)

Luck's article represents an intelligent theological reaction to Conzelmann's position. He sets out with one conviction: that contemporary studies centered on salvation history do not yet reach the heart of Lukan thought. They only describe the framework.

³⁴ H. J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (London, 1955).

From the prologue of the gospel, and more precisely the *λογος* (Luke 1:4), Luck thinks that this term designates the kerygmatic schema of the christological speeches in Acts. This is the same as to say that Luke's objective was to confirm the Christian message.

Contrary to the most widespread interpretation, this confirmation is not of a rigorous historical kind, as if the facts could prove the meaning. On the contrary, the Lukan discourse must attest that the facts are not profane, that they fulfill the OT or, at least, the purpose of God.

The Lukan concept of the Spirit is the major argument in favor of this thesis. In his history of the Synoptic tradition,³⁵ Bultmann already noted that Luke did not unfold a continuous history, but rather a series of interventions of the Spirit. In the Lukan texts, the Spirit has a double mission that is practical and hermeneutical: he is the instrument God uses to act and the sign indicating the supernatural signification of the events.

God acts in history by God's Spirit. This central conviction permits Luke to resolve the problem of the particularism of revelation. Without the presence of the *pneuma*, the particular history of a Jewish messiah remains obscure for the Gentiles. scriptural proofs change nothing, for they come from a book whose authority is not universally recognized. Nature and the Unknown, both integral parts of the argument in Acts 17, can be used as starting points, but their weight is not compelling. Moreover, this is seen in Athens where Paul's presentation provokes laughter, not faith. To convince, to overcome the last obstacle of human resistance, God's own work by the Spirit is needed. The story of Cornelius shows this especially well.

Scriptural argument like the apostles' witness does not convince by its logic or evidence. The agreement between the promises and the life of Jesus is not a mathematical equation, but rather is the explanation of "from faith to faith" given by the resurrected One. Similarly, the witness of the apostles attests not to the historicity of the facts, but to the pneumatic activity of God in history. This active presence of the Holy Spirit is not limited to the time of Jesus. Luke can speak about it, for he is living it. This is what links Luke's time to the time of Christ, much better than an abstract continuity of a salvation history. Thanks to the Spirit, Jesus' time, which belongs to the past, can become present.

³⁵ R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen, 1957), 391f.

I share Luck's sentiment with only one reservation. Taken up by the polemic, this exegete affirms (p. 64) that the Spirit, not salvation history, is the exclusive gate to the story of Jesus. Luke would not have written two books if he had been so pentecostal! Access to Jesus through history is not barricaded. Only the access to the truth of this story is reserved to the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the author realizes this when he says that history and the kerygma go together. Neither history nor the pure call to decision can suffice in themselves.

*U. Wilckens (1961)*³⁶

This German exegete presents and evaluates the theological project of Luke.³⁷ From the speeches in the gospel and Acts, he believes he is able

³⁶ F. Mussner (1961) defends the authenticity of "in the last days" (Acts 2:17a) and draws several conclusions concerning the eschatological perception that Luke has of the present time. By the same author (1962) we can read an analysis of Luke 17:20b-21, verses we know are important for the interpretation of Lukan eschatology: neither predictable by signs, nor exclusively future, the kingdom is among you in the form of enigma that only those who place it in relation with the person of Jesus can decipher. As for W. Eltester (1961), he published an article entitled "Lukas und Paulus." The first part brings Lukan studies up to date (it is particularly a controversy with A. Ehrhardt [1958]). To understand Luke's theology, it is necessary to place the evangelist within his own time period: in the eighties and not in the second century (against G. Klein). The precise traits of *Frühkatholizismus* are lacking (against E. Käsemann). The polemic against Judaism is still intense. The corpus of the Pauline letters is not yet constituted. The author of Luke-Acts is Greek and did not want to do the work of a historian, but of an evangelist. The arguments evoked against the identification of the author with the companion of Paul are not all binding. Particularly loose are those based on theological differences, for Paul's theology is that of a converted Jew. As a Greek, Luke could not understand the apostle's approach. The circumstances more than the times have changed: while the Pauline kerygma renounced the Synoptic tradition, Luke, with a clear theological will, inserts this tradition. This is why the gospel is placed before Acts. In placing Acts after the gospel, Luke pays tribute to history, whereas John telescopes the exalted Christ and the historical Jesus. However, in Luke, the history remains a salvation history. The Lukan particularity of the apostolate is not unfaithful with regard to the apostle Paul, but rather the consequence of the adoption of the Synoptic tradition. Similarly, the relation between Judaism and Christianity is no longer Paul's, not because the times have changed, but because Luke's point of view is different. It is the approach of a Gentile, who is bent on explaining that all the chances for conversion have been given to the Jews. The "Judeophilic" character of the Lukan apostles originates from an ecclesiastical preoccupation of a Gentile Christian: to show the continuity between the Israel of the promises and the early church. The OT reveals to Luke the God who is creator of the world and regulator of history. Furthermore, he presents the prophecies relative to the Christ. All that Paul could have read in them escapes Luke. A new and important contribution to the work of Luke was provided by W. Eltester (1972).

³⁷ This important work contains: (1) a good state of the question that insists on the

to establish its redactional nature. He is convinced that his work confirms several of the ideas of Conzelmann and Haenchen. Widely accepted by contemporary criticism as far as they describe the Lukan realization, these theses are rightly the object of lively controversy as soon as they offer value judgments. Like Vielhauer, Wilckens declares that a simple comparison of the respective doctrines of Paul and Luke is inadequate. It is necessary to keep in mind the historical situations of both before judging them. I would not go as far as Wilckens, who following W. Pannenberg says that such a treatment, simply human, is demanded by the essentially historical character of God (p. 195; I return to this thesis that exaggeratedly links the essence of God to history).

There are four indications attesting to Luke's historical displacement with respect to Paul. (1) While Paul receives a kerygmatic and liturgical tradition that is still homogenous, Luke has to struggle with prolific traditions.³⁸ (2) Luke assimilates the Synoptic tradition, which Paul, according to Wilckens, does not yet know. (3) Paul's religious situation is completely different from Luke's. Paul fights on two fronts: against Judaism and gnosticism. Luke's situation, described by Wilckens in the negative, is no longer threatened by Judaism and while the gnostic danger is nonexistent. (4) The situation of the Christians in the world has modified. Persecution, still local in Paul's time, has become general (this is not evident in my opinion).

Wilckens finds a common denominator in these four differences; the space of history, which was closed to Paul, has opened up wide to Luke's life and reflection: "das Problem der inzwischen überall wirksam und also aufdringlich sichtbar gewordenen geschichtlichen Zeit des Christentums, das theologische Problem der Kirchengeschichte und damit der Geschichtlichkeit der christlichen Glaubens als solcher" (p. 200).

consensus of C. H. Dodd—M. Dibelius (the speeches take up an archaic traditional schema); (2) a first section on the recurrent structure of the speeches; (3) a second section shows that the redactional frame corresponds admirably to the speeches; the scheme of these latter is redactional as well as a good part of the material used; and (4) a last part situating the Christology of the speeches in Hellenistic Christianity and ending with a theological evaluation of which we speak in the text. J. Dupont (1962) wrote an excellent summary and critique of this work.

³⁸ To oppose, as Wilckens does, the solutions that Luke and "popular Christianity" (this unfortunate term designates 2 Peter, the Pastoral Epistles, etc.) give to the problem of the apostolic heritage seems to be a simplification that exaggerates the theological merit of Luke.

I am in agreement with Wilckens until here. He finds the appeal to the delay of the Parousia, which Conzelmann invokes, too limited and too negative. We appreciate his emphasis on the present time, which receives a *heilsgeschichtlich* dignity (p. 201). Yet I consider that this author leaves the exegetical terrain and moves toward a more contestable systematic approach when he sees history, like Pannenberg, as the horizon enveloping Christian theology. For to accept the historical and secular character of the manifestation of God—which becomes a past event—Wilckens saves normalcy in a odd manner. He does not invoke the present intervention of the Spirit, as Luck does, but discovers an intrinsic organization made up of announcements and fulfillments in history. In this manner, the relationship between the OT and the time of Jesus is explained, as well as the relation between Christ's period and the contemporary era. To conclude that Luke's merit was that he knew how to elevate these representative structures to the level of a reflective theology is to make Luke a systematic theologian, which he certainly could not have wanted nor have been. To say that Luke situated Jesus' life in a salvation history is no doubt correct, but to add that he inserted this *Heilsgeschichte* into a universal history is again an exaggeration. This gives too much weight to the synchronisms that situate the lives of John the Baptist and Jesus. To go from a theory of universal history to a concept of God who manifests his essence by acting in history, there is but one step that Wilckens does not hesitate to take. To add that God is not immanent in history, since God is not metahistorical, seems to be a restriction that approaches retraction. He is closer to the truth when he declares that God's intervention, in the resurrection of Christ, fits into history, and since it is historical, it has universal importance for Luke by reason of the prophecies.

When he evokes the name of Jesus and the word of God as dynamic elements that link the two periods, the author dilutes his wine a bit. History could not be the only necessary mediation for salvation. All the better!

For the author, three deductions emerge from these theses, which are hard to understand and summarize: (1) For Luke, faith is oriented first toward the past of Jesus and not toward the living Christ. This is indicated by the narrative schema of the christological speeches, especially Acts 10:34-43. From the Lukan prologue, I would say that the believer comes to know the life of Jesus when he meets the living Christ. (2) Primitive Christianity does not become a sphere connected to the

salvific times of Jesus that we contemplate, powerless to attain except by imitation (against Käsemann). (3) Luke insisted on Jesus as the bearer of salvation, but he did not know how to explain why Jesus was the savior, nor in what salvation consisted. The cross has no redemptive import, which truncates the concepts of justification, the law, and conversion. Therefore, Luke is indeed the theologian of glory that Käsemann claims he is. Here, Wilckens, in my opinion, accepts too quickly the ideas of the Bultmannian school.³⁹

W. C. Robinson (1960)

The German version of this dissertation from Basel, written and published first in English, is subtitled “Dialogue with Conzelmann.” This shows the influence exerted by *Die Mitte der Zeit* and the trouble the author goes to make his own way (at the Parousia we will see if it was the Lord’s way as well!). The work contains two parts, but their relationship is difficult to see. The first and most original is titled “The Composition of the Lucan Material,” and the second, where the dependence on Conzelmann becomes more evident, “Eschatology in the Gospel of Luke.” Always simple in his formulation, Robinson sometimes seems to insist too strenuously on the details. This is particularly true in certain criticisms of Conzelmann, where he is decidedly over-critical. This subtlety and excessive precision sometimes lead him into misunderstandings that could be serious. On p. 28f., the reader may have difficulty grasping whether the present period is deprived of salvific character, like Conzelmann, or whether the period of salvation extends into the time of the church.

The work begins with a double criticism, which is precisely done. (1) Contrary to Conzelmann’s reports, Luke did not intend to “deeschatologize” John the Baptist and his message (which were already deeschatologized in the tradition Luke took up). He simply wants—for polemic reasons—to reduce the prestige of the forerunner. This perspective for-

³⁹ J. Dupont (1962) and E. Haenchen (1956) expressed sharp reserves with regard to the last pages of Wilckens’s book. In his evaluation of present research (1966), Wilckens corrects some of his theses. He insists on the distance that separates Luke from his sources and on the fact that the framework of salvation history is already indissolubly associated with the primitive Christian kerygma that Paul makes his own. The attacks against Luke come from a contestable existentialist understanding of the Apostle Paul.

bids the exaggeration of the *heilsgeschichtlich* break between John (which Conzelmann placed, as we know, in the old covenant) and Jesus.⁴⁰

(2) The impressive division of the life of Jesus into three periods, which Conzelmann proposes, is an optical illusion. These breaches are not clear. Moreover, Conzelmann does not always situate them in the same place (this is especially true for the third stage). If the baptism and the transfiguration can be considered as the epiphanies inaugurating a new time, one cannot say as much for the entry into Jerusalem. The rejection, which according to Conzelmann regularly follows the divine manifestation, does not clearly appear except at Nazareth and in Samaria, in the first and second parts of the life of Jesus. Whereas Luke 13:32f. may suggest a life of Jesus in four movements, other texts such as Luke 9:51⁴¹ favor only one break within the evangelical history. In any case, Luke's gospel, despite Conzelmann, does not incite one to see a psychological development of Jesus' messianic consciousness.

With these two criticisms, Robinson does not seek to question the notion of salvation history as applied to Luke's work. He attempts to remove what was static and external from Conzelmann's presentation. What is important for Luke—and this is the thesis of the whole work⁴²—is not the stages that divide (the author thinks he has shown that the exact chronology of the periods is of little import to Luke), but rather the movement of the salvation history, the internal dynamic. After his striving with Conzelmann to demonstrate this continuity, this progress, Robinson puts all his strength into these pages, which finally come to life. For this, Luke 23:5 is the crucial verse that explains the sequence of the whole gospel. Jesus' entry on stage constitutes the new principle of salvation history, marked until then by the promises. Luke expresses the accomplishment of the purpose of God in its totality as a walk or a way (Acts 1:21; cf. Acts 1:2; Luke 9:51; 4:13; 13:35; 19:38). The movement,

⁴⁰ S. G. Wilson (1969–1970) also thinks that Luke does not remove all eschatological value from John the Baptist.

⁴¹ The reader may not grasp why the word *take up* (Luke 9:51) and the verb *to take up* (Acts 1:2, 11, 22) might indicate that the life of Jesus would unfold in two stages.

⁴² Another thesis: the ministry of Jesus has a normative value as the representation of the reign of God. From here the church draws its confidence in the divine plan that stretches toward the last realization of this reign. The church draws its legitimation from the time of Jesus, for it is the present proclamation centered on the kingdom and the authority of the apostles that has been given to the church. It would be exaggerated to say that Luke elaborates his concept of the apostolate in order to offer a historical guarantee to the tradition on Jesus. Luke's preoccupation is more that of a pastor who takes care of his flock than that of a historian or archeologist (pp. 28–30).

crossing over the thresholds and stages, is more important than geography or chronology, which dissect. The theme of the way appears in the quotation of Isaiah 40:3, which Mark transmits to Luke. The author also resorts to the use—to us in a limited and rather conventional manner—the terms *dromo-*, *odō-*, and *eiṣodo-*, and the verb *poreuesqai*. The way is not the way of humans, not even of Jesus, but the way of God. God has come to visit God's people (the second part contains a precious study on the Lukan theme of visitation, inspired by the LXX). The insistent presence of the divine *pneuma* attests that this way realizes the very plan of God.

In the second section Robinson admits with Conzelmann that the coming of the kingdom—not to be identified with Christianity, against Vielhauer—is postponed indefinitely. He recognizes also that Luke 21 dissociates the fall of Jerusalem from the last events, a dissociation that Mark has already operated, against Conzelmann. However, the fall of Jerusalem, following Jesus' rejection by the holy city, is not a secular event (against Conzelmann), but the vindictive visitation of God, announced by the prophets and Jesus himself. Like the present life of the church, the Jewish war is not eschatological but it nonetheless fits into the course of salvation history.

From this presentation, three criticisms come to mind. (1) Where does Luke get his theme of the way? It is not enough to speak of the influence of the LXX. What is this way exactly? A life, a path to follow? The texts that speak of it do not seem to make any allusion to the history that maintains with God's people. Furthermore, these passages are too fragile to support Robinson's entire thesis. How does this way of the Lord coincide with the commonplace course of events? Does it suffice to say that history has no meaning (against Conzelmann and Wilckens), but that it receives its signification from God? How are these divine interventions brought about? By the absurd death of a man or by the miraculous healings of a gifted thaumaturge? Even though the author does not answer these questions, we must admit that he astutely perceives the dynamic movement of the history of Jesus, foreseen and instigated by God, and this Luke avows.

(2) What about the present time period? Robinson denies that the ascension occasions a radical rupture in the time of salvation inaugurated by Jesus. Nevertheless, he admits that the life of the church begins in less favorable conditions than those of the master. Despite all, the passage from one book to the other on a formal level, and the departure

of Jesus on a thematic level, indicates a solution of continuity. However, Robinson does not clearly consider the rift and continuity between Jesus' time and the time of the church.

(3) Is it exact to say that the composition of Luke's gospel was effected from Luke 23:5? When G. von Rad explains the origin of the Pentateuch from Deuteronomy 26⁴³ he can demonstrate the traditional and archaic side of this confession of faith. Robinson does not furnish the same demonstration concerning Luke 23:5.⁴⁴

*D. P. Fuller (1964)*⁴⁵

This book, another dissertation from Basel, first aligns six chapters dedicated to the interpretation of the resurrection from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. It comes to an end with a long last chapter written in honor of Luke, or rather to a certain image of Luke.

Conservative in questions of introduction, the author paints a portrait of Luke with marked traits. The evangelist would have been a man with a square face, simple ideas, and strong convictions, which he must believe at the risk of spiritual shipwreck because of the hardening of one's heart!

⁴³ G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I (Munich, 1958), 127ff.

⁴⁴ To our knowledge, few periodicals have presented the work of W. C. Robinson. Cf. the review of H. C. Waetjen in *JBL* 84 (1965): 300f. Robinson also wrote an article (1960) concerning the theological sense of the journey of Jesus to Galilee in Judea; the trip is one step on the way of the Lord. The length of the journey is explained by the fact that Luke wants to solidly install the apostles in their function as witnesses. In our opinion, the presence of the witnesses at the side of Jesus is important for Luke. It does not explain, however, the length of the trip.

⁴⁵ To present H. W. Bartsch's position (1963; cf. before this, 1959), we can do no better than to cite the good summary given by J. D. Kaestli (1969, 56): "H. W. Bartsch refuses to speak of the extinction of the apocalyptic expectation in Luke. He lifts out of the third Gospel a series of affirmations concerning the proximity of the judgment and the kingdom, which Conzelmann cannot integrate into his conception without doing them violence (Luke 3:9, 17; 10:9, 11; 21:32). In fact, Lukan eschatology must be understood from a double opposition. On the one hand, it is a systematic correction of a primitive concept which in leaning on Gnostic speculations, identifies the resurrection of Christ with the coming of the Kingdom of God. Luke answers this by underlining that the eschaton is linked to no determined event (the resurrection of Jesus or the destruction of Jerusalem: cf. Luke 19:11; 21:9, 12). On the other hand, he combats an easing of the eschatological expectation. This is the reason for his insistence on the sudden and unpredictable nature of the end, and his numerous exhortations to vigilance (cf. Luke 9:27; 21:32, 34-36). It is the 'watch at all times' of Luke 21:36 that best summarizes the intention of Lukan eschatology: each moment of the life of the community is found immediately in relation with the eschaton and placed under judgment."

In writing Acts, Luke pursues several objectives, of which the main is the account of the diffusion of the gospel among the pagans according to the project of Acts 1:8, which, in fact, is only true for the first nineteen chapters. Making the passage of Paul at Ephesus a turning point, Fuller perceives of this trip of the apostle to Jerusalem as the return to mission; it was not to deliver the collection but to tell of his missionary success. This evocation considers—and this is its principal function—the activity of the grace of God.

All of the positive events, such as the conversion of Paul or his free activity at Rome, where he is nonetheless prisoner, must be connected to this divine grace, which Fuller makes the heart and motor of Lukan thought. The effectiveness of this heavenly favor, expressed in the conversion of several Jews and the vocation of the pagans, must originate in the resurrection of Christ, which is why one thought passes logically to the proof of the other. The success of the mission to the pagans proves the value of the apostolic witness, and the reality of the resurrection of Christ proves in turn the generosity of divine love. Thus Luke's participation in the last events (Luke 1:1) and the knowledge of the eye-witness account of the apostles (Luke 1:2) offer Theophilus historical evidence that would confirm his first instruction. This is, for Fuller, the signification of the Lukan prologue.

What remains to be defined is the importance of the facts and the nature of the proofs. Fuller achieves this in the following way. The facts that Luke reports are historical, and because of their historical character, they are evidence that should convince the human intelligence: "Since the mission to the Gentiles cannot be explained apart from the granting of this teaching ministry to Paul by the risen Jesus, and since the Gentile mission is an unquestioned fact of history, Paul's divinely given teaching ministry is therefore historically verifiable. Consequently, Theophilus could not know that the teaching of the apostles and of Paul was from God, for they had been appointed by Christ to have a teaching office and to be witnesses" (p. 226f.).

In the last pages, the writer has to explain why, if the proofs are constraining and the resurrection is an "inescapable" (p. 232) empirical evidence, everyone does not believe. The first answer is that to accept the historical evidence, God's help is necessary (in this way the author thinks to distance himself from Pannenberg). "For Luke, revelation is to be found in history, but history itself is not sufficient to produce faith. Faith comes only when one is the recipient of special grace that turns

one from the powers of darkness to light so that he will be willing to own up to the persuasiveness of the historical evidence” (p. 237). He concludes with two levels of history, the first, empirical, and the second, where the causes, coming from God, cease to be immanent (p. 252).

I cannot accept this positivistic conception of history and revelation, for Luke has a more nuanced view of salvation and of events. Moreover, his insistence on grace hides another aspect of Luke’s thought: the reminder of humanity’s responsibility, which has been sometimes taken as a synergetic tendency. Finally, forgetting the importance that the Western part of the empire gave to Luke, Paul, and the Roman Clement, Fuller bestows an excessive function on Paul’s sojourn at Ephesus; the mission to the Gentiles is not terminated in Ephesus, not even symbolically.⁴⁶

H. Flender (1965)

A systematic mind, Flender rebukes Conzelmann for having applied modern categories such as salvation history to the antique thought of Luke. He also reproaches him for having conceived of the Lukan project in a simplistic manner. In reality, according to Flender, Luke did not succumb to the attraction of a positivism of revelation, for dialectic is the principal mark of his gospel. It is found as much on the formal level where similar attracts opposite, as on the thematic level where the historical and eschatological relay and complete one another.

The title of the work is *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*, and it is divided into three parts. The first part sets out the schemas of Lukan thought as well as their literary expression: the correspondences, the *crescendos*, and the antitheses. These literary indications are meant to demonstrate that Luke does not conceive of history as a simple chain of cause and effect. The reality is more complex than that. The *crescendos*, for example, signal that on the human level a divine reality superimposes itself.

The second part concerns preaching as Luke conceives it: centered on a Christology that dialectically considers the historical Jesus and the

⁴⁶ D. P. Fuller—if we have read properly—is wrong in saying that Paul founded the Christian community in Ephesus. As Acts 18:24ff. attests, there were already Christians in Ephesus when the apostle arrived in the city.

present Christ. The evangelical message also contains two elements. The kerygmatic element is related to the Easter elevation of Christ, and the other, apologetic, is associated with the history of Jesus. Flender wrongly calls the kerygmatic element of preaching “heavenly,” but is right to underline its existence. The other aspect, which the author, differing from Conzelmann, is pleased to note, is the domain of history. Yet Luke has chosen it for a theological reason: divine revelation reaches us in our profane reality—thus the important remonstrance against Bultmann entitled “Die Eingehen der Christusbotschaft in die weltlichen Ordnungen.” (pp. 69–83). The following affirmation can be read: Luke specifies the human side of the eschatological reality (p. 77), and further, the work of Christ is neither conformed to the world nor a stranger to it (p. 77). Luke also dialectically associates humanity’s liberation from the world (Bultmann’s position) and the sanctification of the world, both of which are effected thanks to the Word.

So the conclusion of the second part is that Luke does not historicize reality in a positivistic manner. The third part establishes that the evangelist does not sacralize the history of the church in a supernaturalistic way either. Flender begins with the conviction that Luke accepts a spacial concept of time which appears, for example, in Revelation (ch. 12). According to this conception, the eschatological fulfillment is not to come; rather it is above. If humanity has not reached the last days, it is not because the latter are to be awaited, for they are elsewhere, in the heaven. It is understood that this “spacialization” of eschatology confers decisive importance on the ascension of the resurrected One, who in this way reaches his kingdom. By regrouping the future and the celestial under the term *eschatological*, Luke maintains the tension between the present and future of the eschatological reality that he inherited from the apostles’ generation. However, something has been modified: Luke joins the exaltation to the theological content that Mark and Matthew still associate with the Parousia.

From this, Flender thinks he is able to evaluate the continuing history of the church and the world. He uses the notion of Israel as the frame of the existence of the church and the world. The Jews, having rejected the Messiah, become the image of the world condemned by God. Insofar as Judaism transmits the promises, it finds its legitimate continuation in the church, the true Israel. The continuity is assured on a historical level, and the discontinuity or novelty on the eschatological level (Flender tries to show this from the terms $\lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\omicron\lambda\iota\omega\varsigma$).

Flender is able to conclude his book by affirming that the present period is not a dismal stage of transition (against Conzelmann). For the Holy Spirit is presently active, by reason of his double—not contradictory—character, eschatological and *heilsgeschichtlich*. The Spirit is eschatological as the instrument of God: humans, according to Luke, never have free disposition. The author describes the present interventions of the name of Jesus and the word of God in the same manner.

Until now, the presentation of this book has held to theological theses. So that the reader might realize the skill of the exegesis, I would like to indicate the meaning given to the crucifixion. With Conzelmann, Flender admits that Luke tends to historicize the passion Narrative, and there is indeed, in Luke's work, a reference to the visible and historical level, yet this is only one side of the reality. For the believer, the agony and death of Jesus arouse existential perceptions. This agony and death suggest, if we may say so, a return to a cause, which is not historical, and a descent toward an effect, which is not verifiable. This signifies for faith that the eschatological character of the cross, which emerges from the conformity to the purpose of God, induces the faithful to bear his own cross.

The criticisms can be divided twofold. (1) Fender's exegesis is often arbitrary and represents a form of redactional analysis that discovers meaning in the compositions and the whole. His exegesis could have, and should have, engaged itself more in a diachronic perspective and distinguished tradition and redaction more clearly. (2) The rebuke addressed against Conzelmann can be turned against Flender. If the modern category of salvation history is not without danger, what can be said of the constant use of the category called dialectic? No doubt, Luke perceives that history which strikes the senses is not the last word on reality. But does he really perceive dialectically the affinity between historical and eschatological, between the visible and the heavenly?⁴⁷ If Flender does not give the word *dialectic* a Hegelian sense, how does he mean it?

⁴⁷ We continue our presentation and critique of this book in our chapter on salvation (cf. chapter 5, 290-292). The reader can read three critical presentations of H. Flender: J. D. Kaestli (1969, *passim*), H. Kodell (1971), and R. A. Edwards (1969). The last article presents the articles of L. Keck (1967) and O. Betz (1968), as well as the English version of H. Flender's book (Philadelphia, 1968).

*J. Reumann (1968)*⁴⁸

To pass from Flender to Reumann is to pass from an exegesis that is engaged in the ways of systematic theology to an exegesis that limits its ambition to a dialogue with history. The American exegete first shows the cultural burden that the term salvation history has carried for the last two centuries.⁴⁹

Choosing from numerous approaches, he analyzes the background of the term οἰκονομία. For the Greek world, οἰκονομία meant, among other things, the divine administration of the universe (in a cosmic, not historical, perspective). Following the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint gives no importance to this term. On the other hand, Hellenistic Judaism little by little appropriated the vocabulary of the *economy* to qualify the rule of God over the universe. In this takeover, we witness a certain opening up of the cosmic sense toward a historical significance. When Reumann reaches the Pauline corpus, he proposes that we not read the patristic concept of the economy of salvation too quickly.⁵⁰

Arriving at Luke, Reumann parts company with his project, since the term οἰκονομία does not occur in Luke, and the nearest vocable, διαϱηκῆ, is exceptional. This is of little importance, for Luke certainly composes his work in a salvation history perspective. The question of the origin of this perspective is thus posed. Reumann jettisons any apocalyptic or gnostic influence on Luke and—because of lack of evidence—refuses to make Jesus the father of salvation history.

Whereas two directions are evident, he will follow one and then the other. The first is the way of Greek, Roman, and Jewish historiography. It seems clear that certain historians, like Polybius, Posidonius, and

⁴⁸ Against P. Vielhauer, P. Borgen (1966) shows that the theology of Luke remains in the furrow of Paul's. The continuity concerns particularly eschatology: "Auf eine klarere Weise als Markus interpretieren sowohl Lukas als auch Paulus die Zeit der Heiden auf Grund einer eschatologischen Interimsperiode, welche die historischen Ereignisse mit dem Eschaton verbindet. Lukas interpretiert auf diese Weise das Ausbleiben der Parusie innerhalb des Rahmens einer eschatologischen Perspektive, die schon bei Paulus bezeugt ist" (p. 157). The book of A. Salas (1967) does not touch directly our subject, since he attempts to detect behind Luke 21:20-36, alongside of Mark, a second source. He then seeks to define its theology.

⁴⁹ The first pages of the article provide a brief presentation and a rich bibliography on this subject.

⁵⁰ J. Reumann summarizes here the conclusions of an earlier article (1966-1967).

Josephus, explained the course of events by destiny or providence.⁵¹ It could be that Luke was influenced by this historiographic movement.

Yet Luke does not seem to record events in a divine plan that embraces the whole of history. Reumann hesitates to follow Conzelmann to the end. Hence he prefers to go in the other way; the Jewish liturgy recalls in summary fashion certain important acts of God in the history of God's people. Inspired by the thesis of K. Baltzer on the Bundesformular,⁵² Reumann supposes that the synagogue maintained the custom, on certain solemn occasions, of relating one of the covenants of God which according to the formulary was preceded by a historical reminder. "I think it not unlikely that Luke's most heilsgeschichtlich surveys owe something to this background" (p. 112). A difference surely exists: the primitive church associated the last intervention of God in Jesus Christ with these historical evocations. The beginning of the latter could vary between the creation and the royalty, passing by way of Abraham and Moses. The Christian kerygma was therefore not evoked without reference to its historical precedents.

For a sociological reason, Reumann thinks this Jewish background is more likely than the other. While it is not clear which Christian audience could have been interested in a Christian history written after the canons of the Greek historiography, we understand without difficulty that the first disciples of Jesus readily accepted an account that took up Israel's liturgical tradition. Even if the explicit references to the covenant are rare in the NT, the covenant formula, which included a historical reminder, an evocation of engagement as well as a declaration of blessings and curses, could very well be the background of several early Christian documents. His prudent conclusion is: ". . . the possibility that Luke's view of *Heilsgeschichte* roots in covenantal recital deserves consideration."

This important study suggests several remarks. (1) After a wave favorable to the covenantal formulary, presently—if I am well informed—the scholars are witnessing a resistance to this hypothesis. The research must continue.

(2) The recourse to the formulary seems to explain certain Lukan texts, which are strongly influenced by the Jewish liturgy (Acts 4; 7; 13),

⁵¹ J. Reumann seems to be unaware of S. Schulz's thesis (1963), summarized above p. XX. Otherwise he is remarkably informed.

⁵² K. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular* (Neukirchen, 1960).

whose traditional character is generally recognized. However, it does not take into consideration the global project of Luke.

(3) Reumann still does not always keep to the program he has fixed for himself (a diachronical semantic study of the term *economy*). He seeks in historiography what writers offered as a universal principle of history (in this case, they refer more to destiny or providence than to economy); from the Jewish liturgy he retains a literary structure and not the concept of covenant. The same hesitation is found concerning Luke. Without precisely defining either, Reumann debates, sometimes, the general intention, which organizes the facts into a salvation history and, sometimes, certain texts or terms, of which one does not see the corresponding rapport with the totality of the work.

(4) Nonetheless, understood as a study of the possible background of the Lukan work, the two milieus presented surely merit consideration. As for me, I prefer the way marked out at the beginning of the article: a Greek reflective idea desirous to take into consideration the totality of the universe. This idea would then have been taken over and adapted by Hellenistic Judaism with a religious and historic perspective.⁵³

O. Betz (1968)

In his article entitled "The Kerygma of Luke," Betz also challenges the excess of redactional analysis, as well as the theological consequences that are drawn. He prefers to grasp the major themes in Luke-Acts and then look for the background. Luke did not betray the primitive kerygma, for unlike the historians, he did not write a Christian Antiquities, but a gospel. The Lukan presentation of history remains kerygmatic.

To clarify the meaning of Jesus' preaching as the evangelist presents it, Betz turns to the fragment from Cave 11 of Qumran, relative to Melchizedek. Three of the characteristics of the messenger of God, which the Hebrew text announces, are to be found in the gospel: (1) the good news concerning the heavenly defeat of Satan is proclaimed on the earth (cf. the preaching in Nazareth, Luke 4:16-30); (2) this proclamation is destined to the entire earth (cf. Luke's universalism); (3) the

⁵³ J. Reumann published other articles concerning the notion of *oikonomia*, which he mentions in the notes (they appeared in *JBL* 77 (1958): 339-49; *NT* 3 (1959): 282-99; F. L. Cross, ed., *Studia Patristica*, III [Berlin, 1964], 370-79).

messenger is anointed of the Holy Spirit (cf. the baptism of Jesus and the allusions to the anointing, Acts 10:38, etc.): “The early Christian exegetes must have linked the ministry of Jesus with similar traditions, and it is Luke who points most clearly to them” (p. 136).

Against the Qumran fragment, Luke considers Jesus not only as the messenger of good news, but also the agent of the eschatological reign of God. Expelled from heaven, Satan fell to the earth where he continues to prevail. Jesus does not content himself with announcing the heavenly victory; he tears Satan’s victims from him.⁵⁴ In a similar double activity, the apostles fall into line behind Jesus.

It is necessary to wait for the book of Acts to witness what corresponds in the Christian regime, to the heavenly enthroning of Michael or the Savior: the exaltation of Christ. Like other scholars before him, Betz indicates the distinguished role that the divine promise made to David (2 Sam 7:12ff.) plays here. It is more the early Christian kerygma, inspired by the Davidic prophecy than the personality of Luke, which explains the relation between the speeches in Acts (e.g., Acts 2, given by Peter, and Acts 13, by Paul).

In his third section, Betz indicates the personal note that Luke gives to the primitive kerygma: the distinction between Easter and the ascension. This provokes other displacements: (1) pushed back to the end times, the apocatastasis hoards an eschatological character which the ascension no longer possesses; (2) the title “Son of God” and the messianic unction of the Spirit make, if we might say so, an inverted journey. Romans 1:3f. associates them with the resurrection, and Luke takes them back to the human origins of Jesus. These signs of Easter become emblems of Christmas. Using Jewish material, especially taken from 2 Samuel 7, Luke can respond to the expectation of the Greek world, which hoped for the birth of a savior.

Against Vielhauer, Betz concludes that Luke maintained a relationship between the Son of Man and the kingdom, between the kerygma of the apostles and Jesus’ kerygma, because Jesus Christ reveals the kingdom. Moreover, Luke cannot be reproached for being *frühkatholisch*, for the historical framework of his work maintains a nonobjective and eschatological connotation. Furthermore, even if Luke did not understand the theology of the cross, he shares with Paul the same conviction concerning the resurrection of Christ. Finally, even if ministry is linked

⁵⁴ Luke could have written a salvation history. O. Betz judiciously remarks, because of the persistent presence of evil as well as the delay of the Parousia.

to the Twelve, it preserves a dynamism that prevents its hardening into an indurate institution.

*R. H. Smith (1958 and 1971), H. Hegermann (1964), F. O. Francis (1969),
and A. J. Matill (1972)*

I would like to regroup here the results of several articles, which claim not only that Luke maintains an eschatological character of revelation, but also that he was a defender of a near, even imminent, character of the Parousia. Since each study comes to its conclusions in a different manner, it is best to summarize each of them.⁵⁵

We know of three articles by R. H. Smith: the first (1958, first title) is a state of the question which places Bultmann's disciples on one side and the partisans of a historical eschatology on the other. Without saying so, the author allows me to establish that before Conzelmann, Bultmann had already spoken of Luke's historicization of revelation (E. Rasco, 1976, will also note that the author of *Die Mitte der Zeit* is less original than has been said). Curiously, elsewhere, Smith does make it clear enough that Cullman is in the second category of exegetes. The second article (1958, second title), often paraphrasing the third gospel, insists on the universal mission of the church, which is not a substitute of eschatology, but a sign of the end. The same is true for the preaching and persecution that accompany mission (p. 891). The delay in the Parousia corresponds to the patience of God (p. 895), and despite all, Luke maintains the imminence (p. 896). In summary, he declares, "he [Luke] sees eschatology unfolding historically" (p. 882). It is Christ's intervention in Luke's person, by the power of grace, that one owes this theological concept (I would like to know how Smith succeeded in delving into the evangelist's heart). Luke makes the resurrection the cornerstone of his theology of history and eschatology. The third article (1971) investigates the theology of the book of the Acts by starting at the end of the work with Paul's stay in Rome (Acts 28:17-31). Paul's journeys, like this one, have a double function. On the one hand, it is through them that God confers on history a general cohesion. On the other hand, they make apparent the inner trek of the believer. These two

⁵⁵ We can join to these authors C. E. B. Cranfield (1963), who speaks of imminence, but for him it is an imminence associated with the decisive event of the cross, and H. W. Bartsch (1963). The latter is summarized on p. 44.

functions manifest the continuity that is established between the Scripture, Jesus, and the preaching of church. By putting Paul's arrival at Rome and the elevation of Christ in parallel, Luke shows how to resolve the problem of distance between the two figures. This solution is neither mystical nor institutional; it is totally christological. It is the risen Christ who alone assures the continuity. Generally well documented, these three articles set out with a conviction that Luke shares with them (that history and eschatology do not exclude one another), but the exegesis is not rigorous enough to move from impressions to certitudes.

H. Hegermann's brief article (1964) presents three theses. Luke kept the hope in an imminent end alive (the verse concerning the generation that would not pass away, Luke 21:32, cannot be understood otherwise). The expression the "time of the nations" (Luke 21:24) and the quotation of Zechariah 12:3 (LXX) both have an apocalyptic coloring which confirms the parallel in Revelation 11:2. Luke integrates the fall of Jerusalem, unrelated to the Parousia, into an apocalyptic schema. This time of the pagans could cease at any moment and the end would come immediately (I do not understand how the author can say that Luke, different from Mark, eliminates all mention to the great tribulation, which would be placed before the last events. Is it not playing with words to say that this trial is integrated into the end times? Luke 21:10-19 does not deal exclusively with the past).

His second thesis is that it is necessary to propose a division of the periods of Jesus' life, Israel, and the church that differs from Conzelmann's. Thus Luke places a time of rejection before a joyous period of success. This is the way of salvation.

The present time is not deprived of the benefits of salvation. It is preaching which saves today from negativity. The fulfillment of the kingdom is still awaited, but its proclamation already rings out (cf. Luke 17:20f.; 19:11; 16:16). From this the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit come forth for today.

Confidently, F. O. Francis (1969) proposes nothing less than a new model for understanding Luke's eschatology. Indeed, he thinks that exegetical verification does not confirm the model of the Bultmannian school. For lack of understanding concerning the exact nature of the new model, I choose to present only a few of his hypotheses. Francis rightly retains the lesson "in the last days" of Acts 2:17 (as F. Mussner, 1961, second title, had already proposed) and deduces from it that Luke

considers the outpouring of the Spirit on the early church eschatological. Acts 2:21 indicates that salvation is a proleptic realization of the Parousia of the Lord. Since Jesus Christ, the center of the kerygma, is resurrected, the apostolic message that it concerns can only be eschatological (cf. Acts 26:6-8, 22b-23; 4:2-10). Believers participate in the transcendence within history (a Bultmannian speaking of historicity could accept this formulation but he would doubt the phrase reflects faithfully Luke's orientation). The second and less convincing thesis is the following: the sequence of Luke 21:12-26 (the time of the testimony, the fall of Jerusalem, and the heavenly signs) constitutes an eschatological meditation on Joel 2. Thus Luke does not dissociate the fall of Jerusalem from the last events. This manner of doing makes the eschatological question even more heated. His third thesis is that Luke maintains the imminency but refuses immediacy! He is conscious of the lively tension which characterizes the Christian life and understands this tension in a temporal (Luke 19:11-27 is to be interpreted from Luke 12) or in a spatial (Luke 10, it seems) manner. By incorporating eschatological materials, Luke hints that the kingdom is near in the ministry of Jesus (Luke 4:16ff.) and the witness of the seventy (Luke 10:1ff.). The success of Luke's theology depends on the synthesis that occurs between the historical narration and eschatological truth. The opposition which the apostles encounter in the Acts attests that the evangelical history does not convince simply by its claimed coherence and positivity. It is obvious that this article offers less than it claims, for several studies before it have claimed the eschatological character of history, and this sometimes from the same texts and arguments.

A. J. Mattill, who has given us an indispensable bibliography on the Acts, as well as diverse recent articles,⁵⁶ follows a completely different path to defend the imminency of the Parousia. Rejoining R. F. Weymouth—whom likely he read while writing his doctoral dissertation on the history of the interpretation of Acts—the American exegete invites us, in the name of healthy philology, to give a value of immediate future to the uses of *mei l ein* which the Acts utilize to signal (Mattill would say to date!) the end times: Acts 17:31; 24:15, 25 (cf. Acts 10:42). I am not convinced. If Luke had really wanted to underline the immi-

⁵⁶ A. J. and M. B. Mattill, *A Classified Bibliography of the Literature on the Acts of the Apostles* (Leiden, 1966). For the articles, cf. 1970, 1972 (second title), and 1975.

nency he would have taken the effort to add *tacui* or *tacew-*,⁵⁷ as the author of the Revelation so wisely did (Rev 22:20). He would not have composed in so a solemn manner Acts 1, a chapter that imposes the mission for today and postpones the Parousia until later. Neither would he have edited the framework of the parable of the Unjust Judge (Luke 18:1-8) nor modified the one of the Talents (Luke 19:11-27). Finally he would not have regularly put in the mouths of Jesus' adversaries or the badly formed disciples the question concerning the date of the Parousia (for example, Luke 17:20). According to the evangelist, this question should not preoccupy us; the exegetes of our century have hardly followed these instructions!

E. E. Ellis (1969) and S. G. Wilson (1969 and 1973)

After a methodological preamble and a state of the matter, Ellis's article proposes to begin with Lukan anthropology which is monist, like the anthropology of other biblical books. This excludes the concept of the individual death understood as *εσχατον* as well as the Platonic contrast of time and eternity.

Following this, it is proper to introduce Christology, which in Luke occupies the whole of soteriology: cf. Luke 11:20. If the kingdom can be near in the preaching of the disciples (Luke 10:9), this means that the "Twelve" are Jesus' plenipotentiary agents, according to the shaliah principle, and that they are associated to their master in corporative solidarity, dear to Semites. To complete this, it is necessary to add a Christian eschatology in two phases, issued from the Jewish conception of the two aeons. At this point, the essay becomes more difficult and perhaps more clustered. If the activity of the Holy Spirit by Jesus has made salvation present, the judgment and consummation of all things are transferred to the end time. While, by his resurrection, Jesus is off the scene, his disciples have to wait. Their participation in salvation can only take place at present by "being" corporally "with Jesus" (Luke 23:43) or "in God" (Luke 20:36). What could be called the vertical dimension of eschatology is not an announcement of a heavenly accomplishment on earth, but rather the earthly realization of the res-

⁵⁷ In Luke 18:8 *ἐν τῶν* appears once, but the translation of these words is not sure: "suddenly" or "soon"?

urrection of Jesus manifested in heaven. If I have understood correctly, Luke's eschatology has a spatial quality; thus it is attainable or realizable. This does not contradict the corporal character of salvation history, which continues to the end.

When Jesus Christ intervenes in human history, it constitutes, at one and the same time, an accomplishment, a deliverance from evil (here the insistence is on continuity), and a novelty (the accent, here, is on discontinuity).

This eschatology may have a polemic function. It dismisses, on the one hand, the "spiritualists" by insisting on the corporal resurrection and, on the other hand, the partisans of a "political messianism," by distinguishing that period from the coming kingdom. Eschatology must calm the deceptive hopes of an anticipated accomplishment. The last section, which owes much to Cullmann, serves to demonstrate this. The delay of the Parousia is not a "problem" that would have engendered salvation history. Rather, from a historical point of view, it is a weapon that Luke uses against those who were too impatiently waiting for the Parousia, and they were numerous in the first century. "Theologically, the delay motif is set in relation to the two phase eschatology mentioned above. Since the eschatological reality is present, the length of the interval until the consummation takes on no crucial significance" (p. 154, ET). The Holy Spirit and the resurrected one make this reality present.

Ellis's position is interesting, but in order for it to be solid, it would be necessary that it be supported in two ways. First, on a conceptual level, is it correct to arrange Luke's anthropology in the "conceptual context" of eschatology? What is a conceptual context of eschatology, if not an abstract reality? Yet this is not what the author wants to say. Furthermore, when he affirms that the "identification of the eschatological accomplishment with Jesus provides the explanation which permits one to understand the relation of the present age and the age to come" (p. 150, ET), he does not tell us which "Jesus" he means (the historical Jesus or the resurrected Christ). He does not consider that the question might be asked concerning the sort of identification intended. I could lengthen the list of terms rich in meaning, which go undefined: for example, continuity, newness, presence, anticipation, and accomplishment. Since the author desires to avoid Platonism in his theology, he should have stated precisely in what consists this anticipated accomplishment, through the Spirit, in the form of incorporation in the Christ.

Second, we must turn to the exegetical level. We did not verify if Ellis's commentary on Luke (*The Gospel of Luke*, London, 1966) answers our questions, but the article, in any case, does not always provide sufficient exegetical argumentation. In particular, Ellis seems to attribute to Luke a Pauline conception of "being in Christ" that is foreign to the evangelist. He spurns a bit too quickly the texts that favor an eschatology of the individual type which becomes reality at the death of man.

Pages 59–87 of S. G. Wilson's dissertation (cf. the bibliography of ch. 7 of this book, below) are consecrated to Lukan eschatology. They take over the content of an article which appeared in *NTS* (1969–1970).⁵⁸

The author detects two series of texts and begins with two different eschatological conceptions in the Gospel of Luke. According to the one, the date of the Parousia is postponed (Luke 9:27; 19:11, 41f.; 21:20-24; 22:69; Acts 1:6-8), and the problem of the death of believers is resolved by an individual resurrection and a private Parousia (Luke 14:12-14; 16:9, 31; 24:43; Acts 7:56). According to the other, Luke maintains, on the contrary, the imminence of the second coming (Luke 10:9, 11; 12:38-48; 12:54; 13:9; 18:8, where *εἰς ταρσεῖ* signifies "soon" and not "suddenly"; 21:32). Wilson refuses to hand the second conception over to tradition and to reserve the first for the evangelist. He is also opposed to a later date of composition (before A.D. 70), which would explain both of the perspectives. He believes he has found the correct explanation in Luke's pastoral concern, which protects his sheep from two dangers: the presumption of an apocalyptic fervor of low quality and the discouragement from the delay in the Parousia. From a theological point of view, Luke is less original than has been said. Following a movement already sketched out by Mark, Luke modified Jesus' eschatology to include in salvation history the mission to the Gentiles.

According to Wilson, Acts ignores the imminence and was written much later than the gospel. In this second work, Luke would have substituted a schematic salvation history and a present activity of the elevated Christ for the imminence.

Wilson's explanation is not very ambitious. It could be partially valid, though the eschatology of Acts contradicts it. For if the theme of imminence has a polemic function against discouragement or spiritualism, it should appear strongly in the Acts, written after the gospel, at a period even more menaced by these dangers. The explanation, without a

⁵⁸ Cf. above, p. 31-32 and n. 40.

doubt, does not consider enough the results of redactional exegesis, which seem to us to situate the delay in the forefront of Luke's preoccupations. Finally, we wonder if Luke, by this claimed pastoral preoccupation, would not have complicated the problem and confounded the minds of his reader—parishioners (this is at least the opinion of G. Schneider, 1975).

*J. Panagopoulos (1972)*⁵⁹

The author of *God and the Church: The Theological Witness of the Acts of the Apostles* (1969, written in Greek), the Orthodox J. Panagopoulos knows German Protestant exegesis well. He condensed his ideas in an important article (1972), which dialogues mainly with Käsemann. The writer analyzes successively the beginning of Acts, the christological discourses, the historical scenes, and the summaries. Different from many exegetes, he places God at the center of Lukan theology. He accepts the term *salvation history* and even *theology of glory*, but, as we will see, he redefines these terms.

⁵⁹ H. D. Betz (1969) analyzes the legend of Emmaus (Luke 24:13-32) and indicates what henceforth is the mode of the presence of the resurrected one: it is in the interpretation of the Scriptures and the communal meals. It is a presence related to the event of the cross and accessible to faith. This article, without being an explicit contribution to the study of Lukan eschatology, sets forth some important elements to define the time of the church. The year after, R. Schnackenburg (1970) presented his interpretation of the first apocalyptic discourse of Luke (Luke 17:20-37). He attributes to the redactional work of Luke the following: the double frame vs. 20a and 22a; perhaps v. 21b; v. 22; the reminder in v. 25 of the suffering of the Son of Man; the insertion into v. 31 of a saying taken from Mark, which should instill faithfulness in the hour of the end; v. 32; and the question of the disciples in v. 37a (the v. 34a on p. 230 should be corrected). The redactional work allows several particularities of Lukan eschatology to emerge: (1) the bending of the apocalyptic expectation of the end; (2) the accentuation of sufferings, persecutions, and tribulations; and (3) a gaze on the coming of the Son of Man that motivates the parenesis and encourages the community. By the sensitivity, he witnesses to the theme of vigilance. Luke remains faithful to Jesus' intention. Luke 21, the second apocalyptic discourse, will open the space necessary for the mission and the churching of the Son of Man; the insertion into v. 31 of a saying taken from Mark, which should instill faithfulness in the hour of the end; v. 32; and the question of the disciples in v. 37a (the v. 34a on p. 230 should be corrected). The redactional work allows several particularities of Lukan eschatology to emerge: (1) the bending of the apocalyptic expectation of the end; (2) the accentuation of sufferings, persecutions, and tribulations; and (3) a gaze on the coming of the Son of Man that motivates the parenesis and encourages the community. By the sensitivity, he witnesses to the theme of vigilance. Luke remains faithful to Jesus' intention. Luke 21, the second apocalyptic discourse, will open the space necessary for the mission and the church.

In what he calls the *prooemium* of Acts, which is in fact chapter 1, a theocratic program is presented. The time of the church is a history, determined and realized by God, who fulfills Israel's past (continuity) and participates in the last *nouveauté*. As others, Panagopoulos does not think that history and eschatology are incompatible.

The narrative of Pentecost, especially the theological dating of Acts 2:1, which takes over Luke 9:51, confirms and completes this interpretation. The gift of the Spirit, which is both fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel and irruption of the new reality, is an eschatological event. This Spirit incites the church's own prophecy and contemporary *shmeia*. This eschatological reality will conclude the Parousia (this is the meaning Luke gives to the Joel citation). The future Parousia neither takes the eschatological radically away from Christian existence nor transforms it into a "worldly" conformity. The time of Jesus and the time of the church have a clear relationship: they are related to the eschatological salvation already inaugurated. Here we can sense the Orthodox heritage in Panagopoulos's conception of the church which is the place of actualization of the Christ's presence and the eschatological reality.

Against U. Wilckens (1961), Panagopoulos considers the christological schema of the speeches (Acts 2; 3; 4; 10) as anterior to Luke, and he does not think they offer profit toward the evangelist's theology.⁶⁰ What matters is the orientation that Luke gives to each speech (Acts 2:36; 3:13; 10:36 are considered as redactional touches):⁶¹ the manifestation of the glory of Jesus in the present activity of the church. If Luke shares with the early church the conviction that God directs history, he confers a particular note to this salvation history by insisting on the actual manifestation of this *dovxa* of the resurrected One.

The speeches in Acts 7 and 13 allow us to understand how Luke perceives the economy of salvation, and so salvation history. On the one hand, there is the history of Israel, made up of the promises that God will make good on later and the engagements that the people have not respected. On the other hand, there is the time of the fulfillment of salvation in Jesus Christ and in the church. The church must not be content to remember the historical Jesus. She can rejoice in the presence of

⁶⁰ Panagopoulos expresses himself curiously on this subject. He uses the adjective *secondary* in an inusual sense (p. 144). This term must mean "traditional" for him.

⁶¹ After having forbidden the distinction between the tradition and redaction in Acts (p. 140), the author makes it nevertheless (without providing sufficient justification, he declares these verses redactional) on p. 144f.

the risen One, who is not the middle of time but the end of history, a history of salvation that counts but two stages. The narratives confirm this ever-active presence of the risen One, who forbids us to speak of a diminution of the intensity of eschatology (of an eschatology defined quite differently from Käsemann).

Panagopoulos continues by maintaining that the Spirit, which he notes has an eschatological character, does not become the property of believers or institutions. We would be wrong to speak of this as *Frühkatholizismus*. The article ends with a presentation of the eschatological character of the church and the believer. In short, everything remains eschatological, and the message of the Acts shines with an eschatology close to Jesus', as it is primitive.

Four remarks are in order concerning this article that often expresses some legitimate theses in a somewhat grandiloquent style. (1) If he is right to insist on the role of God in history, strangely overlooked in numerous works, it is our opinion that Panagopoulos exaggerates the importance of the present epiphanies of the glory of Christ. For us, Luke senses the absence of the resurrected One as much as his presence, which moreover remains always mediatized.⁶²

(2) Even if he claims that the church is not an institution of salvation, the Greek exegete, nonetheless, perceives the Lukan church as a nourishing mother who generously dispenses her eschatological benefits. He goes as far as to say the church thus becomes a sort of continuation of Christ: "Die Kirche ist als die Zeit der eschatologischen Erfüllung *schlechthin* verstanden" (p. 158, the emphasis is **ours**).

(3) Since the church is historical, he logically concludes that Luke sees a soteriological factor in history (p. 157). We can admit that salvation occurs in history, but this seems to be a modern perspective, foreign to Luke. The secular character of the events, that Luke is also pleased to note, are totally eclipsed.

(4) Finally, we wonder if it is still legitimate to call "eschatological" that which was formerly called "transcendent" or "supernatural" and which is not organically related to a temporal end.

⁶² The translation of Acts 20:32 that is proposed (p. 149) reflects this rejection of mediation; it links directly the words able to edify with the Lord, whereas, if we follow the order of the words, they should be made to depend on the word of grace, i.e., the instrument to which the Christ must resort in order to reach the church. Cf. F. Bovon (1974).

K. Löning (1969), J. Zmijewski (1972), and G. Schneider (1975)

“Lukas Theologe der von Gott geführten Heilsgeschichte” is the title of Löning’s brief but precious contribution. He doubts that Luke was a disciple of Paul and formulates the literary intention of the double work in the following manner: the evangelist longs to provide a reliable presentation of the known events. This presentation contains kerygmatic texts (the gospel and the speeches in Acts) and narrative texts (in the Acts but also in the gospel). As the latter are of a historical character and known to the readers, Luke does not seek to make them known but to make them understood. Thus the Lukan presentation holds a median position between proclamation and information. Because argumentation plays a role, we have to speak of an apologetic work. The death of Jesus is at stake in the debate with the Jews. The resurrection, the triumph of God, shows the Jews that the death of Jesus does not prove his nonmessianity. The passion and the whole life of Jesus thus receive a soteriological character. The historical narration, for apologetic reasons, corresponds to a heilsgeschichtlich understanding of revelation. This is Löning’s original thesis, which explains salvation history not from the delay in the Parousia, but from apologetics.

Löning devotes a second paragraph to Luke’s disposition of his material. The arrangement of the related Samaria traditions (Acts 8:5-25: one relative to Philip and the other to Peter), for example, are explained by the following redactional reasons: (1) the mission is not repeated in the same place; (2) it develops from place to place; (3) it begins in Jerusalem; (4) once the cities are evangelized, it is the country’s turn to receive the visit of the preachers; (5) the mission is not the fruit of chance, but of the work of the ministers designated for this reason.

The notion of “way,” taken over from W. C. Robinson, permits the author to explain in a third section the composition of the gospel and the Acts. The indications of time and place attest to the dynamic character of this way, which successively crosses over two domains, the land of the Jews and then the *oikoumené*.

The fourth point, which deals with the theology of the way, seems to us to be neither very original nor very clear. According to Löning, God wants to go right to the point and accomplishes God’s plan without men and women being able to oppose it effectively. This realization, in the form of the “way,” is a fulfillment of the prophecies.

The preaching of Jesus of Nazareth, greatly reworked by Luke, contains all the themes that Luke will later develop. This fifth part can be summarized in the following manner. At Nazareth, the promise is fulfilled and the time of salvation arrives in the form of proclamation which is for all people, but Israel cuts itself off voluntarily, permitting God to open salvation up to the Gentiles.

(6) Löning presents the passage from Jesus to the church, which in the first phase of its history claims Israel's heritage. Jerusalem and its temple mark this continuity. This heritage is not irremovable, for what matters more than the tie with Israel is the relationship with Jesus and thus the apostles' role as witnesses. Since Luke is not very interested in the future of the church, he does not elaborate a doctrine of apostolic succession.

Finally, the author shows that the concept of the "way" issues forth with a call for individual responsibility. Invited to faithfulness, believers are guided by the ministers, installed for this reason (Acts 14:23).

As can be seen, the most interesting part of Löning's contribution concerns the theological import of the historical narrative. We have a few reservations concerning the rejection of Israel, which would be too long to enumerate. Finally, it seems that the OT is summarized in a promise. I think it erroneous not to insert the time of Israel into the unfolding of salvation history. The reader is surprised that Löning, like Conzelmann, pays so little attention to the infancy narratives (Luke 1-2). This negligence is detrimental to the study of Christology.

The work of J. Zmijewski on Luke 17 and 21,⁶³ a dissertation from the Catholic Faculty of Bonn, would have been better had it been half as long (it has 591 pages!), as repetitions and redundancies abound. The first part (pp. 43-325) explains Luke 21:5-36. After having placed this eschatological speech in its context (at the conclusion and height of Jesus' instructions to the people), the author enumerates more than analyzes certain formal indications (indications of time and place; parenetic and directive elements). He thinks that Luke did not benefit from any sources other than Mark and proposes a conventional division of the text into eight parts (Luke 21:5-7, 8-11, 12-19, 20-24, 25-28, 29-31, 32-33, 34-36). At the end of this introductory section, he discovers a continuous description of the final phase of salvation history in this discourse (against Conzelmann).

⁶³ The author explains why he studied ch. 21 before ch. 17.

It would be fastidious to summarize the elaborate exegesis of all the verses. Let me simply note the author's manner of working and several interpretations. Different from Mark, the double question in Luke 21:7 is aimed at the end of time. Verses 8-11 indicate that during the Jewish War, the Christian community was submitted to both external and internal dangers. The following explanation is characteristic of an exegete who, in my view, requires too much of the text; these verses indicate that the decisive moment arrives when preaching rings out and, through it, Christ draws near.

Verses 12-19 manifest three Lukan tendencies: to adapt the teaching to the reality of the Roman Empire, to establish correspondences with the Acts (especially the martyrdom of Stephen), and to correct the Marcan doctrine of history. On pages 157-61, the reader finds an excursus on the Lukan notion of the "name." Luke sets out the idea of "perseverance" not because of deferment of the Parousia (Conzelmann) but because of the engagements accepted by believers. In my view, two affirmations seem to be arbitrary. (1) It is said that the persecutions are eschatological because Jesus exercises the function of eschatological judge during this time. (2) Here the Lukan Christ is concerned about the unfolding of salvation history (I would rather say he is preoccupied by the diffusion of the Word). The center of the speech is verses 20-24. Luke certainly detaches the fall of Jerusalem from the last events, but it is a chronological separation. From the content point of view, he enforces the links between this historical event and the end times. Henceforth—and this is the main thesis of the book—this catastrophe is just as eschatological as historical and *heilsgeschichtlich*. It corresponds to the plan of God, fulfills scriptural prophecy, and fulfills one of Jesus' predictions. From the angle of *Heilsgeschichte*, Jerusalem is not exclusively a positive place as it is also the theater of the punishment of Jesus' adversaries. In the "time of the Pagans," which begins with this Jewish drama, Zmijewski foresees both the conversion of the Gentiles and the power of Rome. The writer succumbs to allegory when he adds that Christianity, detached from Judaism, becomes the established religion "in the villages" (p. 21). He takes up again (p. 222) the habitual and contestable interpretation of the hardening of Israel which provokes the call of the Gentiles and brings to fulfillment the universal and salvific plan of God. (How much has been written concerning the little *kaiv* joining vv. 24 and 25!) Rightly, Zmijewski refuses to see a clear break between the historical events and the eschatological future (Conzel-

mann), but he goes to the other extreme by saying that the beginning of verse 25 establishes a *sachlich* or thematic link between the Parousia and the fall of Jerusalem. In verses 25-28, relative to the Parousia, Luke makes the apocalyptic color pale. The signs are no longer the forerunners, but represent the negative side of the coming of the Son of Man. Zmijewski does not accept Conzelmann's interpretation that the proximity of the kingdom will not appear until the end of time. Because of the "already" and the "not yet," there is henceforth, a *sachlich* link between history and the end times. Therefore, because of the eschatological character of history—here again we find the central thesis—there are now signs of the end that believers are invited to discern. To claim as the writer does, that verse 32 signifies that there will be humans until the end of the world, seems to sidestep the meaning of the words. Verses 34-36 are clearly redactional, and Conzelmann is right to say that they encourage believers to persevere during the time that is prolonged, while preparing for a sudden Parousia. To this negative ethical foundation, the exegete adds another positive side: the faithful engage themselves to live with dignity, for their present is eschatological in its own manner.

The second part (pp. 326–540) explains the eschatological discourses that Jesus spoke to his disciples after a brief dialogue with the Pharisees (Luke 17:20-37). In the evangelist's vision, there are not two speeches but one in two parts. To a degree of variable verisimilitude, verses 20b, 23f, 26f, 28-30, 33, 34f, and 37b are traditional, while verses 20f, 22, 25, 32, and 37a must be redactional. Zmijewski divides the text into six units: Luke 17: 20-21, 22-25, 26-30, 31-33, 34-35, and 37.

I would retain what the author says about the famous verses 20-21. Luke adapts a traditional saying of Jesus: "The kingdom of God is not coming visibly, but the kingdom is among you." He introduces the Pharisees, who frequently are observers with an interest in the kingdom and its coming. By multiplying their efforts and asking for signs, these hearers do not understand the kingdom as already present—hidden, of course, but accessible to faith. The eschatology in these two verses—like in the two speeches—is characterized in a fourfold manner: (1) it is God's affair; (2) it is tied to the person of Jesus; (3) the hidden presence of the kingdom is maintained in a *heilsgeschichtlich* manner in the church; and (4) the human being has the responsibility not to observe, but to believe. It seems to us that point 3 is badly established in the text and is full of doctrinal prejudice.

In the following verses (22-25), Luke distinguishes “the days” of the Son of Man from “the day.” The days represent the period that goes from the ascension to the Parousia. The day designates the precise moment of the return of Christ. If the parable of Noah (vv. 26-27) describes the present situation (from the ascension to the Parousia), the parable of Lot (vv. 28-30) illustrates the day of the second coming. Logically, the first exhorts to faith, while the other contains a promise. In his explanation of the last verses (vv. 31-36), the writer insists on the anthropological character of eschatology: at present, believers live the humiliation of Christ. They will participate in his elevation when he comes. I feel, however, that the theme, dear to the author, of Christ suffering in his church, (for example, just as we can be hurt in our arms or legs) is exceptional in Luke. The only place we have met it is in the Christ’s answer to Saul on the ground: “I am Jesus, whom you persecute” (Acts 9:5).

The last section of the book compares the two speeches. The relation is evident: they have the same genre of rereading of the traditions, the same vocabulary, and same center of interests. However, we must note several differences. The audience changes from one discourse to the other. Furthermore, Luke 17 depends on different sources, principally Q, while Luke 21 takes up Mark 13. Finally, it can be noted that the orientations, if not different, are at least complementary. The persecutions, the fate of Jerusalem and the mission to the pagans characterize Luke 21, whereas the polemic against the Pharisees, the hidden presence of the kingdom, the distinction between the days and the day of the Son of Man, the allusion to Jesus' suffering, the ideal of poverty, the night, the Last Judgment, and the overturning of values are only found in Luke 17. “In Luke 21 kommt das eschatologische Thema mehr unter dem allgemeinhilfs geschichtlichen Aspekt zur Sprache, in Luke 17 dagegen mehr unter dem besonderen Aspekt der Gemeinde bzw. Jüngerschaft” (p. 556).

These two speeches complete one another to present a rich eschatological teaching. Centered on God, this doctrine makes manifest the accomplishment of the divine plan in the person of Christ, who belongs to the past by his earthly history, and to the present by his exaltation. This Christ confers on the history of the world and the church a perspective both *heilsgeschichtlich* and eschatological. It is obvious that Zmijewski develops the theses of Löning, whom he cites on several

occasions. One thing is peculiar to him, the link between eschatology and ethics indicated above.

By way of a conclusion, the author affirms that there is neither contradiction nor rupture between the eschatological conceptions of Jesus, Paul, John, and Luke. They are in harmony and complete one another (pp. 565–72).

Besides the criticisms developed along the way, we would like to end by indicating our agreement on one point and our disagreement on another. We rejoin the positive appreciation of present time and the basis of perseverance that follows. Our criticism concerns the very term *eschatology*, which designates, like for Panagopoulos, all actual relations with God and all present interventions of God among humans. At the same time, the writer maintains the chronological meaning of the term which thus defines any ultimate intervention of God. Moreover, if we have understood well, Zmijewski gives the adjectives *present* and *actual* a different meaning than Bultmann: eschatology does not fulfill itself in historicity but in history. How? We are not told. In which portion of history? No more precision is given: the fall of Jerusalem? Certainly, but what about the other wars? In the early church? But how far can the generalizations go (contemporary churches, sects, etc.)? To what should the eschatological impact be confined, to the Eucharist, to preaching, to practical accomplishments? Is there still a distinction between eschatological history and plain history? These are the questions that this book, despite its volume, does not answer.

At the beginning of the next volume, G. Schneider (1975) refuses to insert Lukan eschatology into the evolution of primitive Christianity (p. 5). In my opinion, this renunciation is explained by the difficulty that is confronted presently in grasping the development of the first Christian doctrines. It is nonetheless regrettable, for Luke continues to float on the surface of history without obtaining a suitable anchor. The author prefers to concentrate his attention on the Lukan nature of the texts relative to the Parousia.

A suggestive introduction (pp. 9–19) sketches the present discussions concerning Lukan eschatology. His first chapter (pp. 20–54) presents a rereading of the parables that Luke receives from the *Logia* source (Luke 12:35–38, 39f., 41–46; 17:26–30; 19:12–27). Schneider attempts to illuminate the history of tradition of each text and the successive redactions. It seems the *Logia* source had already perceived the delay of the

Parousia but maintained the imminent character. The exegesis of the parable of the Steward (Luke 12:41-46) reaches results characteristic of the whole work: clearly redactional, Peter's initial question in verse 41 and the adjective *wise* placed together with the *steward* reveal Luke's attention to the leaders of the community. This declaration is confirmed by the addition of two isolated sayings, related to the same subject, to verses 47 and 48. Luke thus gives an ecclesiastical slant to the texts dealing with the Parousia; in his hand, they become exhortations directed to the leaders of the community. I have noted that explanations of this type are often found among Catholic exegetes.⁶⁴

Further, Schneider continues by saying that Luke does not seem to provide a new explanation to the delay of the Parousia. He inscribes his interpretation in the perspective that he inherits. Luke tells us in this parable that the church must be conscious of the delay. This is why the servant, who understands the delay of his master (v. 45), is not declared "bad." For the hope of an imminent return, Luke substitutes a vibrant call to be always ready.

The parable of the Vigilant Servants (Luke 12:35-38) confirms the interest that Luke has in the faithful work of the ministers in the church (we are not so sure that Luke desires here to shift the spotlight from believers to their spiritual leaders). Moreover, this pericope strongly attests Luke's consciousness concerning the delay. A third Lukan characteristic appears: a tendency toward allegory, manifested in the addition of the verb *to wait* to verses 35 and 36. Verse 37b, which describes the banquet of the kingdom in terms that are hardly veiled, confirms this taste for allegorical constructions. Luke demonstrates a preference for a second sense in his interpretation of the parable of the Talents (Luke 19:12-27). The first two verses, which describe the man of noble birth who goes abroad, undoubtedly hint at the exaltation of Christ. With this evocation, the parable indicates a fourth characteristic of Luke's redactional work. Unhappy to push back vigorously all impatient expectation, the evangelist offers, contrary to Matthew, a solid christological foundation to the delay of the Parousia.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ So it is with H.J. Degenhardt (see bibliography, 1965), cf. below, p. XX.

⁶⁵ G. Schneider notes that Luke places before the parables of the Flood and the Heavenly Fire (Luke 17:26-30) a historical allusion to the crucifixion (v. 25 is redactional). This allusion provokes a delay in the eschatological program. These two parables, in their actual formulation, declare the questions of the date and the place of the Parousia to be illegitimate. The chapter ends with the exegesis of verses in which a belief of Q and Luke in the imminency have been seen: the judgment announced by John the

The second chapter (pp. 55–70) broaches the eschatological material, taken over from Mark. These pages seem less original to us, as the author relies heavily on Conzelmann. Luke 21 takes Mark 13 over (here the use of a second source is excluded). According to Mark, the parable of the Fig Tree, already related to the apocalyptic speech, considers the fall of Jerusalem as a sign of the end. For Luke, who establishes a relation between the Parousia and redemption (Luke 21:28), the parable (Luke 21:29–31) constitutes a promise: it will be before summer and its blessings when the Son of Man comes. In other words, the kingdom will be near. The evangelist perhaps rediscovers the initial sense that the parable had in Jesus' mouth. Other prophecies must still come to pass before the end (the death and resurrection of Jesus, the fall of Jerusalem, and the universal mission), but these fulfillments, announced in the Scriptures and by Jesus, will be historical, not eschatological.

The absence of certain Marcan texts (Mark 1:15; 13:10, 32) in Luke and the modifications of certain passages of the second gospel (Luke 9:27; 19:28–40; 22:69) do not allow us to declare that Luke sought to maintain the imminence of the Parousia.

The third and last chapter analyzes what is particular to Luke. Before Luke took it over, the parable of the Unjust Judge (18:1–8) proclaimed the certainty of the answer in spite of the troublesome impression of the long entreaties that remained unanswered. On the traditional level, the adjunction of verses 7b–8a guarded the imminent character of the Parousia.⁶⁶ By concluding with a new formula (8b), Luke changes the perspective into a parenetic sense, already perceptible in the redactional introduction of the parable (v. 1).⁶⁷ The evangelist formulates this exhortation, which is a criticism at the same time, because his community is not perseverant enough in prayer.

The study of what is particular to Luke illuminates a last mark of Lukan eschatology: a certain individualization of the expectation and hope. Different texts (Luke 6:20–26; 12:16–21, 33f.; 16:1–9; 16:25; 21:19; 23:43) indicate that the moment of death is an eschatological event for humans. Luke can thus carry over certain ideas that tradition

Baptist (Luke 3:9, 17) would be historical and not eschatological. The preaching of the seventy (Luke 10:9, 11) draws the proximity of “the being” and not the “date” of the kingdom (the author becomes a bit confused here).

⁶⁶ G. Schneider offers an unprecedented parallel to vv. 7b–8a, which must consequently be taken as a unity: Bar 4:25.

⁶⁷ Luke must have understood the *ejn tavcei* in the sense of “suddenly” and not “soon.”

had reserved for the Parousia onto the afterlife of the individual. This is clearly the case with the phrase by your perseverance, you will gain your souls” (21:19) and the answer of the good thief (23:42). From this declaration, three remarks emerge. (1) If Luke individualized eschatology, we understand how he can say, without contradicting his conception of the delay, that the kingdom is near to the believers (10:9, 11).

(2) Luke avoids calling this place of the afterdeath the *kingdom*: he uses the word *paradise* (23:43) or *Abraham’s bosom* (16:22).

(3) In spite of all, Luke is not thinking of an intermediate state. The book ends with an appendix reserved to the eschatology of the book of Acts. Schneider takes up again the theories of Conzelmann and Vielhauer concerning the delay of universal eschatology as well as Barrett’s concerning an individual version.

Schneider’s work, by the nature of things, remains conjectural. Certain reconstructions of the relation between tradition and redaction will not convince. Neither could this study be original in each section. The weight of the heritage of Conzelmann is felt; Schneider refuses to accept that Luke maintains the assurance of the imminence beside the delay (against Kümmel and S. G. Wilson). To this must be added the influence of Dupont concerning individual eschatology (later we will present the Belgian exegete’s position). Finally, Schneider has the merit of not abusing the term *eschatology*. It seems he does not use it for the present time of the church, which he, nonetheless, does not reject into the profane sphere. I regret that he did not attempt to build a bridge between universal and individual eschatology. It is not enough to say that the spatial concept of the abode of the dead completes the temporal concept of the kingdom (p. 83f.). It is necessary to define this complementarity. Did Luke really sense the problem? Must we await death to see more clearly? Finally Schneider’s position seems to float on one point: concerning Luke 12:39f. and 42-46, he says that Luke takes up partially the perspective of Q (suddenness does not exclude imminence), but he quickly adds that Luke resolutely refuses all traces of the imminence to the profit of the delay. Is not this contradictory?

J. Dupont (1972)

Modestly, Dupont points out several authors who opened up the way for him by evoking the Lukan distinctness with regard to individual escha-

tology.⁶⁸ In the first edition of *Beatitudes* (1954), he had already drawn attention to this point.⁶⁹ But the research of the last years, which has concentrated on the delay of the Parousia, eclipsed this statement. A new study became necessary.

By individual eschatology, Dupont means the destiny of the individual not only in the end times, but also at the end of life. If Luke gives particular attention to these two decisive moments, the latter is going to be the dominating topic of this study.

His first section treats several texts from Luke 12. The parable of the Foolish Rich Man (12:16-20) finds its meaning modified in the passage from tradition to redaction. In Luke's perspective, "The folly of the rich man is not so much in not having thought about death but rather having forgotten what comes after death" (p. 5). The difficult verse 21 ("So is with those who store up treasures for themselves but are not rich toward God") is a creation of Luke. It does not accord with the parable at all. Luke 12:33 allows us to uncover the meaning of the difficult words $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\eta\ \epsilon\iota\ \rho\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omega\ \pi\lambda\acute{o}\tau\omega\upsilon\tau\omega\ \nu\omega$. This verse, which freely adapts the saying of Jesus about heavenly treasure (cf. Matt 6:19-21), indicates that the way to constitute this treasure is by distributing one's possessions to the poor. It is precisely for not having followed this prescription that the rich man of the parable is punished. The decisive moment here, according to Luke, is not at the Parousia but at the individual's death. Beyond this parable, this perspective commands all the development from vv. 13-34.

At a traditional level, Luke 12:32 ("Do not be afraid, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom") promises Jesus' hearers that they will benefit from the kingdom when it arrives. It could be that on the redactional level, the promise is valid for the death of the believers. In the same way, Luke has perhaps modified the traditional declaration that we read in Acts: "It is through many persecutions that we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). According to Luke 24:26, did not Jesus himself enter glory through necessary suffering? To receive the heritage among the sanctified (Acts 20:32) could designate the entrance into the kingdom at death, like the analogous

⁶⁸ On p. 3 n. 2, we find the names of E. Stauffer, R. Bultmann (in their NT theologies), and E. Grässer (1957, 211). We could add C. K. Barrett (1964). Later notes add other names (W. Pesch, A. Descamps, G. Gaide).

⁶⁹ J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes. Le problème littéraire, le message doctrinal* (Bruges-Leuven, 1954), 211f.

expression in Acts 26:18 could mean integration into the church. Dupont concludes this section by returning to Luke 12. Comparing Luke 12:4f. with its parallel in Matthew 10:28, he thinks that Luke wanted to avoid the expression “to kill the soul” and that he spontaneously places his attention on what happens after death. The reality of Gehenna becomes tangible to the guilty one at death and not only at the Last Judgment.

Luke 16, to which the second section of the article is consecrated, begins with the parable of the Shrewd Manager. Dupont concentrates first on the difficult verse 9 (“Make friends for yourselves by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal homes”). “The best use that one can make of money is therefore to make friends for the future life” (p. 13). This conclusion takes up again the affirmation found in Luke 12:33. The moment money fails is the individual’s death, as the antithetical parallel of the Foolish Rich Man (Luke 12:20f.) indicates. The mention of the “eternal homes,” which describes not a temporal reality but a spatial one, is not contrary to this interpretation.

The parable of the Wicked Rich Man and the Poor Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) serves as the counterpart to the one concerning the clever manager. After having spoken of the right use of money, Luke’s Jesus presents what can be the bad use. God does not wait for the Parousia to invert the destinies of Lazarus and the rich man. The death of each one clearly marks the turning point. Dupont approaches the contrast of the Beatitudes that Luke accentuates with the opposition of the “now” and the future by saying, “It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the ‘afterward,’ to which this *nun* is opposed, is that of the time which, for every one, will follow the present existence” (p. 17). At the end of this section, Dupont wonders if Luke 21:19 does not testify to the same passage from cosmic to individual eschatology.

Finally, in the third section, Dupont questions Jesus’ answer to the good thief (Luke 23:43). The reproaches of the onlookers of the crucifixion (Luke 23:35, 37) attest that Luke associates the power to save with Jesus’ messiahship. Answering the bandit, Jesus does not speak of the coming of the kingdom which the latter mentioned, but rather of paradise. Dupont refuses to make an appeal to the Jewish conceptions concerning the temporary dwelling place of the righteous. He prefers to say that Luke is correcting a hope as yet still imperfect. It is “today” that everything is at stake and can be won. The unfortunate counterpart of

the good thief, Judah, goes toward his dwelling place (Acts 1:25), which is no doubt Gehenna. He also must surely go there without waiting for the Parousia.

By way of a conclusion, Dupont reminds us of Luke's interest for the afterlife and notes that Luke did not establish a rapport between the two eschatological forms that are found in his writing. He supposes that Luke's individual eschatology is rooted in the Jewish apocalyptic (cf. principally the book of Enoch). With consideration for his Greek formation, Luke corrects this heritage by refusing to bind together the individual's fate and the events of the end times.

It is hard for us to accept that Luke did not reflect on this rapport. The evangelist certainly affirms the delay of the Parousia, but to our knowledge, he never explicitly pushes this event beyond his own generation. It is possible that he reserves individual eschatology for those who die during the interim period.

A second question arises concerning Luke 23:43. How can Luke's Jesus promise the thief a place with him today since he would be risen only on the third day and exalted forty days later? This is a question if we identify "paradise" with "the kingdom." Yet if we separate them, how can we distinguish and identify each of them? Both the naive and learned reader remain in a quandary.

C. H. Talbert (1966, 1970, 1974)

Talbert follows his own way despite the criticisms encountered. In 1966, he wrote a book, mentioned above,⁷⁰ in which he refuses the omnipresence of the delay of the Parousia in the Lukan corpus. Conzelmann's declarations with regard to the redactional preoccupations of Luke and accentuations are to be explained not by the motif of eschatology in transformation, but rather by reason of a polemic and apologetic motif. Luke wants to hinder his church from succumbing to gnosticism.

This idea of the anti-gnostic front that the author shares with Klein (who curiously goes unmentioned) has been seriously shaken by several exegetes, especially W. C. van Unnik.⁷¹ The latter thinks that Luke writes in a relatively calm ecclesiastic climate. I am not far from thinking he is correct.

⁷⁰ Above, p. XX.

⁷¹ W. C. van Unnik (1967).

In a subsequent article (1970), the author takes up again the study of the Lukan eschatological texts and comes to the same conclusions. The Lukan adaptation of the eschatological traditions does not respond to the delay of the Parousia. The schema of salvation history is not an accommodation to the delay of the second coming of Christ. It rather expresses a polemic conviction that rejects a false interpretation of the primitive Christian hope—one which claims an actual realization of the kingdom and the resurrection in a spiritual form. “Luke’s history of salvation scheme is an expression of the evangelist’s eschatological reservation” (p. 196). Luke takes his place among the antiheretical Christian writers. The eschatological distortion, fought by Luke, is frequently found in Christian antiheretical literature. It corresponds generally to gnosticism.

That Luke follows up the gospel with the Acts of the Apostles and that he understood the gospel as a life of Jesus are Conzelmann’s exact statements. Yet they are not explained by the delay of the Parousia, but rather by Luke’s literary intention. The book of 1974, toward which we turn now, develops this last section of the article.

This study opens with a perspective that claims to be new. Luke the theologian is also an artist, as the style variation and the binary architecture of the work and its sections witness. Talbert proposes to take into account the structural elements of the whole composition and possible parallels taken from contemporary literature.

The first chapters skillfully analyze one and the same procedure of the composition, banal but significant so it seems: parallelism. First it is the history of Jesus and the apostles which respond to one other (Luke is the only Christian writer who considers that the two presentations necessarily call for one another). Then it is the symmetry within the Acts (1–12 and 13–18) that Luke imposes without respect to his sources. Finally, there are the series of texts which balance one other in an architectural and thus esthetic alternance: Luke 9:1-48 // 22:7-23, 16; Acts 1:12-4:23 // 4:24-5:24; Luke 4:16-7:17 // 7:18-8:56; Luke 1-2 // 3-4. They may also be antithetical parallelisms and chiasms, but they must always be binary. The reader can see—sometimes with surprise—the references proposed in the book. Each time Talbert decides a balance of the literary units exists, it is always Luke’s conscious will and never the product of tradition.

At this point in his investigation, the author declares that at the same period in the Mediterranean area, the same “architectural” construc-

tion can be found either in literary works like the *Aeneid* or in works of art like Augustus's *Ara Pacis* in Rome. Judaism has also resorted to this way of structuring, as the book of Jonah attests (but we know that Israel freely borrowed that it needed). The proto-evangelium of James, which it is proper to situate side by side with Luke-Acts, witnesses to the favor Christianity accorded to this literary architecture.

Several interesting remarks conclude this section of the book. (1) The pattern required a slight unbalance to avoid the monotony that the symmetry risked to cause. (2) Since Aristotle, writers were advised to write a sketch of their work before writing the final edition. This intermediate stage allowed the author to care for the composition and foresee the effects of alternance. (3) With regard to their education and the almost corporal movement of the symmetries, the readers could not remain insensitive to the effects of style that were suggested to them. (4) If the ancient use of pattern corresponded perhaps to a requirement of mnemonic technique, at the epoch of our interest, it responded to doctrinal preoccupations.

This is why Talbert directs his investigation toward the relationships that are established between architecture and the theology of Luke-Acts. If we accept that Luke appropriates for himself the popular Greek image of philosopher, who is followed by his disciples to express the traditions relative to Jesus and the apostles, the use of the pattern in the symmetry is explained. Among the typical characteristics of the philosopher, we must note the journeys, the proclamation as the mode of transmission, the style of life as the acceptance of a doctrine, the presence of the disciples, who learn by following their master and the theme of the authentic heritage of the master, which must be preserved. The parallelism between Paul and the primitive church allows the legitimation of the activity of Paul and his successors.

A theory of the present decadence was widespread in the empire. To find virtue and the truth again, it was necessary to look into the past, to go back to the origins. Luke shared this conviction: the postapostolic age—that is, the contemporary époque—has proved to be inferior to the time of the beginnings. So Luke-Acts, constructed in a binary fashion, functions as the authority and criteria of the legitimacy of the “elders” installed in the succession of Paul. The parallels that are established between Jesus and the early church on the one hand, and between the early church and Paul on the other, have thus a semantic import.

Talbert inserts here the contents of the article which he had dedicated to the so-called anti-gnostic Christology of Luke (1967, in the bibliography of ch. 3). He believes in this manner he can take into consideration the three parallels: Luke 9:vv. // **xx**:22-23; Luke 9 // Acts 1; and Luke 24 // Acts 1. The narratives of the ascension and the baptism, in their Lukan version, insist on the physical reality of the body of Jesus. They are opposed, we are told, to the doceticism of—let us say—Cerinthus.

The work ends with a chapter that makes a bridge between the literary genre of Luke-Acts and the presence of numerous parallels within the work (the use of the famous pattern). The author chooses Diogenes Laërtius (*The Lives, Teaching, and Sayings of Famous Philosophers*), which he brings together with Luke-Acts. He concludes, following the hypothesis of H. von Soden, that the evangelist has reworked his sources under the influence of the literary genre of the biography of a philosopher. The kinship is trifold. It concerns first the contents: both Luke and Diogenes relate the life of their hero and supplement it with information about his doctrines and disciples. Second, it is also formal: the lives of the disciples correspond to the life of the founder. Neither Diogenes nor Luke consider the evolution that the doctrine has undergone in the passage from the master to his successors. Finally, the relation is functional: sometimes the narrative serves the polemic side and at other times the apologetic. The relation must allow the defense of a certain figure and a certain tradition that flows from it.

The examination of the differences leads the author into subtle distinctions. For him there was an ancient pattern of the lives of the philosophers which evolved in two directions. First, Diogenes' direction enumerates several philosophers but then insists little on their successors. Then, Luke's direction retains only one "philosopher" but describes abundantly the authentic tradition of his legitimate successors. The general public was to represent the *Sitz im Leben* of the first category, and the community, the second. In the latter case, the text served as a cultural legend that legitimated the pretensions of such a branch of the school or sect.

The presence of a dedication and the letters within Luke-Acts indicate an influence of ancient historiography, whereas the narrative of the shipwreck of Paul attests to a literary relationship with the Hellenistic novel. Yet these are two complementary influences. The literary mold into which Luke melted his work was the philosophical biog-

raphy. Moreover, that he also resorted to the binary pattern of the parallelisms, which was widespread universally, can be better explained in that he inscribed his work in the biographical tradition, which completed the master's portrait with the story of the disciples. "The (a) + (b) structure of a biography that is composed of the life of a founder of a philosophical school plus a record of his successors and selected other disciples innately tends towards balance" (p. 135).

If we can give a brief evaluation of these works, we would begin by saying that Talbert is indubitably right to advance that salvation history is not the indispensable (and urgent!) answer to the problem of the delay of the Parousia. But he is wrong to deny the insistence Luke puts on "erasing" the imminence. We also doubt the anti-gnostic character of the work. A work that attacks heretics—if we want to be sensitive to the literary genre as Talbert desires—uses other means of expression. Polemic is much more explicit; we have only to read Ireneus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius.

Let us turn now to the literary analyses. Compared to those A. Vanhoye wrote concerning the letter to the Hebrews, these appear simplistic and sometimes forced. It is not enough to mark off a binary system. It is comparable to an art historian who has not yet understood a Doric temple simply because he has counted the columns or a baroque facade because he has noted the number of orders. Far from rejecting this type of analysis and thinking that Talbert went too far, we think contrariwise that he has not sufficiently pushed his structural analysis, or to take up one of his terms, *architectonic*. This would have permitted him to realize a certain literary fact that is not included in his beautiful edifice: the life of Jesus is divided in three sections, not two.

It is necessary to note another fault: his speculative generalizations concerning the spirit of the first century. Before accepting that everything goes in pairs, it is necessary first to prove that the understanding (Greek *episthmh*) of that time used this category of pairs. Can we just speak of the "spirit of Roman imperial times" (p. 100)? Talbert takes this uniformity for granted too easily. Could the intellectual preoccupations and mental categories of a Jewish zealot, a Greek rhetorician, and a Roman historian be the same?

Finally, we were surprised that Talbert never mentions the literary genre of the parallel lives. Would this not be a way to pursue in understanding the literary genre of Luke-Acts, which precisely puts the life of

Jesus and the life of Paul in parallel? Was not Plutarch a contemporary of Luke?

Our last remark is to the credit of this exegete, who has an allergy to *redaktionsgeschichtlich* elaborations, too often subjective. He is right to look for thought schemas and comparable forms of expression in Luke's contemporary epoch. His incursions into the domain of comparative literature and even art history merit our attention and, of course, critical attention.

*R. H. Hiers (1973), M. Völkel (1974), O. Merk (1975),
and E. Rasco (1976)*

For exterior reasons of time and space, I am obliged to briefly summarize the more recent works. Hiers defends two theses. The first, shared with Conzelmann, can be summarized in the following manner. Jesus, according to Luke, did not proclaim the imminency of the Parousia. The redactional omissions, additions, and transformations that the exegete mentions are well known, and it is useless to repeat them. His second thesis goes against Conzelmann's view. Luke retains, for his generation, the perspective of an imminent Parousia, for Jesus' prophecies relative to the fate of Jerusalem, the appearance of false prophets, and the evangelization of the nations are fulfilled at present. Unknowingly, Hiers proposes an interpretation close to H. W. Bartsch's (1963). One of his arguments seems original to us. For Luke, the mission of the Twelve (Luke 9), which corresponds to the beginnings of Christianity, announces the kingdom and not its proximity. The mission of the seventy (Luke 10), which evokes the evangelization of the nations, has as its content the imminent coming of the kingdom. Contrary to the author, I do not think that these two theses dissolve the darkness that envelopes Lukan eschatology. To take an example cited, I recall that the seventy must establish (and not only announce) the proximity of the kingdom *εἶς ἡμέραν* and not the absolute imminence of the kingdom coming in power, as the author believes.

M. Völkel's article (1974) is subtle, which might hinder its power to convince. Let us attempt to present without betraying it. The writer perceives of the *basileia* as an organic part of the theological whole of the Lukan redaction. Not only does this notion designate a condensation of the preaching of Jesus (like in Mark and Matthew), but it also expresses,

in a reflected manner, Jesus' perception vis-à-vis his being sent. Because of this second christological aspect, the preaching of the kingdom, for Luke, is continued after Easter.

The first speech of Jesus of Nazareth (Luke 4:6-30), which is substituted for Mark 1:14f., explains the nature of the kingdom of God. Since Luke 4:43 confirms it, Luke is not content to affirm that the divine promise is accomplished, but specifies the person of the one who fulfills the prophecies. This link between the message and the messenger, between the kingdom and Christ, will not become explicit until after the passion. Yet, it is present from the beginning. Völkel sees a supplementary indication in the Lukan rereading of the order to the demons to be quiet concerning Jesus' messianism (Luke insists [Luke 4:41] on the title "Christ," which he associates with the passion, whereas Mark evokes the only Son of God).

To this christological connotation of the *basileia*, the author adds an ecclesiastic nuance from Luke 2:34 on and especially in Acts 28:17ff. Luke 4:25-27 already establishes the link between the Jews and the Gentiles. The end of Acts describes this relation even more clearly, not as a separation of Israel, inducing a transfer to the pagans, but rather as an incorporation of the Jews and the Gentiles into the church. The automatic access to salvation, received by belonging to the Jewish community, is followed by an individual insertion of the Jews and the Gentiles into the people of God. For this reason, the Christian discourse passes (Acts 28:31) from the evocation of the kingdom to the proclamation of Christ, whose title evokes the suffering, and from that, to the accomplishment of the kingdom in Jesus, the suffering Messiah.

Luke is not content to simply receive passively the vocabulary of the *basileia*. In the new expression he forges ("to evangelize" or "to preach the kingdom"), he integrates a christological and ecclesiastical reflection.

This essay attempts, after many others, to explain the cohabitation of the proclamations centered sometimes on the kingdom and sometimes on Christ. However, it does so perhaps in a too doctrinal manner. This does not prevent him from perhaps illuminating a subjacent structure of Lukan thought. Effectively, it is not without reason that the book of Acts begins and ends with a mention of the kingdom (Acts 1:3 and 28:31), yet I must admit that I did not understand how the personal engagement expected of each believer explained the double mention of the kingdom and Christ in Acts 28:31.

O. Merk's article follows the line of study staked out by U. Luck (1960) and M. Völkel (1974). It is a critique of Conzelmann that begins with methodological considerations and several statistical elements.

The speech of Jesus at Nazareth in Luke 4 (particularly Luke 4:43), as well as the use of *basil eia tou qeou* in Acts (especially Acts 28:23), permits one to imagine that the evangelist integrates the whole life, passion, and resurrection of Jesus in the notion of the kingdom of God. This kingdom of God does not appear in the gospel in the typical and transient manner or according to its timeless essence (Conzelmann). When Jesus preaches at Nazareth, the kingdom is present in all its eschatological consistency by reason of the Spirit conferred on Jesus; this Conzelmann neglected in a surprising way. Luke 10:18, 23; 11:20; 16:16; and 17:20f. also attest to this conviction.

The theological problem that Luke had to overcome was not the delay of the Parousia, but the survival of the kingdom during the time of the church. The resurrection is a first solution, for it links the two periods while qualifying them at the same time, but it is chiefly the conception of the kingdom of God, that offers the decisive answer. According to the teaching of Jesus, the kingdom of God that embraces the present and the future remains important at present thanks to the present activity of the Spirit. Luke shows that the time of the church belongs to the time blessed with the presence of the kingdom in the person of Christ by projecting the time of the church into Jesus' (cf. especially the travel narrative). Merk establishes links between the kingdom, Christology, and eschatology, as Völkel has done.

Our summary cannot be more precise, for if the declaration of his results is clear, the way taken by the author remains borrowed. It is, therefore, difficult to say if the conclusions hold. I doubt that Luke has the sense of historical continuity so much that he cannot see a simple description or projection of the time of the church in the travel narrative. Merk does not sufficiently consider the rupture that occurs at the ascension. This break provokes a modification of the sense of the *basil eia*, which Acts never associated with its coming. Thus, we cannot say that the allusions to the imminency in the travel narrative of Jesus portray an imminency which has become real at the time of the church! To want to deny a certain sclerosis in the notion of *basil eia* at the end of the first century, especially in Acts, is to prefer theology to history. In return, Merk is right to think that Luke considers the time of the church as a blessed time, during which salvation is made present. However, the evangelist chooses

other ways to express this conviction, rather than resorting to the *basil eia*: the Holy Spirit, the presence of the word of God and the effectiveness of the name are his main arguments.

During the same period, an important history of Lukan studies, the work of E. Rasco (1976)⁷² deals basically with three theological themes: Christology, pneumatology, and salvation history. He does not tarry with long exegetical developments, but presents a synthesis that finds support in the most recent works.

Jesus introduces the eschatological era. Luke collects and transmits this conception, which he makes his own. Leaning basically on G. Voss (cf. p. XXX below [x-ref ms 225]), Rasco refuses the term *adoptionism* in order to insist on the communion of the Son with the Father (rightly he insists on Luke 10:21f., a text neglected by Conzelmann). Where a servile submission had been seen, Rasco perceives a confident abandon into the hands of the Father (Luke 23:46). The union of the human and the divine in the person of Jesus, attested to in the nativity account, precludes docetism and adoptionism. To interpret the meaning of the death of Jesus according to Luke, the author refers to an article by A. George (cf. 1973, in the bibliography of ch. 3). Luke certainly does not explicitly associate salvation with the cross. Yet he is not, for all that, a defender of a *theologia gloriae*, for he maintains a narrow link between the death and resurrection of Jesus. Going beyond A. George, Rasco thinks that the entire ministry of Jesus, considered as a path, allows the believer more than an imitation, a salvific insertion into the horizon of God. Luke shows in a narrative manner what theologians, like Paul, call a death for us or an expiation for our sins. The Lukan account of the Lord's Supper confirms this conception.

Concerning *pneuma*, Rasco opposes Conzelmann's interpretation, which is content to see it as an Ersatz of the eschatological benefits. He is able to show, without difficulty, the ties that Luke establishes between Jesus and the Spirit (cf. Acts 16:7), especially between the ascension and Pentecost. The relation of Christ to the Spirit corresponds to the relationship of the Son to the Father. The Spirit, like Jesus, is not only an instrument in the hands of God. He establishes a Trinitarian collaboration which induces an eschatological qualification of the time of the church. Since the Spirit, given at Pentecost, proceeds from the Son, now

⁷² From E. Rasco, we know about a long critical review of Conzelmann's book (1965) and two copied fascicles concerning the beginnings of the Acts (Pontifical Biblical Institute); cf. bibliography, 1968.

elevated to the right hand of God, it is incorrect to disparage his presence to a meager *Ersatz*. The pneuma agion is the plenipotentiary representative of Christ during the time of the church.

The relationship between believers and Christ is brought about thanks to the Spirit, but this does not mean that simply a vague spiritual communion is established between the Lord and his disciples. Luke emphasizes sufficiently the role as witnesses which the Twelve have: the apostolic ministry has a function of direction and canalization. If Luke writes his work, it is because of the multiform presence of the Spirit in the church.

Finally, E. Rasco deals with the highly debated question of eschatology. He first criticizes the separation that occurs frequently concerning the difference between Luke and Paul. It follows that distinguishing the historical problem of their personal relations and the theological question of their doctrinal positions is primordial. His attacks are directed at the critical positions of P. Vielhauer (1950) and H. Conzelmann (1954) with his consorts, who Rasco thinks return to Bultmann. For support, he finds P. Menoud (1970), M. Carrez (1969), and P. Borgen (1966), who demonstrate that Paul, less existentialist than has been said, is also a defender of salvation history, and Luke does not conceive of history in a positivistic manner. J. Zmijewski's work (1972), which we analyzed above, comes to his aid here.

Jesus and his history (and not only his word) constitute the time of salvation. The time of salvation is not completely interrupted by the ascension, for it continues within the church.

In order to introduce us to this eschatological fact that is Jesus, already in his own ministry (as against Bultmann) and furthermore, according to Luke, still in its infancy; a ministry which is undoubtedly a privileged time of salvation (in agreement with Conzelmann) but which does not end in Jesus (from this comes our insistence on the fusion of the era of his ministry and that of his reign by means of the Spirit), that is its a still-present time of salvation (partly agreeing with Bultmann and not Conzelmann) not through a Church composed of a 'salvation institution' independent of the Spirit, but rather subject of the Spirit and to Jesus, Luke has not had to [renounce/deny] history, nor allow eschatology to consume it. Quite the contrary; Luke has illuminated the fullness of its reality with the eschatological enlightenment that flows from Jesus and the Spirit. History and salvation history coexist without canceling each other out [ET].⁷³

⁷³ Rasco, 162: "Para introducirnos en este hecho escatológico, que es Jesús, ya en su

Rasco brings forth diverse arguments to buttress his thesis. For example, by transforming the historical present in Mark to the perfect, Luke shows the historical character of Jesus' life and, at the same time, its still actual import.

If we have understood well, the distinction that can be read in Luke 17 between the days of the Son of Man and the day serves as an indication of the two aspects of the Lukan salvation history: the existential continuity and punctuality. The Lukan vocabulary of the way, life (in relation with Christ), and conversion respects these two aspects as well. One can really speak of the coexistence of the historical and eschatological (p. 168) in the Lukan corpus, for Jesus is the unique and polyvalent figure who, while being historical, also interprets history.

I too believe that the Spirit is the work in the church and that eschatology can be present in the continuity of history. Yet, I wonder, where is the church today? Without saying so explicitly, does Rasco think that it is in the Roman Catholic church? If this is the case, the study can be read entirely from a triumphalistic perspective: the Roman church received the Spirit, it is the place where redemptive history continues and where eschatology is accomplished. Is not Luke's Christology, as it has been presented, open to later developments (p. 129) by his insistence on the union of the divine and human in Jesus?⁷⁴

propio ministerio (contra Bultmann), más aún, según Lucas, ya en su infancia; ministerio, que es sin duda un tiempo privilegiado de salvación (con Conzelmann), pero que no termina en Jesús (de ahí nuestra insistencia en la fusión de la época de su ministerio y de la de su señorío por medio del Espíritu), que es tiempo de salvación aún presente (en parte con Bultmann, y contra Conzelmann), no por medio de una Iglesia constituida en 'institución de salvación' independiente del Espíritu sino sometida a él y al Señor Jesús, Lucas no ha tenido que renegar de la historia, ni ha tenido que hacer que escatología se la devore. Al contrario, Lucas ha iluminado la plenitud de su realidad con la iluminación escatológica que procede del Señor Jesús y del Espíritu. Historia e Historia de la Salvación conviven sin cancelarse."

⁷⁴ E. Franklin (1975) clearly distinguishes himself from Conzelmann. The end is not neglected or pushed back, for history is determined by eschatology. While transcendent, the kingdom nonetheless exercises an influence on history. The ascension becomes, for this author, the central eschatological event that gives meaning to the whole of salvation history. The theological reinterpretation of Luke does not consist in substituting salvation history for eschatology, but in making salvation history serve eschatology. The goal of this reinterpretation is that the readers of the Lukan work recognize in Jesus, the Lord, i.e., the place of the eschatological action of God.

CONCLUSION

Luke thinks—and who would dream of contradicting him?—that events happen in space and time. These events can be narrated, and certain events are chosen depending on the narrator's point of view. In the beginning, the evangelist exposes the criteria that determined his selection (Luke 1:1-4).

The spatio-temporal details of these events fit into the framework of the powerful masters: the kings and leaders who reign at a certain moment in time. The Lukan synchronisms do not differ on this point from the dating that the OT prophets offered. Luke is no more interested in this frame than are the Jewish historians of his time. Different from the apocalypticians, he does not dream of the destiny of the empires. This assumption prohibits us from discerning two parallel histories in Luke, for he does not elaborate a secular history. The principle of reality incites him, nonetheless, to situate concretely what he desires to narrate.

Which painting does he desire to put into this frame? Does he want to narrate a holy history or an irruption of the word of God? To express this debated problem in other terms, does he believe in a revelation in and through the events which, when under the shock, become a visible manifestation of God, a holy history whose coherence would then be intelligible? Or does he prefer a punctual revelation through the word of God and which would snub space and time?

The analysis of the typically Lukan phrases where the verb is *eigeneto* permits me to refuse this dilemma, though set forth in contemporary dogmatics, remains foreign to the evangelist's thought. By way of example, let us read the famous synchronism in Luke 3:1ff, which places the evangelical account on the same scale as the reigns of the world. The evangelical content, which provokes the narration, or simply what has happened (*eigeneto*), is first *rhma qeou*. The action of God plays on the mode of speaking. It is not possible, henceforth, to affirm positively that God intervenes directly in history and provokes events that inherently have a salvific character. But the text continues and passes from the level of the word to the level of facts. The verifiable facts are certainly not swollen with divine force. They are not in themselves revelatory. For God, in a certain measure, withdraws while advancing at the same time. God speaks, but to communicate God's word, God uses a relay. The man God has chosen and to whom God

addresses God's word in this case is John the Baptist. The latter belongs to concrete life; he has a name, an age, a graspable reality. What distinguishes him from the others, what makes him a link between God and humankind, does not belong to the visible or verifiable order. While he travels across the country, (v. 3a), he does what every man could do. He becomes an original, new, bearer of God among men, when he preaches a baptism of repentance, with a view to the forgiveness of sins (v. 3b). We can speak of salvation history, only on the condition that we not place under this banner an installation of the divine in history or, at the other extreme, limit God's intervention to a proclamation without effect on the events of the world. There is a salvation history because men and women under the action of the word of God provoke a history and live it. A voice, preserved in the book of promises, confirms this specificity of salvation history; in this case, it is the voice of the prophet Isaiah whom Luke quotes in verses 4-5 (Isa 40:3-5).

God's intervention is described here in terms of the word. It is not always so. What has roused the grounds for grievance of the theology of glory directed against Luke are the so-called miraculous acts where God seems to put a hand to the plow of history. First of all, let us say that these actions are never those of God, but of God's messengers: angels, the Spirit, and so on. Furthermore, Luke is not concerned with the risk that he runs in mentioning the celestial forces, for again such interventions are words, orders, messages of encouragement. Moreover, this word is destined not for just anyone but for believers, and this situates the reception in the order of faith. Ambiguity often characterizes these manifestations. We forget too frequently that in Acts 21:4, the disciples in Tyre beg Paul "by the Spirit" not to go up to Jerusalem. At the same time, Paul, not to mention Agabus (Acts 21:11), affirms that from city to city the Holy Spirit announces to him the suffering that awaits him in the capital (Acts 20:22f.). Finally, let us note that Luke is constrained to speak of these divine interventions afterward. This suppresses any aspiration to a direct and auto-sufficient revelation. Luke, of course, can declare that the tongues of fire came down on the disciples at Pentecost or that the Holy Spirit came upon Jesus in bodily form, but he recognizes at the same time—what we forget too often—the metaphorical character of these affirmations. The miracles themselves must be read in the perspective of the first century as signs of the active presence of the divine and not as proofs to convince unbelievers. Luke takes care regularly to associate them with faith. He does not elaborate

a conception of nature where “miracles” come to perturb the natural order.

In summary, Luke integrates without hesitation the fulfillment of the purpose of God (cf. the importance of the term *boulē hē tou theou*) into the lives of humans. It is this junction, for lack of a better term, we call salvation history, for, if we dare say, God is coherent with God’s ideas: God’s project is accomplished by stages linked by thresholds.

Let us not forget that the main stage is the life of Jesus of Nazareth, the center of the Lukan message. This life, which should not be subdivided, passes by way of death—Luke does not tone it down; he even cultivates its memory—in order to arrive at the resurrection and especially the ascension. Here again, and especially here, God called forth a human presence, a person, Jesus, Son of God through the intervention of the Spirit and the lineage of Adam (Luke 3:23-38). The Parousia, or at least the date of the end, loses its importance. Only the *ajrchē* counts. The *telōs*, the end, depends on it, not by reason of a historical determinism but rather by theological necessity.

Without a doubt, Luke thinks that the end of history will be marked by a divine intervention of another type: a direct sort, “in Power,” where God triumphs. This type will manifest and openly realize God’s plan. If this is the case, the last divine activity will correspond to the first, creation, which was visible as well. In Luke, these two are differentiated from the more discreet and indirect interventions which stake out salvation history, the love relationship of God and God’s people.

This Lukan conception of the intervention of God among humans, particularly the eschatological sending of the Son and the Spirit, is less original than has been said. With the other Christians of the apostolic age and his time, Luke deems that the history of humanity, our concrete history, has a positive sense by reason of the word of God which rings out and the Spirit which is distributed.

Luke’s originality resides in the responsibility of believers, activated by the action of God, attested in the kerygma, and confirmed in the narrative. This human side of the eschatological reality, attested by *metanoia*, is expressed in the apostolic function. It also explains the presence of the book of Acts side by side with the gospel. This proximity suited the Christians of later centuries, who attentively placed the Epistles next to the gospels. Like them, Luke believes that by the Word of God and the word of human beings, by the Holy Spirit and the pres-

ence of the church, believers are placed in a double and yet unique relation with the living Christ and the historical Jesus. The gift of God and the welcome God reserves for humanity constitutes the totality of salvation history. Even if we need not identify the Christ and his church, we can no longer separate them.